

Conspiracy Rises Again

Racial Sympathy and Radical Solidarity across Empires

POULOMI SAHA

When in 1925 members of the Jugantar, a secret revolutionary association in colonial India, began to conceive of what they believed to be a more effective strategy of anticolonial revolt than that of non-violence promoted at the time by the mainstream Congress Party in Chittagong, they chose for themselves a new name: the Indian Republican Army (IRA). In so doing, they explicitly constructed a revolutionary genealogy from which their future actions were to draw inspiration, a direct link between the anticolonial revolt in East Bengal and the 1916 Easter Uprising in Ireland.¹ The 1930 attack on the Chittagong Armory, the first in a series of revolutionary actions taken by the IRA, also marked the anniversary of the Irish rebellion. The very language of Irish revolt seeped into the practices of the Indian organization as they smuggled in illegal copies of the writings of Dan Breen and Éamon de Valera and began each meeting with a reading of the Proclamation of the Irish Provisional Government.

The ideological and textual kinship between these two anticolonial communities and another former holding of the British empire, the United States, illuminates transcolonial circuits that formed a

curiously shared revolutionary project, at once deeply local and insistently global. Rather than simply offer a historical account of those interconnections, this essay presses on the language of resurrection offered by the Easter date of these two uprisings to consider revolutionary violence as perpetual, repetitive haunting. Locating these interconnections and their falter engages a form of reading that I will call here conspiratorial—a practice of reading for expansive sympathy in both latent and manifest forms, for the travel of shared breath across revolutionary imaginations: to argue for a historiographical live burial by which the violences of the past reappear in surprising, fleeting, and sometimes incongruous forms, disrupting the imperial promise of futurity and continuity; to argue for forms of radical sympathy that emerge, flourish, and stutter in an era of ethnonationalist constriction as the transportation and translation of British imperial conceptions of race become a critical node of imagining radical sympathies in America.

The Resurrection and the Crypt: A Time of Revolution

The date of the 1916 Rising on April 24, Easter Monday, was of course not picked at random. Originally set for the day before, on Easter Sunday itself, the decision to strike was postponed after a rash of conflicting orders. Beginning that morning, some twelve hundred Irish men and women took key infrastructural sites around Dublin by force: the General Post Office (GPO), the Four Courts, the South Dublin Union, Boland's Mill, Stephen's Green, and Jacobs' biscuit factory. They declared the Irish Republic independent of the United Kingdom and, against odds of supply and sheer number, held off the British Army for six days.

Though a Sunday attack might have more efficiently compressed symbolic and functional elements of the day, the mythos of Christ's resurrection essentially scaffolded in particular Padraic Pearse's vision of the insurrection. He writes in "The Coming Revolution" (1913), "I do not know if the Messiah has yet come, and I am not sure that there will be any visible and personal Messiah in this redemption: the people itself will perhaps be its own Messiah, the people laboring, scourged, crowned with thorns, agonizing and dying, to rise again immortal and impassible."² The body of an Irish people is

cohered into the singularity and exemplarity of the Messiah—yoking together tropes of messianism from the Old and New Testaments. This is a call not to wait for salvation to come but to become the self-sacrificing savior, redemption by whom is allocated across an unbroken and unmarked futurity. By the same stroke, Ireland is purged of both sin and subjugation. Thus the choice of Easter as the moment of rebellion aligns the certainty of death with the promise of futurity, an iconography of moral certitude.

Fourteen years later the insurrection of that Easter Monday rose again, sutured to resurrection's promise of return. On April 18, 1930, Good Friday, sixty-five young men under the guidance of schoolteacher Surya Sen captured the weapons depot in Chittagong in East Bengal, destroyed the telegraph services, and attempted to assassinate members of the European club, inaugurating four days of concerted anticolonial armed insurgency. They hoisted the tricolor flag of the Swadeshi movement, declaring a provisional revolutionary government, before British troops forced them to flee into the surrounding hills. (Curiously, on this very day, the 6:30 BBC news bulletin famously announced: "Good evening. Today is Good Friday. There is no news.") The seemingly ragtag group of revolutionaries kept the much larger and better-equipped military forces at bay for several days, allowing many members of the IRA to escape arrest. The armory raid also inspired waves of armed anticolonial protest in the region that continued over the following two years. If this sounds familiar, it should. The IRA imagined its strike against colonial infrastructure as contiguous to and in solidarity with a transnational circuit of anti-imperial and left resistance that participated in the world revolution with Germany, China, and Russia. Revolution was to be a shared practice, a chorus of action whose various verses would evoke a mythopolitics that ranged from theological to apophatic. Messianic, we might say, without messianism. For colonial authorities—not least of all Police Commissioner Charles Tegart, an Irishman who served as an intelligence officer in Dublin during the Anglo-Irish War—the anniversary did not go without note. For them, the uprising most visibly and troublingly bore the mark of Ireland and of 1916 in particular.

As police scoured Chittagong in the days following the raid, seeking evidence and absconders, they found littered throughout the town pamphlets addressed to the students and youth to stand in

arms against colonial tyranny and copies of Breen's proscribed *My Fight for Irish Freedom*. The "search statement" for the body of a young man of about fifteen years old killed in the fire in Jalalabad Hill lists these "items seized":

One piece of paper containing some writings in ink—being page 109 torn from a *khata*: It contains the following writings in ink. "Lalor wrote before the Irish Revolution:—If any body tells you that an act of armed resistance, even if offered by ten men only, even if offered by men armed with stones, any and every such man who tells that such an act of resistance is premature, imprudent or dangerous, shall be at once spurned and spat at; for remark you this and recollect that somehow, somewhere and by somebody a beginning must be made and that first act of resistance is always and shall ever be premature, imprudent and dangerous."³

Borne on the body of a corpse, the words of James Fintan Lalor might be read as Inspector JC Farmer read them when he wrote Te-gart on arriving in Chittagong to oversee evidence collection: that the IRA of Chittagong followed the lead of Irish republicans, taking their revolts of 1848 and 1916 pedagogically.

