

## For a Revolutionary Feminist World-Systems Analysis: The Case of *Ghadar*

Umaima Miraj  
PhD Student  
Department of Sociology  
University of Toronto  
725 Spadina  
Department of Sociology  
Toronto, ON M5S 2J4  
Phone: 647-573-7843  
[umaima.miraj@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:umaima.miraj@mail.utoronto.ca)

**Abstract:** In revolutionary anti-colonial movements, women's involvement has been limited, and their contributions often marginalized or forgotten. This is not only an empirical puzzle in that anti-colonial movements have historically recruited women and furthered feminist discourse while also marginalizing female members, but also a political problem for movements that the lived reality for female movement participants diverges from the egalitarian philosophies of the movements themselves. In this article, I build on and further develop theories of feminist world-systems analysis, contending that feminist world-systems needs to rethink theories of anti-systemic movements to better include women's revolutionary roles as active agents in the historical process of colonial independence and decolonization. In so doing, I contend that a revolutionary feminist world-systems analysis is increasingly important to analyze that women's active roles as revolutionary agents have been sidelined because the movements that they have been a part of have also found themselves co-opted by dominant liberal ideology. This theoretical position is illustrated through an analysis of the published periodicals of the anti-colonial Ghadar Party. Through this empirical case study, I show that Ghadar's revolutionary potential receded to the background because of its failures to fully include its female members. This case study is then levied to demonstrate how reviving a feminist world-systems analysis can help us better theorize women's important but under-analyzed role in revolutionary anti-colonial movements.

**Keywords:** World-Systems Analysis; Feminist Theory; Anti-colonial Movements; Ghadar Party; South Asia; Historical Sociology;

### **For a Revolutionary Feminist World-Systems Analysis: The Case of *Ghadar***

*It is not enough to say: "We must target women with our propaganda and draw women into our ranks;" we have to take things further, much further than that. The vast majority of male comrades . . . have minds infected by the most typical bourgeois prejudices. Even as they rail against property, they are rabidly proprietorial. Even as they rant against slavery, they are the cruellest of "masters." Even as they vent their fury on monopoly, they are the most dyed-in-the-wool monopolists. And all of this derives from the phoniest notion that humanity has ever managed to devise. The supposed "inferiority of women." A mistaken notion that may well have set civilization back by centuries.<sup>1</sup>*

In the above quoted passage, Lucia Sanchez Saornil, a Spanish anarchy-feminist writer and poet, critiques her male comrades of the National Confederation of Labor (CNT) for their sexist attitudes towards both female members of the CNT along with women who could not enlist because of onerous domestic responsibilities. Saornil highlights the common gendered dynamic of revolutionary movements, where men oppose structures of oppression but fall short of questioning their positions when it comes to women. She urges leftists to move beyond "target[ing] women with our propaganda and draw[ing] into our ranks," because women in left politics have either been silenced or "added" to the movements as afterthoughts. Saornil's analysis signals a larger problem in the global Left where women and their political contributions are sidelined, tokenized, or coopted.

Anti-colonial movements across the Global South are no exception to this broader trend. Women have historically played an important role in winning independence from colonial rule but their contributions have gone largely unacknowledged and under appreciated.<sup>2</sup> In this article, I therefore am primarily interested in explaining how we might explain, in the context of movements with revolutionary anti-colonial aspirations, women's marginalization and lack of representation? Even when women are represented in anti-colonial movements, their role is typically limited to liberal bourgeois ideas of women's social roles, compounded by the more ready inclusion of upper middle-class women compared to working class women, which betrays the revolutionary potential

and aims of the movement. The limited role for women in revolutionary anti-colonial politics limits which women can participate. As Rose Brewer cautions, “dichotomous and additive [approaches that either divide women from left movements or add them on to them] – elide the intersection of race and gender and erase the experiences of women of color.”<sup>3</sup>

While Saornil details the problem of patriarchy in the global left, my focus on anti-colonial movements adds an important contour to feminist questions facing the global left. Anti-colonial movements were structured by the world-system, more specifically, bounded by core-periphery dynamics. Anti-colonial movements opposed the politico-economic structures of the core but also sought to maintain their legitimacy in the peripheries for what they envisioned to come after independence.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, an important factor in understanding how women were represented, (or weren't), in anti-colonial movements is understanding how anti-colonial movements were shaped by global politico-economic dynamics. Drawing largely from Silvia Federici and Maria Mies, I argue that a revolutionary feminist world-systems analysis can reveal the importance of women's unique contributions to anti-colonial politics as central to the development and sustenance of struggles against capitalism.<sup>5</sup> It is not only important to underscore revolutionary women's contributions but also to highlight that the categories of gender, race, and class are not separate ends of revolutionary struggle. Instead, and therefore, when studying anti-systemic movements that oppose the capitalist, colonialist system, it does not suffice to accept them as revolutionary without questioning why they didn't include marginalized groups. As I posit in this article, women have been met with the 'not yet' attitude in socialist politics, which separates class from gender and advocates dealing with class first, and then gender second, if at all. It is important to acknowledge that “[women of the Global South] do not want to be grafted onto "feminism" [and socialism] in a tokenistic manner as colorful adjuncts to "real" problems.”<sup>6</sup>

One anti-colonial movement, widely revered for its socialist, progressive, and revolutionary efforts to overthrow British Rule in Punjab is the Ghadar Party, a South Asian diaspora anti-colonial socialist party founded in 1913 in San Francisco. It is often implicitly and explicitly argued that the reason women do not make an appearance in the party's narrative is because they just weren't there because of gendered immigration policies of North America which did not allow women to immigrate with their husbands.<sup>7</sup> In this article, I alternately contend that the apparently revolutionary anti-systemic middle class- male-dominated movement's gender problem was a function of the movement's liberal ideas about women. Because the movement was located in a capitalist world-system where liberal bourgeois notions are the dominant hegemonic narratives of the cores that subsume the peripheries into their ideologies, male leadership, though revolutionary in its anti-colonial politics, was traditionalist when it came to gender.<sup>8</sup> I extend Federici and Mies to show that not only are women's bodies expropriated and exploited in this capitalist domain, but their ideological representation is also coopted and central for the movements shifting ideologies. I don't claim that the movements are passive recipients of this ideology, instead, as already mentioned, I contend that—in this case Ghadar—anti-colonial movements have such radical potential that gets coopted because of the universalist interests of the hegemons adopted by the former in these contexts. I take Ghadar as a case to illustrate the theoretical need of a *revolutionary* feminist world-systems analysis which can highlight the woman question in anti-colonial movements as situated within historical capitalism. In so doing, my objective in this paper is to not only identify where and how the women were located in anti-colonial left politics, but also bring together world-systems analysis with revolutionary feminism.

By proposing a revolutionary feminist world-systems analysis, I argue for a framework that does not restrict Marxist analysis to narrowly conceived waged factory labor-relations, class

analysis separated from gender, or feminist analysis ignoring historical processes. As Maria Mies argues, “[feminist strategy for liberation] must aim at an end of all *exploitation* of women by men, of colonies by colonizers, of one class by the other.”<sup>9</sup> In doing so, I argue that we need not fall into the ‘isms’ trap of identity politics, but must highlight that revolutionary women have been important forces of historical processes that have struggled against colonialism, capitalism, and patriarchy holistically, from a standpoint capable of seeing them as intertwined and co-constitutive processes. To this end, I analyze the role of women in the Ghadar Party through an analysis of analogous cases of revolutionary women in the Global South, which underscore the problems of additive, compensatory, and liberal-pluralist understanding of women as one among many categories in such emancipatory movements. Although world-systems as a paradigm expands Marxists analysis to a more nuanced understanding of the historical-geographical processes such as colonialism, I show that women have been absent from this framework to a large extent. Most efforts by feminist world-systems analysts, moreover, have tended to focus on the impact of globalization, debt crisis, and structural adjustment programs of late 20<sup>th</sup> century, along with the position of women in commodity chains. I argue to draw the implications of such feminist world-systems analysis to movements of revolutionary feminism. Next, I provide some context of the Ghadar Party which highlights its one-sided revolutionary zeal. Following an explanation of the data and methods I employ, I analyze the magazines of the Party to provide a nuanced analysis of how women have been envisioned and represented in its self-narration. In conclusion, I argue that while women have been absent or misrepresented in the movement’s liberal bourgeois narrative, yet they are central in pushing forward Ghadar’s surge to present itself as a viable alternative to British rule.