Lalor, an architect of the Young Irelander Rebellion in 1848, calls for a start, even as he cites the inspiration of the 1798 Rebellion in "Clearing the Decks," the essay from which the quote was transcribed. Each start is new yet always casting an eye back to those failed revolts whose incipency made necessary the fight this time around. But should we take seriously Lalor's promise of nascency and recklessness, look closely at the apparent failure of 1848, and account fully for the lost life of the unidentified body against which those words lay, we might see the coherence of text and form otherwise. Armed resistance's temporality is the intimate paradox of the ended life and repeated word. The beginning, the first act of resistance, is a false start. Not because it does not take off—it does—but because it must, as all false starts, begin again. That start—premature, imprudent, dangerous—appears as a scratch on the record, both that which does not count and that on which we stutter, skip, and back-cue. When the Indian Republican Army chose the date of their raid,

they did not draw on a prior moment of revolutionary potential immediately fulfilled. Like the Young Irelanders glancing back to 1798 and the Irish Republicans to 1848, the Indian Republicans commemorated, recalled with, acts of armed resistance that produced precisely what the body on the record evinced: that the end of human life carries the promise of continual return, onward but not forward. Indeed, Pearse writes in the preface to *Ghosts* (1916), “There is only one way to appease a ghost, you must do the thing it asks you. The ghosts of a nation sometimes ask very big things.” The pamphlet ends, “Thus Tone, thus Davis, thus Lalor, thus Parnell. Methinks I have raised some ghosts that will take a little laying.”⁴ By these accounts, revolt follows revolt, a linear if troubled accumulation of resistance, its remedy, and its potential outcome.

Resurrection, the movement by which Jesus, once crucified on the cross and entombed behind stone, returns to life as proof positive of his divine lineage, appears in the English language as the promise of both return and progress. From Latin’s *resurgo*, the word carries the propulsive force of ascent, the sudden rush of the wave upward toward surface and sky. In the New Testament, resurrection is the interregnum of the holy but material body between internment (into the earth) and ascension (toward heaven). Resurrection, quite distinctly, is neither resuscitation nor reincarnation. Jesus is not brought back to life from death, nor is he reborn into a new form. He rises again, from mortal existence to immortal life. His reappearance in front of disciples after the spectacular execution of his body is a repetition with difference of Word made flesh (John 1:14). Jesus’s reappearance, though fleshly, is of a body that is not the same physical one on the cross but rather a new spiritual body, as Paul writes in 1 Corinthians:

What you sow is not brought to life unless it dies. And what you sow is not the body that is to be but a bare kernel of wheat, perhaps, or of some other kind; . . . So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown corruptible; it is raised incorruptible. It is sown dishonorable; it is raised glorious. It is sown weak; it is raised powerful. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual one.

We here see the disambiguation of sin and sown from which the political resurrection of Easter as inspiration comes for the Irish Republicans. Sin from which Ireland was to be cleansed is inheritance of what is corrupted and debased. The seed of Irish possibility is, in the act of resurrection, chaffed of the poisonous enclosure of British rule.

While the biblical idiom of resurrection and salvation through blood was a deeply local one for the Irish Catholic imagination, it was not nearly as foreign as one might think to the Indian (though modern Hinduism lacks a distinctive messianic feature). Indeed, this is because of the material and administrative embeddedness made possible by the British empire. In addition to the significant number of Irishmen in the British Civil Service, like Charles Tegart, Thomas Babington Macaulay's "Minute on Education" accompanying the English Education Act of 1835 called for the creation of an Indian administrative elite through English-language education and produced new demand for missionary schooling on the subcontinent. Macaulay's vision of "a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect," was driven by the labor of those who were themselves British colonial subjects—the Irish and the Scots.⁵ It is therefore no surprise that authorities would come to locate a causal link between growing anti-colonial sentiment among an Indian elite—targets of the mandate of English-medium education—and intimate, pedagogical contact with other wayward subjects.⁶ While other revolutionary and political groups in India adhered to the ritual and ideology of goddess worship as political theology at the time, the IRA's citation of Easter is a feature of the postcolonial condition, the idiom of empire.⁷ How wonderfully apropos that Macaulay, laying the groundwork for what he hoped would be a long administrative possession of India, would inadvertently encourage the development of Indians, in blood and color, whose taste, opinions, morals, and intellect were not merely English but imperial,⁸ for whom the language of resurrection and resistance would be a patois of Indianness and Irishness.

This resurrection, like that of Jesus, requires the destruction of human life. Indeed, much has been made by scholars of Pearse's rhetoric of blood sacrifice—"bloodshed is a cleansing and a sanctifying

thing”—and its centrality to the Rising.⁹ Joseph Valente suggests that for Pearse, Connolly, and other architects of the Rising, “envisioning and enacting blood sacrifice less as an instrumental measure for winning Irish independence than as an end in itself—the resurrection of Ireland’s patriotic spirit in repeated risings—... gave blood sacrifice its final liturgical and evangelical form and came to be, for future generations, its embodiment.”¹⁰ Easter’s promise of resurrection constitutes the nation continually and repeatedly through death and sacrifice in an Andersonian mode. The time of insurrection, we might say following Pearse, is messianic. Utopian time to come, inaugurated by the sacrifice of Christ within Christian eschatology, is at once foretold and the fulcrum on which history rests.

In *Specters of Marx*, Derrida writes of the “messianic opening to what is coming, that is, to the event that cannot be awaited as such, or recognized in advance therefore, to the event as the foreigner itself, to her or to him for whom one must leave an empty place, always, in memory of the hope—and this is the very place of spectrality [i.e., ghosts].”¹¹ The future to come, which cannot be seen, is not yet but always already, lives inside a space that Derrida recognizes by its opening: a mouth. A mouth gaping, but unspeaking. What is inside is out of sight, encrypted. The space of what is promised is haunted by what no longer is but has not yet ceased to be. Spectrality is the historicist trace. The crypt, the mouth of which is blocked, is also where Christ becomes undead and in becoming undead becomes Himself. The crypt, then, isn’t where corpses—artifacts of death—are held but is instead the waiting room of the redemption and liberation to come.

Within this messianism, armed revolt refuses the singular and linear narrative of progressive temporality. When Pearse wonders if the Messiah has yet come, he glances backward to the 1798 Rebellion, to Emmet’s 1803 uprising, to the Young Irelander Rebellion in 1848, to the Fenians in 1867. From his vantage, he cannot say for certain that the Messiah has not already appeared in these prior revolutionary eruptions (“I do not know if the Messiah has yet come”), or whether He will in 1916 either (“I am not sure that there will be any visible and personal Messiah in this redemption”). The future that is opened and made possible (“the people itself will perhaps

be its own Messiah”) disrupts the linearity of the past by suggesting a hitherto unrealized possibility of redemption but is yet not beyond the prior event that makes it possible. Eugene O’Brien suggests that Pearse’s subsumption of a revolutionary past “involved a centrifugal opening, spatially and temporally, to other cultures, to other aspects of Irishness, and to the future.”¹²

The 1916 Proclamation of the Irish Provisional Government reads, “In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national freedom and sovereignty; six times during the past three hundred they have asserted it in arms.” This seventh time, commemorating Jesus’s resurrection, revolt reappears. Carrying on its form the traces of those prior six insurrections, this one does not guarantee victory but holds in possibility that the future to come may, in hindsight, locate itself in this moment. But it intimates a hope that the generation to come might also participate in the Irish-making, if not Ireland-making, project of aborted and failed revolt. What would happen if we were to conceive of the project of national sovereignty in terms of the moments at which it does not come to pass? I am not suggesting a negative politics, or the romanticization of failure. Rather, I am inviting us to the mouth of the crypt—to the blocked opening, behind which lies that which we cannot foretell yet for which we have already left space.¹³

Nicholas Abraham and Maria Torok call the crypt both the site of preservative repression and the cocoon around the chrysalis.¹⁴ What is inside the crypt, whether Christ or the revolutionary body, is not destroyed. It is radically transformed yet recalls, necessarily and vividly, the prior form by which it makes itself knowable to us. Resurrection, recall, is not rebirth. Encryption shuttles what is unspeakable, unincorporable, untimely, out of sight to await the cipher and signal of its resurgence. But how do we parse, as historiographical practice, what is encrypted/in the crypt, lying in wait for the revolution to come? While Indian and Irish Republicans forged material and textual links between their uprisings, the sign by which they announced that contingency is itself a kind of hermeneutic cipher. Diffuse messianism of these revolutions that might yet come depends on access to that cipher—the key to the crypt(ogram). Certainly, colonial officials like Tegart and Farmer believed themselves to have

the key that unlocked the encrypted intimacy between imperial holdings and, in so doing, revealed some extent of the spread contagion. They saw connection everywhere. Indeed, critical to the project of British colonial administration was the ability to decode potentially dangerous interrelation between individuals, organizations, and even colonies that might otherwise go unmarked, remain hidden behind the blocked mouth of the crypt. Colonial officials were trained to read paranoidly and to map conspiracy. The analytic work of mapping conspiracy demands deft movement between what is appreciable—semiotic and material—and what is allusive and elusive. Entanglements between India and Ireland as tracked by authorities and as cited by insurgents inaugurated a kind of revolutionary time that necessitated a practice of reading for the trace of conspiracy: for revolutionaries, a paranoid optimism anticipating the freedom to come that might yet have been; and for authorities, a paranoid pessimism presaging the inevitable return of revolt.

Indeed, revolution can only ever be untimely, the return back to a prior moment foretold by the movement of cyclicity, the circle that aspires to the spiral. Etymologically, its connotation as the establishment of new order comes late in the life of revolution. Change, for most of the time of the English language, is inextricable from repetition and return. So revolution must wait. And it must come both too early and too late. Fourteen years after Pearse recalled the transgenerational assertion of independence from British rule, Surya Sen read out another declaration: “The Indian Republican Army, Chittagong branch, hereby solemnly declares its intention to stand today against the age long repression by the British people and their government, which they have followed as a cruel policy to keep the three hundred millions of Indian people subjugated for unlimited time and to eradicate the slightest trace of nationalism and their national originality amongst them.” The time of colonial rule, unlike that of its resistance, is less clearly marked. Untimely too, perhaps, but by its perpetuity rather than by its cyclicity. Whereas the Irish Republican proclamation orients the life of nationalism toward a generational and generative body, the IRA evokes a haunting timelessness of infertility.

So when in the proclamation the IRA “pledges the life of every one of its members to the cause of freedom,” it makes a womb of the crypt, that open space of potentiality, of the future to come that cannot be predicted, that is never without the spectral remains of what came before, that is always marked by death. Revolutionary genealogy, a genealogy of revolutionary sentiment, radically refigures the logic of chronobiology. One way to see each event is as leading up to the eventual independence of India and Ireland from British rule. Indeed, this is true. But they are equally, perhaps even more so, markers of what never was. Neither India nor Ireland directly comes to political independence by the bloody means of armed revolt. Nonetheless, there is an impulse and compulsion to resurrect the dead and to build of their bones a bridge to the future that came to be.

In 2010 Ashutosh Gowariker, the Indian director known for his big-budget Bollywood hit *Lagaan*, revisits the scene of 1930 Chittagong, which is now a part of Bangladesh, in *Khelein Hum Je Jaan Sey* (loosely, *We'll Play with Our Lives*). The cinematic trailer begins with Surya Sen and the provocation that he was “a schoolteacher who triggered a revolution.” The 1930 uprising is, in its cinematic reincarnation, adopted into a nationalist narrative of a nation to which the town of Chittagong no longer belongs. Moreover, its apparent failure is rescued into a reproductive heroism. Revolution is herein proleptic. The historicist subvention reframes Pearse’s adverbial speculation that the people perhaps will be their own Messiah into the future anterior. The people, in this case, will have been their own Messiah.

But let us press against the anteriority of this future tense. For Chittagong in 1930 and Dublin in 1916, revolt is significant because of the revolution it did not see coming. This is what Derrida calls the messianic without messianism: “Whether the promise promises this or that, whether it be fulfilled or not, or whether it be unfulfillable, there is some promise and therefore some historicity as future-to-come.”¹⁵ The promise, that open space of the crypt housing what we cannot see, is just that—open space, unfillable by its constitution as open, that invites and promises the fulfillment that might yet be, that might have been, that may be. Revolutionary possibility’s

asynchronous time coexists along and beyond these temporal markers. The empty space of the crypt is not just where the specters of the past lie in wait and in fragment but is the very site of timelessness itself. It is the waiting room of the undead.