## Revolutionary Women of the Global South

The question is not *whether* women have been revolutionary, as countless examples highlight their important roles at the forefronts.<sup>10</sup> The early and later 20<sup>th</sup> century involvement of women in armed revolution in Latin America have been noted by many.<sup>11</sup> Revolutionary women have been prominent in armed struggle as guerillas and spies in independence movements and rebellions.<sup>12</sup> Black feminists have also undertaken the extensive task of identifying women as more than “‘bridge-leaders,’ rank-and-file or the ‘backbone’ of organisations,” and outline their revolutionary praxis and involvement in the struggle for liberation.<sup>13</sup> Black women’s struggles and roles in the US Communist Movement has been identified in *Sojourning for Freedom: Black Women, American Communism, and the Making of Left Feminism*.<sup>14</sup> In the seminal text *Heart of Race*, Beverly Bryan, Stella Dadzie, and Suzzane Scafe correct the one-dimensional history of Black communities in Britain to center radical black women’s voices and work.<sup>15</sup> In India, scholars have identified women’s struggle in liberation movements in Bengal,<sup>16</sup> in the anti-imperialist “Gandhian, armed revolutionary, and left oriented mass movements” in the Burdwan District,<sup>17</sup> in the Telangana District,<sup>18</sup> and many other movements and revolutionary circles.<sup>19</sup> In the case of the Naxalbari of post-independent India, a Maoist movement for peasants’ liberation from landlord oppression, Mallarika Sinha Roy shows how the historiography of the movement has been blind to its gendered aspects.<sup>20</sup> The edited volume, *Women Rising: In and Beyond Arab Spring*, highlights women’s revolutionary struggles in myriad ways in the Arab world to counter ahistorical claims that they had “finally risen” during the Arab Spring.<sup>21</sup> In East Asia, women’s revolutionary roles in liberation movements have also been highlighted.<sup>22</sup> While this list is exhaustive by no means, it shows the important work done in recent decades to recover the contributions of revolutionary women and reveal how radical history has erased women’s involvement.

The task facing historians of revolutionary movements in the Global South thus goes beyond recovering women as participants in anti-colonial movements. We must go further and analyze the historical dynamics that have enabled and perpetuated these mis- and non-representations of women in revolutionary movements. This need has been echoed by many scholars previously.<sup>23</sup> Lalita and Kannabiran claim about leadership roles in liberation movements:

The fact that not many women were there at the decision making or leadership levels does not make their participation peripheral for, given the structures, the real question that needs to be posed is whether women could have been present at the decision making level or not.<sup>24</sup>

It is important to question why women's roles are coopted or unrecognized in these movements because there exists a divergence within anti-systemic, socialist movements and women's movements. As Immanuel Wallerstein noted, women's movements were historically seen as a nuisance by socialist movements.<sup>25</sup> Maria Lugone also puts it succinctly in her essay "Coloniality of Gender," in which she describes racialized men's indifference to racialized women's struggles as "insidious since it places tremendous barriers in the path of the struggles of women of color for [women's] own freedom, integrity, and wellbeing and in the path of the correlative struggles towards communal integrity."<sup>26</sup> While Fanon had recognized women's participation as veiled soldiers in the Algerian revolution in "Algeria Unveiled," he infantilized them by stating "Each time she ventures into the European city, the Algerian woman must achieve a victory over herself, over her childish fears."<sup>27</sup> In the case of socialist movements in India, Illina Sen, an Indian activist, highlighted the divisions amongst theorists who criticized women for not partaking in the "mainstream revolutionary struggle" and undermining the latter's interests by insisting on an autonomous feminist movement.<sup>28</sup> Sen and others have pointed out how different mass movements, although they included women, coopted women's issues and converted them

into action plans to gain mass support.<sup>29</sup> Women who tried to push left movements in the Global South to take on feminist concerns were criticized by male leadership who conflated feminism with ‘the West’ and therefore dismissed feminist critiques of left movements as a variant of western imperialism.<sup>30</sup>

The separation of feminism and socialism in much of the left movements of the Global South have posited the former as secondary, applying the “not yet” designation to feminist matters that would only merit consideration *once* the capitalist regime is overthrown. This isolates patriarchy from capitalism and posits both as a binary instead of stemming from the foundations of the endless accumulation of capital. This is highlighted by how revolutionary women have also been occluded because feminism has been uncritically relegated to the urban sphere, usurped by upper-class, western-liberal concerns that alienated masses of subaltern women. Here, class and women’s issues were seen as completely separate, by subsuming all women’s experiences to one-of the urban upper classes. For example, in *The Birth of Chinese Feminism*, Lydia He Liu, Rebecca E. Karl, and Dorothy Ko show how around the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, liberal notions of empowerment overshadowed mass struggle. They claim that:

For the critically minded educated women of the late-Qing period, the problems they perceived within their own elite lives took center stage in their analysis of China’s ills and the consequent challenges facing “women”. Their concerns, represented then and now as concerns for the analytical totality of women as *such (nuzi)*, tended to concentrate on such socially reformist solutions to women’s and China’s problems as educational opportunities, limited marriage freedom, footbinding, social and cultural equality with men, independence from crushing family norms that suppressed “female personhood” (*reng*), and participation in newly emerging forms of governance.<sup>31</sup>

To provide some contrast to this kind of feminism, the authors of the book translate the writings of Hi-Yin Zhen (1884 – 1920), an anarchist feminist who wrote about the gendered oppressions of a globalizing China with a radical “interpretation of the social totality of the early-twentieth-century world,” instead of centering Chinese feminism’s foundation in liberal



discourses.<sup>32</sup> Anup Grewal, studying the formation of Chinese proletarian socialist woman, discusses how the revolutionary woman stood against the “New Woman” ideal and modernity.<sup>33</sup> In Pakistan also, the urban feminist Women’s Action Forum idealized liberal feminist goals, overshadowing other class-based feminist movements such as Sindhi peasant women’s Sindhiani Tahreek, leading to the occlusion of the latter and the celebration of the former in the mainstream literature on the history of feminist struggle against the Islamization of the Zia regime in the 1980s.<sup>34</sup>

The separation of socialist and feminist movements along with the liberalization of the latter’s domineering ideals begs the anti-systemic movements’ analysis, which argues that the exploitation of workers and women stem from the same foundation of accumulation of capital which turns both into commodities. Women’s mis- and non- representation, therefore, is a product of the overdetermination of women’s exploitation in colonialism. My objective in this essay is to devise a revolutionary feminist world-systems analysis which highlights women’s roles in revolutionary, leftist history in order to correct masculinist historiography of Global South left movements. However, instead of isolating the movement from larger historical forces and pointing to this misrepresentation and occlusion as a result of some sexist agenda, I argue that the anti-colonial movements were sexist because of the systemic conditions of colonial relations. They were anti-systemic movements, yes, but when it came to women, they retreated into liberal reformist platforms, where women’s issues and how they would be solved in the utopia they imagined overshadowed the revolutionary work that the colonized women themselves were performing in those very moments of history.

### **Revolutionary Feminist World-Systems Analysis: A Theoretical Intervention**

In *Caliban and the Witch*, Silvia Federici theorizes how primitive accumulation expropriated women from their bodies and monopolized them as reproductive commodities of the next labor force, and how this appropriation of women was foundational to capitalist development.<sup>35</sup> In highlighting how this appropriation divided the working class, she poignantly notes:

Primitive accumulation, then, was not simply an accumulation and concentration of exploitable workers and capital. It was *also an accumulation of differences and divisions within the working class*, whereby hierarchies built upon gender, as well as “race” and age, become constitutive of class rule and the formation of the modern proletariat.<sup>36</sup>

It is this inherent divisiveness of capitalism that some Marxist strains of thought have either forgotten or ignored. For example, certain veins of Marxist thought have located the rise of the historical process of capitalist production in the English agrarian class of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, by concentrating on relations of production.<sup>37</sup> This is important to criticize because many Marxists, following Robert Brenner, have understood the origins of capitalism with exclusive reference to class struggles in Europe, especially England. This framework ignores the importance of the non-West for the development and sustenance of capitalism. Brennerite marxists focused on the industrializing West in their accounts of the origins of capitalism, overlooking the importance of how the world-system creates a system of production and exploitation across national boundaries.<sup>38</sup> This vein of Marxist thought is not only Eurocentric, it also precludes capitalist exploitation and expropriation on the world scale which is state-sponsored, gendered, and racialized.