Conjuring the Vampire: Crossing the Color Line

In New York, in March 1920, Éamon de Valera spoke to a meeting of the Friends of Freedom for India (FFI). Addressing a group whose founding members and national council included W. E. B. Du Bois, Franz Boas, and Upton Sinclair, de Valera brought the question of kinship between India and Ireland close to home. His speech, later published as *India and Ireland*, begins by recalling George Washington's 1788 missive, "Patriots of Ireland! Champions of liberty in all lands!—be strong in hope! Your cause is identical with mine," and suggests that were Washington alive then, he would have extended that assertion of perfect similarity to India as well.¹⁶ The common link between these three lands is of course their common ruler, Britain. For de Valera, speaking to a crowd of over five hundred Americans sympathetic to the Indian anticolonial cause, this shared genealogical condition of imperial oppression also suggested its own shared solution: the armed revolution of America to the armed rebellion of Ireland to a future moment of armed revolt in India, too.

For de Valera, the relation between the wayward children of the empire is not simply genealogical along the bloodlines of imperial hegemony that were geopolitically emerging at that moment. Instead, he insists that what bound America to Britain, and binds India to them both, is a very different relationship of blood indeed. He writes: "We of Ireland and you of India must each of us endeavor, both as separate peoples and in combination, to rid ourselves of the vampire that is fattening on our blood, and we must never allow ourselves to forget what weapon it was by which Washington rid his country of this same vampire."¹⁷ De Valera's invocation of British vampirism physiologically and chronologically compresses the time of empire. Colonies current, past, and interim are culled together into a single body, raced brown, black, white, within a common network of veins. Sanguinary rites of the vampire, bent over his

victim like a lover, the very definition of parasite—one who eats beside—produce serointimacy not just between vampire and victim but also across victims.

De Valera's vampire thus becomes the site of a transimperial comingling, condensing the geographic distance between British holdings and the chronological time of their revolts intracorporeally. Here, serointimacy of the subjugated, the kind of propinquity and affinity that would be so anxiety-producing for colonial authorities in Bengal in a decade, is what feeds the monstrous immortality of the empire. When de Valera suggests a weapon ready at hand, already marked by the blood of a prior revolution, the wooden stake aimed at the heart of empire's vampire is suspended in time. This is a troubling stutter; that vampire, once apparently vanquished, nonetheless continues to fatten itself. What promise is there of revolt if not of the return of the repressed?¹⁸ The reverent will return, it seems, as surely as the specter of insurrection. The apotropaic magic de Valera offers as consolation is also a particular kind of return. Vanquishing the vampire requires looking into the mirror in which the vampire shows no reflection; its historical self is unchanged. But the mirror of historicism by which two images are reconciled as congruent and congruous appears as the past: not the past itself but its belated, fragmented, flattened specter.

Intimate feast of blood; penetration of wood into deathless flesh. We have, in the cyclicity, returned to the figure with which we began. A repetition with a monstrous difference. The sacrament of the Eucharist abides by the promise of John 6:56, "He who eats My flesh and drinks My blood abides in Me, and I in him." Here the worshipper takes the transubstantiated body and blood of Christ into herself; the immortal life of Christ is a consecration. In the vampire, both he who feasts and he who is feasted on are cursed by immortality of another order. In Christ, you are returned to yourself—"redeemed." In vampirism, you are lost to another—"enthralled." In both cases, a new body is created by this intimate, fluid exchange. We might say that it is conjured into being. To conjure is not just, as we commonly use it, to summon the supernatural. Conjunction is also the act of entering into a conspiracy, to swear together on something to come (from *jurare*, "to swear"). If vampirism and blood

sacrifice haunt the language of revolutionary community between India and Ireland, another kind of supernatural body stalks the perimeter of their filiality to America.

De Valera's appearance before the FFI, too, is evidence of the common bonds between these three wide-limned holdings of the British empire, its long-tenacious grip across space and time, the broad global imaginary it produced. More to the point, it suggests a model of intimacy between sites of anticolonial resistance that exchanges the fantasy of historical linearity for an insistence on the prefixed repetition promise of *rebellion*. The FFI, like the IRA a decade later, mnemonically sutured itself to a prior and proximate Irish organization. The Friends of Irish Freedom (FIF), established in New York in 1916 to support the Easter Rising, offered an example of leftist solidarity, radical imagination, and the circulation of transnational capital.

The FFI, begun in 1919 by Agnes Smedley, Sailendranath Ghosh, and Roger Nash Baldwin (who helped found the ACLU), is a transnationalist afterword to the federal case that set the stage for America's most xenophobic and exclusionary immigration policy to date. Smedley and Ghosh met Baldwin while held in the Tombs in New York after their indictment under the Espionage Act for their role in plans to arm revolt in India by way of Germany. Theirs were arrests at the tail end of a case commonly known as the Hindu-German Conspiracy. In 1917 the first defendants were brought to trial in San Francisco in *United States v. Franz Bopp, et al.* on charges of conspiracy to violate American neutrality during World War I by planning with the German consul to ship arms to India, to support a growing nationalist movement through decidedly internationalist means. The trial marked to that date the longest and most expensive federal case in America. One hundred five defendants included Indian nationalists involved in the Ghadr Party (whose very name means "revolt") and German diplomats. Curiously, the Ghadr Party, loosely affiliated with one of the same name in India that also promoted militant resistance to British rule, consisted of largely upper-class Bengali students at the University of California, Berkeley, and Punjabi farmers in the Central Valley. They comprised a political program that insisted on the continuity between agricultural rights and land reform

in America and anticolonialism in India. Ghosh and Smedley were picked up in New York in the closing days of the six-month trial, their involvement in the plot that spanned three continents and two imperial governances inscribed on the legal record before they themselves became subject of surveillance and incarceration. Though their own indictments never came to trial, they were synchronously imprisoned with their compatriots on the other side of the continent.

“Conspiracy” derives from the Latin *conspirare* meaning to breathe together, to share a single inhalation. To conspire is to be bound to another by the act from which all sound and movement proceed. Conspiracy is thus the creation of an organism, a living system formed and animated by the intimacy of shared breath. Conspiracy depends on fidelity, the shared promise of a future possibility, the commitment to abide by an oath. The word shares an origin with the Latin *coniuare*, from which *conjure*, itself a swearing together, derives. Conspiracy, in this way, is the conjuring into being of a body made of breath, thought, secret, passed within and between unseen people, that appears unconstrained, amorphous, and invisible. While the secret refuses reassuring corporeality, slips through the evidentiary net of the perceptible, the organism conjured into being by the oath of faith—pressed together so tightly as to pass between them a common respiration—is an insistently material one. Conspiracy invites a kind of paranoid scan in which the sign of the body stands in for the mark of the secret. In common law, the charge of conspiracy occupies a unique place as the only crime for which no formal expression or material action is required in order to be proved. Indeed, as an “inchoate” crime, conspiracy is one of intentionality, agreement, and intimacy. Like British officials scouring scraps of paper and whispered rumors for whiffs of contiguity between insurgencies in Bengal and in Ireland, a decade earlier the US government set out, however reluctantly, to read conspiratorially within a court of law. Conspiracy, like the specter of revolution and the revenant of the vampire, promises to rise again, to be resurrected.

A conjuration, Derrida writes, is an alliance that seeks to itself exorcise, “to attempt to both destroy and disavow a malignant, demonized, diabolized force, most often an evil-doing spirit, a specter, a kind of ghost who comes back or who still risks coming back

post mortem.”¹⁹ The Hindu-German Conspiracy trial is the administrative and semiotic conjuration of an alliance—the Ghadr, as a political entity, existed before and beyond the confines of the trial—that is rendered recognizable because of what it emerges in response to. Though the trial purported to adjudicate whether the Ghadr and the German officials conspired to violate US neutrality during the war, the conjured body in question turned its face to a different malignant force. Its intended target, that vampire of de Valera’s invocation (indeed, Har Dayal, editor of the Ghadr newspaper the *Independent Hindustan*, would insistently refer not to the British Empire but to the British Vampire), was the very same—though repetition is always with a difference—that the American state had freed itself of; indeed, the case demanded the American government disaggregate the conjured body from the cause of its conjuration.

After a long and startlingly dramatic trial in which one defendant shot another in open court on the penultimate day, twenty-nine of the Bopp defendants were convicted of lesser crimes and given surprisingly light sentences.²⁰ Conspiracy to overthrow the yoke of British rule, in America, was a less egregious crime than Britain might have hoped, the trial less a lesson against perils of insurgency. In some vivid ways, the Bopp trial revealed the deep intimacy and sympathy between the past and future of British imperial decline. This too is a feature of reading conspiratorially—the conjuring of relationality across time and space. Under the character of simile, an American public and legal system both could identify in the rationale behind the charges a shared project, sinusoidally compressed over time and space. Like American revolutionaries 150 years earlier, Indians were compelled to wrest their freedom from the British. That project, so figured, could not be fully criminalized on American land. However, that sympathy only extended so far. For the bodies gathered in conspiracy could not, in service of this project, make themselves American. What was proscribed and prosecuted in colonial Bengal drew roots into new soil in a former British colony at the turn of the twentieth century. The wayward children of an iron-fisted matriarch in spectacular decline were unable to entirely declare their affinity to one another, but the emancipated elder was unable to participate gleefully in parental discipline. But the body that was

conjured into being under the sign of the charge was one that would prove itself nonetheless difficult for America to digest.

The FFI, consisting of some of the most prominent liberal academics and activists of the time, had a twofold objective in its project of Indian decolonization: “to maintain the right of asylum for political refugees from India; to present the case for the independence of India.”²¹ Domestic protection for Indian subjects was, for the FFI, inextricable from international support of Indian independence. This propinquity was as much functional as ideological. Members of the Ghadr Party, especially after the Bopp trial, were under enormous scrutiny and surveillance by the American government, and the threat of potential deportation still loomed large. Though potential deportations included in the original charges of conspiracy brought against the defendants slipped away in the final verdict, the possibility by no means disappeared. It was imperative to the FFI that radical anticolonial and leftist politics find safe haven inside the borders of the United States during a moment of global anxiety about precisely those commitments. The FFI’s appeal to an American public to join its membership, like de Valera’s speech in 1920, turned on the history of the United States as a former British colony and its constitutional commitment to sovereignty to render it a ready ally of Britain’s current colony. Its rhetoric bore itself on the wing of Wilsonian interventionist imaginary. In a full-page ad in the *Independent Hindustan*, the FFI writes, “Can a liberty-loving American remain silent when inhuman brutalities, oppression, persecution and massacre are being carried on by the most militaristic nations in the world? Did we not make a pledge to make the world safe for democracy? Do you know one-fifth of the whole human race is struggling for freedom?”²² For an explicitly anti-imperial organization, the FFI leans on a curiously exceptionalist language. America, emerging from what Michelle Stephens has called “a war of empire,” was positioned as remedy to the embodied and material violences of British rule.²³ Freedom, liberty, and democracy were both its wheelhouse and its mandate.

The Hindu-German Conspiracy stood at the crossroads between visible and invisible forms of power. Though the federal government was clearly reluctant to serve as disciplinary proxy for Britain

against its colonial subjects, the undeniable realities of geopolitical loyalty and alliance made it impossible to turn a blind eye. Moreover, its own interests in and anxieties about potentially subversive forces inside its national borders demanded that the United States yoke anticolonial insurgency to a growing list of undesirable and unincorporable sentiments. The Ghadr Party's anticolonial militancy rankled less than its insistence that the cause of freedom from British rule was inextricable from issues of agricultural workers' rights, racial violence, and class inequality. A motley mix of Indian students and farmworkers steeped rich in socialist and antiestablishmentarian commitments, the Ghadrans represented precisely the sorts of foreign subjects toward whom a new vision of American ethnonationalist containment would be directed.

Indeed, the most significant addendum to the trial, though rarely described in relation to one another, was the series of subsequent legislative changes to the US immigration statute. The Immigration Act of 1917, also known as the Asiatic Barred Zone Act, expanded the limitations of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 to include a wide range of aliens barred from entry. Newly proscribed aliens included the feeble-minded, insane, polygamists, anarchists, and people from all of Asia—except for the Philippines, which was at this time an American colony.²⁴ The act did not of course apply to aliens already in the United States. Contingent—that is, touching, in contact—rather than causal, the Ghadr trial and Immigration Act reveal the dense interlay of anxieties and fraught ideologies that the American state apparatus and public were working out in this moment. Though the 1918 revision of the act, passed in October, would go on to clarify the definition of anarchist and to insist that convicted anarchists who had lived in the United States less than five years were subject to deportation, it passed after the trial's culmination. Strikingly, anarchism was never included in the charges brought against the Bopp defendants, even as America's panic about communist and anarchist forces inside its borders, so piqued in this post-Haymarket moment, propelled forward the conspiracy case and coincided, with brutal precision, with growing xenophobic immigration policies. The United States responded to the paranoid mapping of British imperial control onto its sovereign soil with the tightening of its borders and the

honing of a surveillance apparatus that sought out not just racial outsiders but ideological others as well.²⁵