The world-systems perspective rectifies Brenner’s Eurocentrism in two ways: by shifting the focus away from class struggle to the endless accumulation of capital; and by bringing into focus not merely Europe but also the non-European world to emphasize capitalist development as a global process. The former helps us analyze processes of colonialism and territorial expansion

driven by the endless accumulation of capital, as the peripheries were incorporated in the process of expropriation and exploitation of labor and resources for profit in the core. Therefore, capitalism did not diffuse from a more rational, industrialize England to the rest of the world as an equalizing process, but through the monopolization of power in the hands of the core states (led by a world-hegemon) that exploited other parts of the world through a combination of military, political and economic means.<sup>39</sup>

Moreover, in tracing systemic cycles of dominance and chaos in the world-system, Giovanni Arrighi shows how Britain and the US as world-hegemons proclaimed particular state interests as “universal interests” which maintained their successive hegemonies from the 18<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>40</sup> These “universal interests,” or universalism as an ideology, frames itself as working for *all*, disregards differences and portrays liberal bourgeois goals as beneficial for all classes.<sup>41</sup>

Wallerstein identified that developments in the core impacted the economic structures of peripheries by means of colonial and imperialist trade networks premised on an unequal global division of labor. He notes how the liberal state that created boundaries of citizenship in the French and British cores transmitted these liberal ideas of citizenship to the peripheries in order to maintain their legitimacy in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>42</sup> The French and British imperial states as competing world hegemonies not only remained the sovereign nation states, but universalized their liberal-democratic ideology to the colonies under the hegemony of the liberal-imperial state, to “control the dangerous classes” with the promise of “universal suffrage.”<sup>43</sup> Liberalism then with “[t]he combination of universalism-meritocracy [served] as the basis by which the cadres or middle strata can legitimate the system.”<sup>44</sup> In the peripheries, this set well with the already existing class divisions. This liberal idea of universalism and liberty was never limited to the two competing powers of Britain and France of course. As Arrighi shows, this conception of freedom was

prevalent in the American ideology of liberty.<sup>45</sup> But this liberal universalism has inherent notions of exclusions since the very beginning. Ideas of sovereignty constructed in the liberal state described who was a citizen and who was not. Women were the ‘passive citizens’ in a liberal state which spread throughout the world economy:

All inhabitants of a country should enjoy in it the rights of *passive* citizens; all have the right to the protection of their person, of their property, of their liberty, etc. But all do not have the right to play an active role in the formation of public authorities; all are not *active* citizens. Women (at least at the present time), children, foreigners, and those others who contribute nothing to sustaining the public establishment should not be allowed to influence public life actively.<sup>46</sup>

This idea of liberal universalism helps us situate anti-systemic movements that end up using the same universalizing tropes in the name of progress. Wallerstein dedicated a section in volume 4 of the *Modern World-Systems* to discuss women’s movements and identified the divergence between labor and feminist movements, as the former saw the latter as a “nuisance” and left the two “at arm’s length” at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>47</sup> According to Wallerstein in an essay on racism and sexism in the idea of universalism,<sup>48</sup> the model of universalism sustains itself on the narrative of inclusion for all, regardless of differences. It continues to cultivate the passive woman/other marginalized groups, because it seeks a utopia which is based on the future that creates a universal “Everyman”.<sup>49</sup>

But while Wallerstein mentioned this division of women’s movements and socialist movements, world-systems as a paradigm has given nominal focus to women as part of the world-economy. In the 1970s, 80s, and 90s, there appeared to be a rising feminist world-systems analysis which has now been mostly forgotten, to name a few: Maria Mies, Valentine Moghadam, M. Patricia Fernández Kelly, Joan Smith, and others.<sup>50</sup> Mies’ *Patrilachy and Accumulation on a World Scale* serves as a precursor to major subsequent feminist world-systems works as it extends Marxists analysis to include women’s unwaged, reproductive work and shows the violent logic of

destruction of nature inherent in capitalism. Mies helps us see why socialist movements tend to marginalize women's issues and revolutionary activity: because women's work is considered to be in the realm of unproductive work, such as child rearing, as opposed to waged factory work. She also expands our understanding of how divisions within women in the metropolises and colonies were created through ideas such as femininity and housewifization through processes like the witch hunt, which upheld the bourgeois housewife in the metropole against the colored, lower class witches in the colonies.

In an edited volume, Shelly Feldman also analyzed how the debt crisis and structural readjustment in the 1970s in Third World countries impacted women in households through a gendered division of labor.<sup>51</sup> As nations participated in the liberalization of the economy and accumulation of profits, Feldman argues that women suffered the most "because they represent a disproportionate share of the world's poor," and the volume also looked at the negotiations and exchanges that took place at the level of the household, which keeps the women from being passive recipients of global crisis.<sup>52</sup> Joan Smith *et al.* also argue how the creation of the categories of racism and sexism are intertwined in a larger historic world economy.<sup>53</sup> But the attempts for a feminist world-systems analysis has largely been overshadowed overall in the past.

As Wilma A. Dunaway stated in 2001 in an important essay which thoroughly analyzed women's continued absence from the world-systems analysis after 25 years of its existence, "We have managed to talk about plantations, peasant households, the informal sector, and labor unrest without ever mentioning women or gender disparities" and argued that "Failure to prioritize women represents the greatest intellectual and political blunder of the world-system perspective."<sup>54</sup> Dunaway's work is mostly focused on commodity chains and the incorporation of the Cherokees of Southern Appalachians into a capitalist system. More recently, Rose Brewer,

argued that “The World Capitalist system... uses the intersecting forces of structural racism (or the white supremacy system), patriarchy, core capitalist-dependent nationalist projects, and a dynamic mix of national and international policies to create and sustain an increasingly unequal world.”<sup>55</sup> She warns against the push of identity politics by neoliberal economies that sustain the use of ‘isms.’ Federici, whose analysis of women in the development of capitalist accumulation, is also foundational. Jason Moore, drawing largely from Mies and Federici, has also highlighted the importance of the impact women, nature, and ecology are foundational to capitalist accumulation as human and extra-human work but is often overlooked.<sup>56</sup>

Feminist world-systems analysis of the post-1970s was primarily focused on the impacts of the debt crisis, structural adjustment programs, and development agendas on women of the Global South. It develops important concepts of the unwaged work women do which is not centered in Marxist analysis. The overall scholarship has been concentrated with the *impact*, and while resistance and revolution are mentioned, it doesn’t appear to be the primary focus, especially in the historical anti-colonial context. Therefore, while these forgotten, and more recent, feminist world-systems works do the much-needed work of situating women at the forefront of a global political economy, it is also important to bring them back to the forefront and stretch their framework to anti-systemic movements to emphasize women’s *revolutionary* roles as active agents in this historical process. To this end, it is necessary to highlight the dialectic of anti-systemic movements against colonialism, and how as part of the capitalist world-system, they have often been subsumed in the liberal ideology that appealed to their westernized and urbanized leaders. I contend, then, that a revolutionary feminist world-systems analysis is increasingly important to analyze that women’s active roles as revolutionary agents have been sidelined because the anti-systemic movements that they have been a part of have also found themselves co-opted by

dominant liberal ideology. The tunnel vision of identity politics that looks at movements around ‘isms’, abstracting them from global processes, have resulted in upholding even leftist revolutionary movements that focus on one goal, while disregarding, or pacifying others. By focusing on the case of the Ghadar Party, I show how it sustained its one-dimensional narrative as a revolutionary anti-colonial movement, while maintaining a liberal-democratic vision of women’s equality.

### **Ghadar Party**

The Ghadar Party was founded in 1913 and constituted of Sikh, Hindu, and Muslim students, ex-soldiers, and intellectuals who had migrated to find work or were exiled as the conditions in Punjab worsened due to Britain’s extraction of Indian surplus for the impending World War in the core—leading to high taxes, famines, and generalized dilapidation of social conditions.<sup>57</sup> At a time when revolutionary activity was increasingly restricted by the British in India, the Party established its foundations along the West Coast of North America, with branches spread in the Far East, specifically Manila, Shanghai, Tokyo, among other cities.<sup>58</sup> Maia Ramnath provides a detailed analysis of Ghadar as it chartered the globe, and argues that the movement,

[blended] political libertarianism and economic socialism, along with a persistent tendency toward romantic revolutionism, and within their specific context a marked antigovernment bent, [which is why] one may argue that Ghadar movement’s alleged incoherence is actually quite legible through a logic of anarchism [...] In short, not only did Ghadar manage to join the impulses toward class struggle and civil rights with anti-colonialism, it also managed to combine commitments to both liberty and equality.<sup>59</sup>

What brought Ghadar’s diverging and overlapping political ideologies together were its “common denominator of identifiable core values”, which Ramnath points out for us: “anti-colonialist”; “passionately patriotic”; “internationalist”; “secularist”; “modernist”; “radically democratic”;

“republican”; “anticapitalist”; “militant revolutionist”; “in temperament audacious, dedicated, courageous unto death”. Over the years, the Ghadarite goal became directed towards the following:

to a free Hindustan

to a free Hindustan, along with a free Ireland, Egypt, and China,

to a free Indian democratic-republican federation, plus a free Ireland, Egypt, and China,

to a free Indian democratic-republican socialist federation, plus a free Ireland, Egypt, and China,

to a free Indian democratic-republican socialist federation, and an end to all forms of economic or imperial slavery anywhere in the world.<sup>60</sup>

In its early years, revolutionary Ghadarites began an uprising against the British government in Punjab. This uprising began in February 1915 with the intention of overthrowing the British by, smuggling arms and ammunition into the country, along with enraged returnees of the deported *Komagata Maru*, who were not allowed to land in Vancouver under the Continuous Journey Act passed by the Canadian Government in 1906.<sup>61</sup> Under the leadership of Har Dayal, the Ghadarites infiltrated Punjab, albeit unsuccessful at the end.<sup>62</sup> While Har Dayal and his male counterparts’ revolutionary actions are currently being recovered by past and contemporary scholars,<sup>63</sup> the female revolutionaries of the Ghadar Uprising remain silenced.

Thus, while historians have done much to recover the history of the Ghadar Movement,<sup>64</sup> the question of why women’s voices haven’t been brought to the fore is had been neglected. One explanation often given is that because of the restrictive immigration laws of United States and Canada at the time, women were not allowed to immigrate with their husbands in the early twentieth century, which led to the protests around the Hindu Woman Question which contended to allow women’s migration as well.<sup>65</sup> Another factor, in general about communist women revolutionaries from India, is that they did not write as much as the men.<sup>66</sup> However, such



narratives are bounded by the North American geography and accepts the no women equals no participation equation unquestioningly.

Harish K. Puri, in his study of the movement, has identified the flaw with the historiography of the party:

In one category fall those accounts in which the approach being elitist and focus mainly on Indian revolutionary intellectuals abroad, the Ghadar movement is presented as founded, controlled and directed by the ‘traditional intellectuals’ who won over that ‘wonderful human material’ – the illiterate Punjabi labourers – as part of their fabled international schemes. Thus the role and activities of the vast numbers of Punjabi Ghadarites remained either subsidiary or ignored.<sup>67</sup>

While he tries to fill the identified gap, the gender element is not significant for his study. Ghadar’s historiography is premature in this sense—only few have voiced the gendered history of the movement.<sup>68</sup> However, to not unsettle this ‘given’ fact would be a lackadaisical endeavor. Ghadar was not limited to North America. The immigrants hailed from Punjab, and they sent seditious literature to Punjab, rose in Punjab, and were often hanged in Punjab. But they were also working in a world-system, with India as a colony of the British, the US as a rising hegemon, and the rest of the world as the constituent proxies of the competing powers. It is thus important to highlight the differences of gender created in this movement’s narrative which can be alluded to the capitalist world-system. How did Ghadar bring in women in this the progressive, universalist ideals they posed? While certain historians have identified the need to recover Ghadar women’s histories, I use Ghadar’s narrative on women as a case to show how they met with the ‘not yet’, liberal bourgeois phenomenon that posited socialist liberation from the British as central, while it misrepresented or silenced mass women. By doing so, I highlight the significance of a revolutionary feminist world-systems analysis that underscores that women are misrepresented in anti-colonial movements because they are overdetermined by colonialism where the liberal bourgeois asserts itself.

## Archival Strategy

For the purpose of this essay, I examined the published materials of the Ghadar Party over the decade of 1918-1927. This published material is accessible from the collection “Ghadar Party” of the *South Asian American Digital Archive*, which is the largest publicly available archive for South Asian American history. The collection holds about 61 documents that record mostly the struggles toward the freedom movement, early immigration and activities of the Ghadarites in America, materials largely absent from mainstream collections. The periodicals I analyze include, in particular, *The United States of India: A Monthly Review of Political, Economic, Social and Intellectual Independence of India*, which was earlier called *The Independent Hindustan*. To my knowledge, these periodicals have seldom been analyzed by researchers of the Ghadar Party, who tend to focus on the main magazine *Ghadar* and *Ghadar di Gunj* (Ghadar’s Echo).<sup>69</sup> These periodicals were thus largely published after the revolutionary uprising in Punjab, from the Pacific Coast Hindu Association in San Francisco, and they provide insights into the lesser known conversations within and around the Party. I first surveyed the data to see where women were mentioned, if they were mentioned at all, and if yes, how were they represented. My intent was to not count the number of times women were mentioned so as to give the party credit for having done so; instead, I focused on the discourse surrounding women in order to ascertain how they fit into the political ideology and program of the Party. I borrow heavily from Ke Lalita and Vasantha Kannabiran’s chapter “Writing About Women in Struggles” in their book on the Telangana people’s struggles. They argue that in Indian left literature women appear either as exceptional figures, or as passive add-ons to men’s struggles. It is an additive history, they write:

Though the conscientizing force of such efforts is undeniable, the critique provided by compensatory history is obviously not radical enough. True, it forced traditional history to extend itself and accommodate more women. But the cultural biases, the political commitments and the disciplinary strategies that excluded women in the first place

remained unquestioned, and consequently intact, but invisible, taken for granted. Women's absence from history, compensatory practices indicate, is an omission which can be set right with a little goodwill and application.<sup>70</sup>

I believe that this critique can apply to the periodicals I analyze in this essay as it highlights that merely mentioning women or laying out women's struggles as part and parcel of the larger struggle makes them qualitatively invisible which points to the fundamental question of divisiveness posed by Federici. As argued, "revolution for women demands a change that is qualitative, and not merely quantitative."<sup>71</sup> I see the written material as part of a greater whole of a one-sided historiography. In this sense, my work is not novel as Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier point out how the feminists of the New Left history "were not content to simply uncover the roles of women in the past... the object of women's history was to reveal the ways that gender hierarchy was constructed."<sup>72</sup> However, as Fernand Braudel argued in *On History*, I do not intend to write a history restricted to the event, but through the analysis of primary texts I aim to understand the larger structural realities of anti-systemic movements in the world-economy.<sup>73</sup> As Howell and Prevenier argue, moreover, texts are "filtered through discourses—discourses of discovery, redemption, conquest, civilization, manhood, whiteness," which makes it imperative upon us to understand them with reference to the larger structures in which they are subsumed.<sup>74</sup> The following section highlights how this is accomplished.

### **Ghadar's Representation of Women**

An image of Rani Lakshmi Bai in a soldier's uniform rests on the cover page of the May 1926 issue of *The United States of India* with the heading "Rani Lakshmi Bai: the Heroine of the War of Independence of 1857."<sup>75</sup> The issue commemorates the anniversary of the 1857 War of Independence, an event that saw an armed insurrection to overthrow the British. Lakshmi Bai was

the leader of Jhansi, a princely state in Northern India, who lost her life in battle and is often remembered as a revolutionary warrior.<sup>76</sup> The central focus is not Lakshmi Bai, but the event. However, her reference in these periodicals shows an acknowledgment of women revolutionaries in this great anti-colonial struggle. The other periodicals show, however, that the overall narrative on women is far from focused on their revolution. In the periodicals, women are generally referred to in two ways: in a liberal bourgeois fashion based on progress and education; second, as a way of sustaining the ancient traits of Hindu civilization. In both ways, however, they are pacified, or the middle-class based analysis is used as an overarching lens, as I will show below. And both narratives fit in how the party finds itself in a world-system where it pushes its boundaries against yet is imbedded in a core-periphery relationship.