Here we are faced with a basic but inescapable paradox of this historical moment, and perhaps of radical imagination more broadly. Claims of equivalence necessary for political solidarity must reify the basis of their constitutive difference. American sympathy for the cause of Indian independence, especially as imagined by the FFI's own radical orientations, had to contend with what Du Bois would famously name the problem of the time: "The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line,—the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea." The terms of the FFI's investment in Indian independence were inextricable from the legal designations by which Indians were now barred from immigration to the United States and from the ongoing court cases in which immigrants from northern India—*United States v. Balsara*, a Parsee from Bombay, in 1910 and *United States v. Akhay Kumar Mazumdar*, a Bengali, in 1913—sued for their right to citizenship on the basis of being Caucasian. To demand permanence in the United States was to demand entrance to the other side of the color line, to align with whiteness in the moment at which America declared whiteness its character. How then do we make sense of the concatenation of political sympathies here? Of radical commitments to decolonization and liberation alongside petitions to taxonomical racialization?

Radical internationalist solidarity seems to stutter at the pronouncement of national citizenship. To be clear, I am not suggesting that the Indians who petitioned for naturalization on the grounds of racial classification were white nationalists. Indeed, a rarely commented-on footnote to the landmark 1923 case of *Bhagat Singh Thind*, which would ratify the denial of citizenship to Indians in America for another forty years, is Thind's own sympathies to the Ghadr, many of whom he knew closely from shared time in Berkeley. For most of the men who sued for naturalization, the Caucasian identity claim was a useful cloak to wrap around other exigent needs for immigration. But the forms of radical intimacy through which Indian and Irish republicans alike would imagine their causes to be shared falter on American soil with the intervention of a domestic category of race.

Early Indian immigrants to America fell broadly into three categories (the links to imperial caste formations will quickly become clear): Parsis like Bhicaji Balsara, Sikhs from Punjab like Bhagat Singh Thind, and upper-caste Bengalis like Taraknath Das. In 1910 Balsara was granted his petition by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, which avowed that Parsis, Zoroastrians who emigrated to India from Persia in the seventh century, were racially white. Thirty years later, in *Wadia v. United States*, when another Parsi man sued for the right to naturalization, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals would cite the *Balsara* decision to hold that “there a Parsee, and in *Re Halladjian*, C.C., 174 F. 834, an Armenian from Syria, was admitted on the ground that irrespective of any question of the color of the individual applicant he was of the Caucasian race and was thus properly classified as white.”²⁶ The courts would not resolve the question of Indian racial classification until the Thind case, in which the Supreme Court would rule that Thind, despite his claim to be of Aryan descent, was not a free white man. It held that “the term ‘Aryan’ has to do with linguistic, and not at all with physical, characteristics, and it would seem reasonably clear that mere resemblance in language, indicating a common linguistic root buried in remotely ancient soil, is altogether inadequate to prove common racial origin.”²⁷ Despite the Caucasian identity claims, too, Thind’s petition was refused by the Court, as it simultaneously refuted several of the major race theories of the time.

In fact, when these men—Parsi, Bengali, Sikh—claimed their right to Americanness by being “high caste Hindu” in a court of law, they imported the racial logic of the British Empire. Caste thus conceived signified, administratively and socially, in British India as a marker of ethnological difference at which class and phenotype intersected. British ethnologist H. H. Risley, whose phenotypic taxonomies within his 1901 *People of India* census report would provide the British Raj with a systematic structure of caste and color, and German Indologist Max Muller, whose philological work made a case for the Indo-Aryan migration theory, in which a single racial origin in the Caucasus diverged eastward to India and westward to Europe respectively, offer the basis of two common narratives that conflated caste and race under the sign of Aryan.²⁸ “High caste” vouchsafed

against miscegenation—here particularly classed—and thus promised singular origins based on the interdiction of touch between those of high and low castes. When caste traveled from British India across the Indian and Pacific Oceans to the West Coast of the United States, where the substantial portion of naturalization claims by Indians originated, it came to connote a new racial status—one whose deployment by immigrant Indians the Raj watched with great interest and deep concern. A weekly report to the director of British criminal intelligence in January 1917 described a recent case in which an Indian man had been granted citizenship by a Superior Court judge in Imperial County, California, which was home to a large number of Punjabi agriculturalists. Quoting from a local news source, the report went on to say: “The Naturalization Bureau contends that Hindus only of a certain caste are ‘white’ men in the legal sense of the term, and that Hindus below that standard are of such mixed lineage as to be ineligible.”²⁹ Repeating, in distortion, the move by which caste in India served as the gateway to institutional power—and indeed education, as in Macaulay’s minute, which made possible the entanglement of Irish and Indian radicalism in the first place—racial purity produces the terms for national inclusion. Despite the exclusionary immigration policies that were being implemented in this moment, targeted largely at laborers from across Asia in response to growing violence from white Americans who feared losing their jobs to these immigrants, Indians already in the United States attempted not only to secure the right to citizenship but to do so by aligning themselves with the white racial majority.³⁰

The *Thind* decision would respond to the British administrative logic of race and caste by asserting its own vision of what constituted racial citizenship in America. It held:

The children of English, French, German, Italian, Scandinavian, and other European parentage quickly merge into the mass of our population and lose the distinctive hallmarks of their European origin. On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that the children born in this country of Hindu parents would retain indefinitely the clear evidence of their ancestry. It is very far from our thought to suggest the slightest question of racial superiority or

inferiority. What we suggest is merely racial difference, and it is of such character and extent that the great body of our people instinctively recognize it and reject the thought of assimilation.³¹

Not quite the “separate but equal” of the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision, the racial difference asserted by the Court in this case would ratify the terms of American citizenship as either black (segregated but allowed) or white (the standard-bearer). In this moment at which race and citizenship are in flux, so too is the question of political solidarity and the possibility of liberationist ideals beyond the nation-state. Though the Court would certify a nationalist faith that, under the sign of Caucasian, the “brown Hindu” and the “white European” might have once shared “a common ancestor in the dim reaches of antiquity,” the category of citizen, guarded by the 1790 Naturalization Act for any “free white person” and in 1870 revised to include the Fourteenth Amendment, would not be broadened to include Indians until 1965.³²