The liberal way women are written about is illustrated by an interview entitled ‘Women and New India’ with Mrs. Lila Singh, ‘a suffragist from India’ educated in Calcutta University, who “was the first woman student in a college exclusively meant for men.”<sup>77</sup> Singh acknowledges the “clearly-defined unrest of [Indian women’s] because of their lack of opportunity, and because of their suffering.” Connecting Indian women’s struggles to Europe and America, she claims that “I admit our social evils [...] The same situation existed in Europe and America up to a short time ago, comparatively speaking. And the women of Europe and America would be in the same position as the women of India if the same political and economic system prevailed in those countries.” Also, when she speaks to Agnes Smedley, the interviewer, Singh claims: “Our isolation from the world has been the other great reason for our position. The ideals available to you have not been available to us.” While Singh admits that women in India have had some role in jobs and other sectors and “they do not suffer the calumny which pioneer women of Europe and America have suffered” which gives her “great hope for the future activities of women in India,” there is an

idealization of work and education as the harbinger of freedom. “Among the women of India,” Lila Singh claims,

while their political consciousness is not fully developed, yet there is widespread dissatisfaction with things which they are powerless to control.<sup>78</sup>

There is of course a recognition of dissatisfaction here. However, the entire narrative seeks to do a catching up to the West and assumes India’s isolation. Women of India appear here to have all this radical potential that remains untapped because they are not educated or waged. In the second statement, Mrs. Lila Singh argues that because of lack of education, it is only natural that women are ignorant and superstitious:

We would be beyond human if, under such circumstances, our women were not ignorant and superstitious, not to mention poverty-stricken.<sup>79</sup>

This idea of the backwardness of the ordinary Indian woman, as opposed to the Western-educated Indian “suffragist,” highlights and extends Hazel Carby’s argument that Third World women are seen as living in “precapitalist” conditions by white—in this case, Western educated, upper middle-class bourgeois—feminists.<sup>80</sup> Carby claims that “[t]he metropolitan centers of the West define the questions to be asked of other social systems and, at the same time, provide the measure against which all “foreign” practices are gauged.”<sup>81</sup> How do we make sense of superstition and ignorance in this context? Singh appears to admire a binary (liberal) logic that leads from community to private lives, where the latter will give more freedom.

Other periodicals also mention the Indian Woman’s Association, the political activist Sarojini Naidu’s Presidential Address, the need for educational reform, and greater rights for women. While all necessary steps, they highlight Sangari and Vaid’s argument that “[m]iddle class reforms undertaken on behalf of women are tied up with the self-definition of the class, with a new division of the public from the private sphere and of course with a cultural nationalism.”<sup>82</sup> As

stated in the case of Chinese feminism at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century quoted earlier in the essay, these middle-class, liberal aspirations are predicated as the ideals for *all* women. This is reflected in Lila Singh's idealization of liberal values that assume "that it is only through the development of a Western-style industrial capitalism and the resultant entry of women into waged labor that the potential for the liberation of women can increase."<sup>83</sup> While quantitatively, it could be said that at least there was a woman who was given a platform in the periodical—this interview was taken by Agnes Smedley, another feminist activist, and she had some other articles, along with Sarojini Naidu —however, the fact that they were elite women with connections to the likes of Jinnah highlights the intertwining of class and gender.

The transmission of universal hegemonic ideas can be seen in how the party took American ideas of liberty as central to their idea of democracy. Ramnath argues that,

[Ghadar's] encounter with an ideal in the founding values of French and American political liberalism, combined with disgust at the distance between this ideal and the reality they encountered, was an important impetus of the emergent Ghadarite thinking, which gravitated toward the politically libertarian aspects rather than the classical economic elements of Enlightenment thinking as it invoked the touchstones of freedom and democracy.<sup>84</sup>

This idealization is found in the July 1926 issue of the *The United States of India*, for example, which begins with "America's message to India: Declaration of Independence from British Rule." The message is the text of the declaration: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights... That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men."<sup>85</sup> The text is preceded by a hope that Americans, "the real lovers of freedom from all," will remember that Indians have yet to gain independence from the "same tyrant."<sup>86</sup> In another issue, in February 1924, Indian patriots are given inspiration through images of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, accompanied by short quotes from them celebrating liberty and democracy. A few pages

down, the authors argue about the similarity of the Indian struggle of freedom with that of America, and how the former would “forever turn their eyes to America to take new hope and renew courage until such times they will stand victorious, as victorious as Washington stood.”<sup>87</sup> In March 1925, George Washington’s picture is also posted with the title “American Democracy—the Hope for India.”<sup>88</sup> This hope is grounded in the universalist ideas of humanity and freedom, with language that is all encompassing:

[T]he Hindustan Ghadar Party was established with a view to bring about a *complete change* in the political and economic system of India. The history of the party bristles with the same sort of forces which forge the destiny of *mankind* towards the *most progressive consummation of ideals*.<sup>89</sup>

It is important to question what Ghadar means by ‘progressive consummation of ideals’ in this passage. While the ideals seem to provide an alternative to the oppression of colonialism, scholars such as Mies argue that the

concept of ‘progress’ [...] is historically unthinkable without the one-sided development of the technology of warfare and development [...] the progress of European Big Men is based on the subordination and exploitation of their own women, on the exploitation and killing of Nature, on the exploitation and subordination of other peoples and their lands. Hence, the law of this ‘progress’ is always a contradictory and not an evolutionary one: progress for some means retrogression for the other side: ‘evolution’ for some means ‘devolution’ for others; ‘humanization’ for some means ‘de-humanization’ for others...<sup>90</sup>

Ghadar’s concept of progress, developed on the American ideals, appears to follow this similar divisive logic. Ideals of liberty for *all* and freedom for *all* set well against the British tyrants, the common enemy. This overarching notion of liberty assumes inclusivity for all, but as Wallerstein noted (quoted above), has exclusivity imbedded in it. Ghadarites had shifted their core from the British metropole to America. But these ideas of liberty and freedom that they set close to heart and actively took as inspiration show also how the ideas of universalism were inculcated in the peripheral intellectuals working in the United States. The Americanness in the party is prevalent in its desire to be like the bearers of freedom. When it comes to the conception of women

in the party then, it becomes easy to see this liberal universalism taking place—where women were coopted/silenced in the unidirectional goals of the movements to overthrow colonialism. This notion extends Federici’s point where she claims, European bourgeoisie “formed in Europe [and] was at all points involved—practically, politically, and ideologically—in the formation of a world proletariat, and therefore was continually operating with knowledge fathered on an international level in the elaboration of its models of domination.”<sup>91</sup> By the 20<sup>th</sup> century here, the basic premise of capitalist accumulation, at the time of Ghadar, was slowly turning towards America—although not actualized until after World War II<sup>92</sup>—and the levels of domination were perpetuating both through Britain and America, which was in this case the complete disregard of the women in resistance to the colonialist being inculcated within the colonized.

Another aspect prevalent in the portrayal of women is when they are used as tropes of ancient Hindu civilization—as docile women or brave wives. This is evident through this quote by Mrs. Lila Singh:

The women of India are part and parcel of Hindustan; they retain the traditions and customs of India, and they are the *greatest potential forces in the struggle for freedom through which India must and is passing.*<sup>93</sup>

This equation of womanhood with nationhood fits in the larger idea of the remembrance of a national culture by the intellectuals. It is also important to note that women here are seen as the “potential forces in the struggle for freedom.” However, this points to an important question of *how* are they the potential forces if they made to be ahistorical caricatures of a precolonial India—with ideas of purity, traditions, and customs as examples—instead of forces of change in their own right. This representation of women is found in an essay, “Ancient India and Her People,” beginning in May 1925, which is continued over a couple of issues. The essay is meant to refute Indian representation by the West, by citing validating passages by mostly Western men. In



admiring India, a foreign observer writes that Hindus are no far behind Europeans in the “treatment of the female sex, full of confidence, respect and delicacy.”<sup>94</sup> Women’s status is upheld as the epitome of purity in the Hindu civilization when their role is remembered in history. In one of the issues, one Sir George Birdwood’s remarks on the “sweetness of Hindu womanhood” earlier published in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* is cited:

Perfect daughters, wives and mothers, after the severely disciplined, self-sacrificing Hindu ideal, remaining modestly at home, as the proper sphere of their duties, unknown beyond their families, and seeking in the happiness of their children their greatest pleasure and in the reverence of their husbands the amaranthine crown of a woman’s truest glory.<sup>95</sup>

Maria Mies showed in *Patriarchy and Accumulation* how Europeans considered egalitarian practices of Africans backward because “[women had] to understand that [their] independence stands in the way of progress.”<sup>96</sup> Here, the same ‘housewifization’ is considered the Hindu ideal. This projection is important to contrast with how the authors themselves tried to project women and ancient India all together. In one issue, one of the authors writes:

It is interesting to note that in those ancient days, the martial spirit animated not only the men, but also the women of the land. At a time of war, the womenfolk urged their male relations to march to battle, resolved to win or die like heroes. The wife rejoiced to see her husband display his valour, and the mother to see her son show his bravery, in war; and neither was troubled by the thought of any possible danger to the life of her hero.<sup>97</sup>

This notion of the past fits within the larger narrative of remembering ancient India. It is interesting to contrast it with Lila Singh’s earlier point quoted above where she claimed that India’s political backwardness is the result of its isolation. Here, women appear to have done better relatively before colonialism. The passage indicates some sort of bravery, even if centered around the male war hero, as opposed to the portrayal of poverty-stricken women of India unable to do much about their condition.

While European validation rested on the docile housewife, Ghadar’s own conception of womanhood rested also on the women’s bravery in precolonial India. However, in trying to

represent India as resting on ideals of universal humanity, women seldom find representation. This is highlighted in how moving on from women, the focus becomes on the universal humanity in ancient India. In the December 1923 issue of *The United States of India*, it is written that “In India people never had a word for nation. They had only one universal consciousness of humanity.”<sup>98</sup> The essay, entitled “Pride and Love of One’s Own Nation” speaks of the Indians knowing no arbitrary differences, even of color and religion. Here, the authors remember the precolonial history of India: “The Hindu civilization is older than the memory of man. Its origin was prior to recorded history.”<sup>99</sup> In the March 1926 issue, a summary of the history of India succinctly puts: “Formerly India was very prosperous. Her culture was profitable and the state was *perfectly democratic*.”<sup>100</sup>

Women’s representation thus appears to oscillate between different ideals: as docile housewives, as brave women/wives, as potentials for change. But contrasting it with the ideals set by Lila Singh and the basis of a Western conception of liberty echoes Federici when she points out, “in the “transition from feudalism to capitalism” women suffered a unique process of social degradation that was fundamental to the accumulation of capital and has remained so ever since.”<sup>101</sup> As Walter Rodney claimed that colonialism “intensified” the divisions of labor that divided women’s “backward” work and men’s “modern” work, although, women had held better positions before the colonialist came.<sup>102</sup> Although he was writing in the context of the African continent, when colonialism is analyzed as a global historical process, it is important to see how the reference to an untainted history is done more for a past culture, women are central to promote a more egalitarian *past India*, just as they are used to propose a utopic liberal *future India*. It validates the party’s claim that:

After the overthrow of the British rule, the seething masses of India will, with new freedom revolutionise the *entire economic and political thought and system of the world*.<sup>103</sup>

Women, then, become an idea that fits in the larger surge of the cultured past and a universal liberal future to legitimate India in the world-system of the colony and metropole, which is not unique in the process of anti-colonial struggle. As Fanon argues: “This stated belief in a national culture is in fact an ardent, despairing turning towards anything that will afford [the native intellectual] secure anchorage. In order to ensure his salvation and to escape from the supremacy of the white man’s culture the native feels the need to turn backwards towards his unknown roots and to lose himself at whatever cost in his own barbarous people.”<sup>104</sup> This phenomenon also highlights what Shelly Feldman cogently noted in her essay on the silence of East Bengal from the larger narrative of the subcontinent Partition.<sup>105</sup> She claimed that a feminist critique could elucidate on how first “in order to secure representation of its hegemonic interests, the nationalist narrative depends for its success on its ability to transform emergent counter-narratives.”<sup>106</sup> Secondly, paraphrasing Partha Chatterjee, she notes “how the social practices that sought to realize national sovereignty were part of a process characterized by a set of institutional and normative practices that would train the new, ‘non-colonized’ woman. These normative practices conflated women with tradition, situated in the inner domain of sovereignty.”<sup>107</sup> Women’s ideological representation is then expropriated, just as their bodies and work has been, in the historical process of capitalist and colonialist development and decolonization. They are represented as prototypes of a past Hindu civilization, and while their bravery is acknowledged, it is a cursory remark. The central projection is the desire for women to be rational, educated—waged—actors in an independent India or as docile housewives of the past. This vision sheds light on the contours of class, sex, and national narratives that continue to co-opt and silence revolutionary women and their contributions.

## Conclusion

The Ghadar Party was formed in 1913 as a revolutionary, socialist, anti-colonial movement that sought to overthrow the British Raj. With foundations along the West Coast of North America, it had its operations around the globe as it incited revolutionary struggle in Punjab. However, the one-sided, male dominated, and universalizing narratives of the party help highlight the ever increasing need to question apparently anti-systemic movements' tendencies to recede to the liberal, intellectualized and bourgeois narratives as they function within a capitalist world-system. As Ghadar idealized American notions of liberal democracy, it envisioned a homogenous new India, as it glossed over women's role in the historical process of colonialism, infantilized women's resistance, and idealized a non-colonized bourgeois 'new' woman. This begs to show that women have often faced a triple colonialism of class, gender, and race altogether.

By way of a revolutionary feminist world-systems analysis, in this essay, I have argued that although mis- and non- represented in the narrative of anti-colonial movements, women remain central in the dialectic relation of anti-movements' relationship with the cores. As the movements try to push back on the cores, they also adopt the universalist hegemonic ideals which end up propagating a liberal agenda, premised on women's progress in the name of work and education, or as bearers of the lost—and disconnected—past. This overshadows women's active participation as revolutionaries and limits their representation to the wider goals of the movements. While certain Marxist thought have apparently forgotten or ignored this fact, this analysis is especially important when there is a tendency to divide anti-systemic—colonial, socialist, Marxist—movements from women's issues. Thus, it is important to question Ghadar, and other such movements, who while revolutionary as anti-colonial, took forward the liberal ideas of the

world hegemony they tried to overthrow when it came to the role of women in the movement. A revolutionary world-systems analysis situates the movement in a global system, working in a dialectic against colonialism, as the movement pushes back the restraining ceilings of the colonialist, and accepts what it perceives to be best for the struggle. It also opens up important questions of who is considered a revolutionary in the global Left and who isn't. It is imperative to show how women have been central in this systemic push and pull, and it is important, therefore, to highlight their revolutionary praxis in this history as the next step.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lucia Sanchez Saornil, “The Question of Feminism,” in *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas, Vol 1: From Anarchy to Anarchism (300CE-1939)* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2005).

<sup>2</sup> See, for example: Ania Loomba, *Revolutionary Desires: Women, Communism, and Feminism in India* (London: Routledge, 2019); Sangari Kumkum and Sudesh Vaid, introduction to *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History* (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1989); for an overview of how women were seen as a homogenous category in the nationalist project of the Indian independence, see: Suruchi Thapar, “Women as Activists; Women as Symbols: A Study of the Indian Nationalist Movement,” *Feminist Review*, 44, no. 1 (Summer 1993): 81-96.

<sup>3</sup> Rose M. Brewer, Cecilia A. Conrad, and Mary C. King, “The Complexities and Potential of Theorizing Gender, Caste, Race, and Class,” *Feminist Economics* 8, no. 2 (January 2002): 3–17.

<sup>4</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein, *Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century: With a New Prologue* (Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of California Press, 2011).

<sup>5</sup> Maria Mies. *Patriarchy and Accumulation at a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labor* (London: Zed Books, 1986); Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation* (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2004).

<sup>6</sup> Hazel V Carby, “Black Feminism and the Boundaries of Sisterhood,” in *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and racism in 70s Britain* (London and New York: Taylor and Francis, 1982), 211-234.

---

<sup>7</sup> Rita Dhamoon, Davina Bhandar, Renisa Mawani, and Satwinder Kaur Bains, eds. *Unmooring the Komagata Maru: Charting Colonial Trajectories* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019).

<sup>8</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein, *After Liberalism* (New York: New Press, 1995).

<sup>9</sup> Mies, *Patriarchy*, 80.