So, while mapping radical anticolonial sympathies between India and Ireland—and, indeed, the historical invocation of the United States—offers one itinerary of spatial and temporal entanglement, the transition to a new imperial moment that the prophesied decline of the British Empire brought with it is mediated by a new global conception of race. Let us, then, return to that vampire, fattening itself on the blood of the colonized, which seemed to flicker yet persisted. It is true that George Washington might have seen himself, armed with a stake, vanquishing that undead revenant. Indeed, 150 years later America would continue to position itself as steward of independence movements abroad, champion of liberation from British rule, while producing its own imperial imagination—abroad in its newly established colonial holdings and domestically in its concretized racial citizenship. Thus when Indians—of radical sympathies and otherwise—made the claim to citizenship, they made the claim to whiteness; to a naturalized genealogy unencumbered by the lived legacy of chattel slavery; to being a part of an Aryan conquest westward that would converge with settler colonialism and military empire. This is the blood that the vampire continues to fatten on. Not the blood of free white men—of which Irish Americans would

become a part—but of the darker races of the world and within America. While hints of the resurrection would announce themselves again in Bandung in 1955, in Belgrade in 1961, in San Francisco in 1968, the project of radical sympathy evoked by the entanglements of India, Ireland, and America remains apparently incomplete. Revolutionary weak messianism must, it seems, be one without the specter of the free white man as the sign of freedom itself.

Marx writes in “The Eighteenth Brumaire” of the time of revolution, of its untimeliness: “Thus the resurrection of the dead in those revolutions served the purpose of glorifying the new struggles, not parodying the old; of magnifying the given task in imagination, not of fleeing from its solution in reality; of finding once more the spirit of revolution, not of making its ghost walk about again.”³³ Revolution is anachronous not because it repeats what has come before but because it refuses the fantasy of its own singular historicity. These failed rebellions, reinsurrections, offer us a way out of that fantasy, an invitation to wait at the mouth of the crypt, not knowing what will emerge but abiding in the certainty of its possibility.

.....

POULOMI SAHA is assistant professor of English at the University of California, Berkeley. Her first book, *An Empire of Touch: Women’s Political Labor and the Fabrication of East Bengal* (2019), was awarded the Helen Tartar First Book Subvention Prize by the American Comparative Literature Association in 2017.

Notes

1. While the relationship between the Bengali IRA and Sinn Féin has been examined in Silvestri, *Ireland and India*, and Heehs, *Bomb in Bengal*, there has hitherto been no comprehensive study of the relationship between the two revolutionary movements that includes other provocative points of contact, like the influence of Sister Nivedita, an Irish woman who deeply influenced Swami Vivekananda (see n. 6), and the construction of a revolutionary literary canon that spanned Bengal and Ireland to include works by Sarat Chandra Bose, Dan Breen, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, and Éamon de Valera. For more work on the intracolonial relations between India and Ireland, see Cook, *Imperial*

- Affinities*; Herman, *Empire's Bodies*; Jeffery, "Irish Empire?"; and O'Ceallaigh, *India and Ireland*.
2. Pearse, "Coming Revolution," 54.
 3. Intelligence Branch Files, CID, June 19, 1932, No. 115/1932, West Bengal State Archives, Calcutta.
 4. Pearse, "Ghosts," 118.
 5. Macaulay and Young, *Speeches by Lord Macaulay*, 359.
 6. Perhaps one of the most prominent examples is Sister Nivedita, an Irishwoman born Margaret Nobel, who became a follower and then close associate of the Hindu revivalist monk Swami Vivekananda. Nivedita, whose father was an Irish Nationalist, joined the Anushilan Samiti in 1905. Michael Sivestri suggests that accounts of her influence in these revolutionary contexts is overstated (*Ireland and India*), but her influence on figures like Vivekananda, Rabindranath Tagore, and Sri Aurobindo suggests a broad complement of political investments.
 7. I have written elsewhere at length about the interrelation between revolutionary ideology and the figure of the mother goddess. See Saha, *Empire of Touch*.
 8. That revolutionary—or terrorist, depending on whom you ask—sentiment might be cultivated alongside and, often, through those canonical texts of the English imagination and through language training meant that schools became sites of particular colonial surveillance. Indeed, the power of Pearse and Sen as leaders was often ascribed to their day jobs as teachers. They had direct access to the fertile young minds who would join their ranks.
 9. Pearse writes: "We may make mistakes in the beginning and shoot the wrong people; but bloodshed is a cleansing and a sanctifying thing, and the nation which regards it as the final horror has lost its manhood. There are many things more horrible than bloodshed; and slavery is one of them" ("Coming Revolution," 56).
 10. Valente, *Dracula's Crypt*, 58.
 11. Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, 65.
 12. O'Brien, "Messianism or Messianicity?," 12.
 13. Walter Benjamin writes that "the past carries with it a temporal index by which it is referred to redemption. There is a secret agreement between past generations and the present one. Our coming was expected on earth. Like every generation that preceded us, we have been endowed with a weak Messianic power, a power to which the past has a claim. That claim cannot be settled cheaply" ("Theses on the Philosophy of History," 254).

14. Abraham and Torok, *The Shell and the Kernel*.
15. Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, 92.
16. De Valera, *India and Ireland*, 24.
17. De Valera, *India and Ireland*, 24.
18. Marx on the vampire: "Capital is dead labor, that, vampire-like, only lives by sucking living labor, and lives the more, the more labor it sucks. The time during which the laborer works, is the time during which the capitalist consumes the labor-power he has purchased of him. If the laborer consumes his disposable time for himself, he robs the capitalist" (*Capital*, 342).
19. Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, 59.
20. On the Ghadr trial, see Sohi, *Echoes of Mutiny*; Bhatt, *Roots and Reflections*; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*; and Bains, "Ghadar Movement."
21. *Independent Hindustan*, "Friends of Freedom for India."
22. *Independent Hindustan*, "Friends of Freedom for India."
23. Stephens, *Black Empire*, 26.
24. See Kramer, "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons."
25. If Britain's disciplinary oversight of its colonial subjects halted abruptly in the American courtroom, then the courtroom also became a locus of national self-regulation and reinscription from which immigration reform was one vector. The Bopp trial and Ghosh's and Smedley's subsequent indictments highlighted a consolidating sense of what constituted a good national subject. Indeed, Smedley's indictment included charges of violating a local ordinance against the distribution of birth control. She had been working with Margaret Sanger, who later posted her bail. The institutional record thus contains evidence for the accusation that she had betrayed not only a national ally but also a moral stricture. See MacKinnon, MacKinnon, and Smedley, "Agnes Smedley's 'Cell Mates,'" 531.
26. Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, *Wadia v. United States*, n.p.
27. US Supreme Court, U.S. Reports, 210.
28. For more on race and caste in the Aryan question, see Bates, *Race, Caste, and Tribe in Central India*; Thapar, "Theory of Aryan Race and India"; Bronkhorst and Deshpande, *Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia*; Bryant and Patton, *Indo-Aryan Controversy*; Shaffer, "Indo-Aryan Invasions"; and Reddy, "Ethnicity of Caste."
29. The report cites the case of one Ralla Singh: "File 126/13—Indian Agitation in USA and Canada: Arrangements for Watching Seditiousists