<sup>10</sup> Kumari Jayawardena, *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World* (London: Zed Books, 1989); For a detailed analysis of socialist women's activism in what is termed the Second World, i.e., Eastern Europe, see Kristen Ghodsee, *Second World, Second Sex* (Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2019)

<sup>11</sup> Jane S. Jaquette, "Women in Revolutionary Movements in Latin America," *Journal of Marriage and Family* 35, no. 2 (May 1973): 344-54; Linda L. Rief, "Women in Latin American Guerilla Movements: A Comparative Perspective," *Comparative Politics* 18, no. 2 (January 1986): 147-69; Victoria González-Rivera and Karen Kampwirth, *Radical Women in Latin America: Left and Right* (Pennsylvania: Penn State Press, 2010); Timothy P. Wickham-Crowley, *Guerillas and Revolution in Latin America: A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes since 1956* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2018);

<sup>12</sup> Jaquette, "Women in Revolutionary Movements,"

<sup>13</sup> Chris W. Johnson, "Guerrilla Ganja Gun Girls: Policing Black Revolutionaries from Notting Hill to Laventille," *Gender & History* 26, no. 3 (October 2014): 661-87; Julia Sudbury, *Other Kinds of Dreams": Black Women's Organisations and the Politics of Transformation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005); Tanisha C. Ford, "Soul Generation: Radical Fashion, Beauty, and the Transnational Black Liberation Movement, 1954-1980." *Journal of Pan African Studies* 5, no. 1 (August 2012): 294; "Do you Remember Olive Morris?" n.d. Accessed June 24, 2020;

---

Tanisha C. Ford, "Finding Oliver Morris in the Archive: Reflections on the Remembering Olive Collective and Community History." *The Black Scholar* 46, no. 2 (April 2016): 5-18; Helen A. Neville and Jennifer F. Hamer, "Revolutionary Black Women's Activism: Experience and Transformation." *The Black Scholar* 36, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 2-11.

<sup>14</sup> Erik S. McDuffie, *Sojourning for Freedom: Black Women, America Communism, and the Making of Black Left Feminism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011).

<sup>15</sup> Beverly Bryan, Stella Dadzie and Suzanne Scafe, *Heart of Race: Black Women's Lives in Britain* (London: Verso Books, 2018).

<sup>16</sup> Ishanee Mukherjee, "Scaling the Barrier: Women, Revolution and Abscondence in Late Colonial Bengal." *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* 6, no. 1 (March 1999): 61-78; Durba Ghosh, "Revolutionary Women and Nationalist Heroes in Bengal, 1930 to the 1980s." *Gender & History* 25, no. 2 (July 2013): 355-75; Soma Marik, "Breaking Through a Double Invisibility: The Communist Women of Benhal, 1939-1948." *Critical Asian Studies* 45, no. 1 (January 2013): 79-118.

<sup>17</sup> Inamur Rahaman, Md, "Women in the Anti-Imperialist Movement: A Case Study of Burdwan District, 1930-47." *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 75 (2014): 575-80.

<sup>18</sup> Lalita Ke and Vasantha Kannabiran, *We Were Making History: Life Stories of Women in the Telangana People's Struggle* (London: Zed Books, 1989).

<sup>19</sup> For a detailed account of women in the freedom movement, see Manmohan Kaur, *Role of Women in the Freedom Movement, 1857-1947, 1<sup>st</sup> ed* (Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1968) and Ram Chandra, *History of the Naujawan Bharat Sabha* (Chandigarh: Unistar Books, 2007).



- 
- <sup>20</sup> Mallarika Sinha Roy, *Gender and Radical Politics in India: Magic Moments of Naxalbari (1967-1975)* (London: Routledge, 2010).
- <sup>21</sup> Rita Stephan and Mounira M. Charrad, *Women Rising: In and Beyond the Arab Spring* (New York: NYU Press, 2020), 1.
- <sup>22</sup> Sandra C. Taylor, *Vietnamese Women at War: Fighting for Ho Chi Minh and the Revolution* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999); Jungyun Gill, "Gender and History of Revolutions in East Asia," in *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Gender and Sexuality Studies* (American Cancer Society, 2016). 1-8.
- <sup>23</sup> Sangari and Vaid, *Recasting Women*; Lalita and Kannabiran, *We Were Making History*; Kama Maclean, "What Durga Bhabhi Did Next: Or, Was There a Gendered Agenda in Revolutionary Circles?" *South Asian History and Culture* 4, no. 2 (February 2013): 176-95; Marik, "Communist Women of Bengal."
- <sup>24</sup> Lalita and Kannabiran, *We Were Making History*, 2.
- <sup>25</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789-1914* (London: University of California Press, 2011b), 185.
- <sup>26</sup> Maria Lugones, "The Coloniality of Gender," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Gender and Development*, ed. Wendy Harcourt (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2016), 13-33.
- <sup>27</sup> Frantz Fanon, "Algeria Unveiled," in *A Dying Colonialism* (New York: Grove Press, 1967), 35-69.
- <sup>28</sup> Illina Sen, "Feminists, Women's Movement, and the Working Class," *Economic and Political Weekly* 24, no. 29 (July 1989): 1639-41; Illina Sen, ed., *A Space Withing the Struggle: Women's Participation in People's Movements* (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1990), 2.

---

<sup>29</sup> Madhu Kishwar, “Nature of Women’s Mobilisation in Rural India: An Exploratory Essay,” *Economic and Political Weekly* 23, no. 52/53 (December 1988): 2754-63; Sen, *Space within the Struggle*.

<sup>30</sup> Sen, “Feminists, Women’s Movements,”

<sup>31</sup> Lydia Liu, Rebecca E. Karl, and Dorothy Ko, *The Birth of Chinese Feminism: Essential Texts in Transnational Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), 34.

<sup>32</sup> Liu, Karl, and Ko, *Chinese Feminism*, 47.

<sup>33</sup> Anup Grewal, “Transnational Socialist Imaginary and the Proletarian Woman in China,” *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15, no. 2 (2013).

<sup>34</sup> Babar Ali, “Elitist View of Women’s Struggle in Pakistan,” *Economic and Political Weekly* 23, no. 20 (May 1988): 1034-36.

<sup>35</sup> Federici, *Caliban*.

<sup>36</sup> Federici, *Caliban*, 64; emphasis original.

<sup>37</sup> Robert Brenner, “The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of New-Smithian Marxism,” *New Left Review* 0, no. 104 (August 1977): 25-92.

<sup>38</sup> Ellen Meiksins Wood, *The Origins of Capitalism: A Longer View* (London: Verso, 2002); William Robinson, “The Pitfalls of Realist Analysis of Global Capitalism: A Critique of Ellen Meiksins Wood’s Empire of Capital,” *Historical Materialism* 15, no. 3 (January 2007): 71-93; Vivek Chibber, “On the Decline of Class Analysis in South Asian Studies,” *Critical Asian Studies* 38, no. 4 (December 2006): 357-87; Vivek Chibber and Adaner Usmani, “The State and the Capitalist Class in India” in *Routledge Handbooks of Indian Politics*, edited by Atul Kohli and Prerna Singh (London: Routledge, 2012), 204-210; Vivek Chibber, *Postcolonial Theory and*

---

*the Specter of Capital* (London: Verso Books, 2013); Barry Eidlin, "Class Formation and Class Identity: Birth, Death, and Possibilities for Renewal," *Sociology Compass* 8, no. 8 (August 2014): 1045-62.

<sup>39</sup> Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times* (London: Verso, 1994); J.M Blaut, "Robert Brenner in the Tunnel of Time," *Antipode* 26, no. 4 (October 1994): 351-74; Wallerstein, *Modern World-System I*.

<sup>40</sup> Arrighi, *Long Twentieth Century*.

<sup>41</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Ideological Tensions of Capitalism: Universalism versus Racism and Sexism," in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (London; New York: Verso, 1991).

<sup>42</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein, "Citizens All? Citizens Some! The Making of the Citizen," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45, no. 4 (October 2003); Wallerstein, *Modern World-System IV*.

<sup>43</sup> Wallerstein, "Citizens All," 137.

<sup>44</sup> Wallerstein, "Ideological Tensions," 35.

<sup>45</sup> Arrighi, *Long Twentieth Century*.

<sup>46</sup> Sieyès, 1789, 193-194 quoted in Wallerstein, *Modern World-System IV*, 145.

<sup>47</sup> Wallerstein, *Modern World-System IV*, 185; 192.

<sup>48</sup> Wallerstein, "Ideological Tensions."

<sup>49</sup> Wallerstein, "Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World-System," *Theory, Culture & Society* 7, no. 2-3 (June 1990): 52.

---

<sup>50</sup> Mies, *Patriarchy*; Valentine Moghadam, “Women, Work, and Ideology in the Islamic Republic,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 20, no. 2 (May 1988): 221-43; Valentine Moghadam, “Hidden from History? Wome Workers in Modern Iran,” *Iranian Studies* 33, no. 3/4 (Summer-Autumn 2000): 377-401; Wilma Dunaway, “Rethinking Cherokee Acculturation: Agrarian Capitalism and Women’s Resistance to the Cult of Domesticity, 1800-1838,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 21, no. 1 (January 1997): 155-92; Patricia Fernández Kelly and Anna M. Garcia, “The Making of An Underground Economy: Hispanic Women, Home Work, and the Advanced Capitalist State,” *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Sustersms and World Economic Development* 14, no. 1/3 (Spring-Summer-Fall 1985): 59-90; Christine E. Bose and Edna Acosta-Belén, eds., *Women in the Latin American Development Process* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995).

<sup>51</sup> Lourdes Beneria and Shelly Feldman, eds., *Unequal Burden: Economic Crises, Persistent Poverty, and Women’s Work* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992).

<sup>52</sup> Feldman, “Crises, Poverty, and Gender Inequality: Current Themes and Issues,” in Beneria and Feldman, *Unequal Burden*, 1.

<sup>53</sup> Joan Smith, Jane Collins, Terence K. Hopkins, Akbar Muhammad, and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Racism, Sexism, and the World-System* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988).

<sup>54</sup> Wilma Dunaway, “The Double Register of History: Situating the Forgotten Woman and Her Household in Capitalist Commodity Chains,” *Journal of World-Systems Research* 7, no. 1 (February 2001): 3, 23.

<sup>55</sup> Rose Brewer, “Political Economy of the World-System: The Imperative of African-Centered Utopias,” *Journal of World-Systems Research* 18, no. 2 (August 2012): 146-50.

---

<sup>56</sup> Jason W. Moore, *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital* (London: Verso Books, 2015).

<sup>57</sup> Anjali Gera Roy, "Soldiers, Artisans, Cultivators and Revolutionaries: The Movement of Sikhs in the Indian Ocean," *Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies* 9, no. 1 (June 2012): 1-19.

<sup>58</sup> M. S Gill, *Trials That Changed History: From Socrates to Saddam Hussein* (New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2007); Maia Ramnath, *Haj to utopia: How the Ghadar Movement Charted Global Radicalism and Attempted to Overthrow the British Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

<sup>59</sup> Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 6.

<sup>60</sup> Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 7.

<sup>61</sup> Mathew Plowman, "Irish Republicans and the Indo-German Conspiracy of World War I," *New Hibernia Review* 7, no. 3 (Autumn 2003): 81-105.

<sup>62</sup> For a detailed account of the unsuccessful attempt at this uprising, see: Karl Hoover, "The Hindu Conspiracy in California, 1913-1918," *German Studies Review* 8, no. 2 (May 1985): 245-261; Plowman, "Irish Republicans,"; Tai Yong Tan, *The Garrison State: The Military, Government and Society in Colonial Punjab 1849-1947* (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2005); Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*; Gill, *Trials that Changed History*.

<sup>63</sup> Randhir Singh, *The Ghadar Heroes: Forgotten Story of the Punjab Revolutionaries of 1914-15* (Bombay: People's Publishing House, 1945); Gurdev Singh Deol, *The Role of the Ghadar Party in the National Movement* (Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1969); Harish K. Puri, "Revolutionary Organization: A Study of the Ghadar Movement," *Social Scientist* 9, no. 2/3 (September-October

---

1980): 53-66; Harish K Puri, *Ghadar Movement: Ideology, Organisation, and Strategy*

(Amritsar: Guru Nanak Dev University, 1993); Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*.

<sup>64</sup> See also: Suchetana Chattopadhyay, *Voices of Komagata Maru: Imperial Surveillance and Workers from Punjab in Bengal* (New Delhi: Tulika Books, 2018); Chris Moffat, *India's Revolutionary Inheritance: Politics and the Promise of Bhagat Singh* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019); Dhamoon et al., *Unmooring*.

<sup>65</sup> Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*; Dhamoon et al., *Unmooring*.

<sup>66</sup> Ali Raza, *Revolutionary Pasts: Communist Internationalism in Colonial India* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

<sup>67</sup> Puri, *Ghadar Movement*, 4.

<sup>68</sup> Kanwalroop Kaur Singh, "Queering Colonial Power: Sikh Resistance in the Ghadr Movement," *Sikh Formations* 13, no. 4 (April 2017): 268-90; Raza, *Revolutionary Pasts*; Satwinder Kaur Bains and Ghadar Centennial Conference, eds., *Interpreting Ghadar: Echoes of Voices Past* (Abbotsford, BC: Centre for Indo-Canadian Studies, University of the Fraser Valley, 2013).

<sup>69</sup> Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*.

<sup>70</sup> Lalita and Kannabiran, *We Were Making History*, 20.

<sup>71</sup> Lalita and Kannabiran, *We Were Making History*, 21.

<sup>72</sup> Martha C. Howell and Walter Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 113.

<sup>73</sup> Fernand Braudel, *On History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

<sup>74</sup> Howell and Prevenier, *Reliable Sources*, 149.

---

<sup>75</sup> “The United States of India (May 1926).” 2011. The United States of India. Pacific Coast Hindustani Association. November 29, 2011. <https://www.saada.org/item/20111129-508>.

<sup>76</sup> Kaur, *Role of Women*.

<sup>77</sup> Surendra Karr, Taraknath Das. 2012. “The Independent Hindustan (September 1920).” The Independent Hindustan. Hindustan Gadar Party. January 11, 2012.

<sup>78</sup> Karr and Das. “The Independent Hindustan (September 1920)”

<sup>79</sup> Karr and Das, “The Independent Hindustan (September 1920)”

<sup>80</sup> Carby, “White Women Listen!”

<sup>81</sup> Carby, “White Women Listen!” 66.

<sup>82</sup> Sangari and Vaid, *Recasting Women*, 12.

<sup>83</sup> Carby, “White Women Listen!” 72.

<sup>84</sup> Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 6.

<sup>85</sup> “The United States of India (July 1926).” 2011. The United States of India. November 29, 2011. <https://www.saada.org/item/20111129-510>.

<sup>86</sup> “The United States of India (July 1926)”

<sup>87</sup> (“The United States of India (February 1924).” 2011. The United States of India. September 19, 2011. <https://www.saada.org/item/20110919-368>

<sup>88</sup> (“The United States of India (March 1924).” 2011. The United States of India. September 19, 2011. <https://www.saada.org/item/20110919-369>

<sup>89</sup> Surendra Karr, Brian Padraic O’Shasnian. 2012. “The Independent Hindustan (November 1920).” The Independent Hindustan. Hindustan Gadar Party. January 11, 2012.

<https://www.saada.org/item/20120111-576>. Emphasis mine.

---

<sup>90</sup> Mies, *Patriarchy*, 74, 76; see also Immanuel Wallerstein, *Historical Capitalism with Capitalist Civilization* (London: Verso, 1983), 63.

<sup>91</sup> Federici, *Caliban*, 233.

<sup>92</sup> Arrighi, *Long Twentieth Century*.

<sup>93</sup> Karr and Das, "The Independent Hindustan (September 1920)." Emphasis mine.

<sup>94</sup> "The United States of India (May 1925)." 2011. The United States of India. November 15, 2011. <https://www.saada.org/item/20111115-467>.

<sup>95</sup> ("The United States of India (August 1925)." 2011. The United States of India. November 29, 2011. <https://www.saada.org/item/20111129-501>

<sup>96</sup> Mies, *Patriarchy*, 94.

<sup>97</sup> Karr and O'Shasnian, "The Independent Hindustan (November 1920)."

<sup>98</sup> "The United States of India (December 1923)." 2011. The United States of India. Pacific Coast Hindustani Association. September 19, 2011. <https://www.saada.org/item/20110919-366>.

<sup>99</sup> "The United States of India (May 1925)."

<sup>100</sup> ("The United States of India (March 1926)." 2011. The United States of India. November 29, 2011. <https://www.saada.org/item/20111129-506>. Emphasis mine.

<sup>101</sup> Federici, *Caliban*, 75.

<sup>102</sup> Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (Washington, 1974), 227.

<sup>103</sup> ("The Independent Hindustan (November 1920)." 2012. Emphasis mine

<sup>104</sup> Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove/Atlantic. Inc, 2007), 173.

<sup>105</sup> Shelly Feldman, "Feminist Interruptions: The Silence of East Bengal in the Story of Partition," *Interventions* 1, no. 2 (January 1999): 167-82.



---

<sup>106</sup> Feldman, "Feminist Interruptions," 176.

<sup>107</sup> Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993) in Feldman, "Feminist Interruptions," 176.