on the Pacific Coast; Reports from W C Hopkinson, Inspector of Dominion Immigration,” IOR/L/PJ/12/1, India Office Records, British Library. For more on Indian petitions to obtain citizenship, see Leonard, “Punjabi Farmers”; and Shah, *Stranger Intimacy*.

30. See Guterl, *Color of Race in America*.
31. US Supreme Court, U.S. Reports, 215.
32. See Teed, “Race against Memory.”
33. Marx, “Eighteenth Brumaire,” 33.

References

- Abraham, Nicholas, and Maria Torok. *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*, edited and translated by Nicholas T. Rand. Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Bains, J. S. “The Ghadar Movement: A Golden Chapter of Indian Nationalism.” *Indian Journal of Political Science* 23, no. 1 (1962): 48–59.
- Bates, Crispin. *Race, Caste, and Tribe in Central India: The Early Origins of Indian Anthropometry*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Centre for South Asian Studies, 1995.
- Benjamin, Walter. “Theses on the Philosophy of History.” In *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn, 253–64. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1968.
- Bhatt, Amy. *Roots and Reflections: South Asians in the Pacific Northwest*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2013.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes, and Madhav M. Deshpande, eds. *Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia: Evidence, Interpretation, and Ideology; Proceedings of the International Seminar on Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 25–27 October 1996*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, 1999.
- Bryant, Edwin F., and Laurie L. Patton, eds. *The Indo-Aryan Controversy: Evidence and Inference in Indian History*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. *Wadia v. United States*. 101 F.2d 7 (2d Cir. 1939). casetext.com/case/wadia-v-united-states.
- Cook, S. B. *Imperial Affinities: Nineteenth-Century Analogies and Exchanges between India and Ireland*. New Delhi: Sage, 1993.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Specters of Marx: The State of Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, translated by Peggy Kamuf. New York: Psychology Press, 1994.

- de Valera, Éamon. *India and Ireland*. New York: Friends of Freedom for India, 1920.
- Guterl, Matthew Pratt. *The Color of Race in America, 1900–1940*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Heehs, Peter. *The Bomb in Bengal: The Rise of Revolutionary Terrorism in India, 1900–1910*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Herman, Jeanette. *Empire's Bodies: Images of Suffering in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century India and Ireland*. New York: Macmillan, 2004.
- Independent Hindustan*. "The Friends of Freedom for India." *Independent Hindustan: A Monthly Review of Political, Economic, Social and Intellectual Independence of India* 1, no. 6 (1921): 144.
- Jeffery, Keith, ed. "An Irish Empire?": *Aspects of Ireland and the British Empire*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Kramer, Paul A. "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880–1910." *Journal of American History* 88, no. 4 (2002): 1315–53.
- Leonard, Karen. "Punjabi Farmers and California's Alien Land Law." *Agricultural History* 59, no. 4 (1985): 549–62.
- Macaulay, Thomas B. M., and G. M. Young. *Speeches by Lord Macaulay: With His Minute on Indian Education*. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- MacKinnon, Jan, Steve MacKinnon, and Agnes Smedley. "Agnes Smedley's 'Cell Mates.'" *Signs* 3, no. 2 (1977): 531–39.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, translated by Ben Fowkes. Vol. 1. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.
- Marx, Karl. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *Marx: Later Political Writings*, edited by Terrell Carver, 31–127. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- O'Brien, Eugene. "Messianism or Messianicity? Remembering Revolution and the Shaping of Irish Nationalism." In *Ireland at War and Peace*, edited by Alison O'Malley-Younger and John Strachan, 12–26. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2011.
- O'Ceallaigh, Sean. *India and Ireland*. New York: Friends of Freedom for India, 1924.
- Pearse, Padraic. "The Coming Revolution." In *Collected Works of Padraic Pearse*, 54–58. London: Lulu, 1924.
- Pearse, Padraic. "Ghosts." In *Collected Works of Padraic Pearse*, 118–37. London: Lulu, 1924.

- Ramnath, Maia. *Haj to Utopia: How the Ghadar Movement Charted Global Radicalism and Attempted to Overthrow the British Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
- Reddy, Deepa. "The Ethnicity of Caste." *Anthropological Quarterly* 78, no. 3 (2005): 543–84.
- Saha, Poulomi. *An Empire of Touch: Women's Political Labor and the Fabrication of East Bengal*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019.
- Shaffer, Jim. "The Indo-Aryan Invasions: Cultural Myth and Archaeological Reality." In *The People of South Asia*, edited by J. R. Lukacs, 74–90. New York: Plenum, 1984.
- Shah, Nayan. *Stranger Intimacy: Contesting Race, Sexuality, and the Law in the North American West*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
- Silvestri, Michael. *Ireland and India: Nationalism, Empire, and Memory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Sohi, Seema. *Echoes of Mutiny: Race, Surveillance, and Indian Anticolonialism in North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Stephens, Michelle. *Black Empire: The Masculine Global Imaginary of Caribbean Intellectuals in the United States, 1914–1962*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Teed, Paul. "Race against Memory: Katherine Mayo, Jabez Sunderland, and Indian Independence." *American Studies* 44, no. 1 (2003): 35–57.
- Thapar, Romila. "The Theory of Aryan Race and India: History and Politics." *Social Scientist* 24, no. 1 (1996): 3–29.
- US Supreme Court. "U.S. Reports: *United States v. Thind*, 261 U.S. 204 (1923)": 204–15. www.loc.gov/item/usrep261204.
- Valente, Joseph. *Dracula's Crypt: Bram Stoker, Irishness, and the Question of Blood*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.