The ethos of Gandhian thought and action had its firm foundation on the utility of non-violent methods for resolving conflict situations, as against the revolutionary ideology based on the efficacy of violent methods. The undercurrent of violence in Indian political thought was one factor that constantly haunted Gandhi who desired a new order of Indian society marked by social solidarity and abstention of violence. He recognised the constraints in the Indian society as the source that generated violence and was also keenly aware of the role of violence in the political matters. He therefore, made consistent efforts to fight against it and also reproved those who were in favour of using violent methods for the eradication of governmental violence.

It was therefore, imperative that Gandhi, during the years 1915-35, should make untiring attempts to convince, the school of revolutionaries about the ill effects of their methods through effective arguments and also by providing them with an alternative methodology. Irrespective of the general faith and belief that Gandhi and the revolutionaries represented the two opposite banks of a river, a close perusal of the period, prior to 1915, clearly reveals that
there were some common factors in their ideology, as their aim was the liberation of the motherland and both believed in maximum sacrifice for the realisation of that aim. The only major point of dispute, therefore was the means which both had decided to adopt, for reaching their destination.

The efforts of the revolutionaries to keep the spirit of nationalism alive amongst the Indians before Gandhi’s appearance on the Indian scene, did not go waste. Immediately after his arrival in India Gandhi spent a couple of years in studying the Indian situation and gradually emerged as a powerful leader who could command the support of the masses. He also took up the task of convincing the revolutionary youth, about the futility of their methods because he had unflinching faith in non-violence and knew that the revolutionary methods would act as a negation to his ideology and programmes. He fervently believed that it was "possible to win over those young men who have been driven to desperation and anger by what they think to be the tyranny of the government and utilize their courage and their mettlesome spirit, their capacity for suffering, to strengthen the daivi sampad of satyagraha." He felt that the emergence of the party of violence in Bengal and Punjab were definitely due to

1. Vide Supra, Chapter I, pp. 49-50.

the discontent and dissatisfaction of the local people and in both the cases the causes of violence were well defined and so remediable.\(^3\) The Khilafat question and the Punjab problem provided him with an opportunity to launch a nationwide movement and the Non-cooperation movement was thus born.

This was the first occasion when one could witness the mingling of the two different streams of thought. Forced by the circumstances, the revolutionaries for the first time decided to join hands with the former, leaving aside the differences that existed, out of sheer expedience. Their participation in the first major movement of Gandhi in Indian politics, had a definite impact on the country’s freedom struggle. While it revealed the acknowledgement of Gandhi’s popular appeal by the revolutionaries, it also brought to light, Gandhi’s determination to win over the latter to his side.

Broadly speaking, the revolutionaries who participated in the movement fall under two categories. There were some old revolutionaries who started their career much before the arrival of Gandhi on the Indian scene but joined hands with the latter in the early twenties on the grounds of expediency. A.C. Guha, Surendra Mohan Ghose, Jibanlal Chatterjee, Shyam Sunder Chakravarty, Manoranjan Gupta, Surjya Sen and others fall under this category.

---

There were still others, who began their political career by responding to the call of the Mahatma but later joined the revolutionary ranks because of their disillusionment with Gandhi’s direct action programme. Chandra Shekar Azad, Bhagat Singh, M.N. Gupta and many others belong to this group.

Inspite of the paucity of materials regarding the exact role of the revolutionaries, it is certain that some of the old Bengal revolutionaries participated more actively in the Non-cooperation movement. In fact, they joined the movement due to the exigencies of time but were not influenced either by Gandhi’s principles or his programmes; on the other hand it was the magnetic pull of the Mahatma and his novel method of direct action that attracted the youth of the Panjab and United Provinces. The promise of "Swaraj in one year" by Gandhi also attracted these revolutionaries to a large extent. Many revolutionaries of Maharashtra who were in contact with Kaka Saheb Kalelkar were persuaded by him to meet Gandhi and they had also accepted Gandhian techniques, around this time.

This period of hectic activity also sharply brings out the realisation on the part of the revolutionaries that a revolution based on action might not be possible through secret activities alone. Gandhi had already surmised it very early during his political career. It was this particular
capacity of Gandhi, the power to carry the public along with him, that attracted the revolutionaries. The secretive nature of their work did not permit them either to work in the open or make an attempt to appeal to the masses. The Non-cooperation movement provided them with such an opportunity. They were ready to support Gandhi and work with the masses because of their realisation that mass participation might bring them nearer to their goal. Guha admitted "We supported this programme not because we were so much convinced of non-violence, but we were convinced that a revolution could not be achieved by a handful of young men. They might serve as a sort of shock treatment, by their sacrifice, suffering and self immolation and rouse the conscience of the people, but a revolution could come only through some mass action and this was the programme which gave us the opportunity for mass action."  

The revolutionaries participated in the positive as well as the negative programmes of the Non-cooperation movement. Bhagat Singh, Azad, Manmathnath Gupta and many others had left schools and colleges on Gandhi’s call. They were also ready to boycott courts. Similarly, the revolutionaries also participated in the constructive programmes of Gandhi. Bhai Parmanand, a Ghadr party member, Sibnath Banerjee connected with Jugantar and Motilal Roy of

the Chandernagore group tried to promote the cause of national education. Purna Das and Surendra Mohan Ghose played an impressive role in organising village committees and Panchayats for the arbitration of disputes.* Enlistment of volunteers to work on the side of Congress was one of the greatest achievements of the revolutionaries.

It is, true that the revolutionaries who participated in the movement were not convinced of total non-violence. However, they generally refrained from resorting to violence in accordance with their promise to Gandhi, like the trained Satyagrahis, who were bound by their pledge of non-violence. It may also be, probably, due to their realisation that they needed time to recuperate and reorganise. There are ample evidences in the government records to show that the revolutionaries utilized the period of the Non-cooperation movement as a cover for their real intentions.

The "attainment of Swaraj" whether in a period of twelve months or more, was the pivotal point which motivated both Gandhi and the revolutionaries to do what, they did at that stage. To the revolutionaries, the word "Swaraj" as envisaged by Tilak meant nothing but freedom, freedom from the foreign domination. To Gandhi too, the word Swaraj denoted nothing more than self government at this stage. To the critics who warned the people against engaging themselves

* Vide Supra, Chapter II, Text Table II.
in a struggle for a Swaraj such as described in Hind Swaraj, Gandhi replied, "I donot ask India to follow today the methods prescribed in my booklet. If they could do that they would have Swaraj not in a year but in a day ... What I am doing today is that I am giving the country a pardonable programme for the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj."\(^5\)

If, it is true to some extent that the revolutionaries were influenced by the Mahatma, it is also true that the followers of the Mahatma too at times had adopted methods that were generally used by the revolutionaries. Some of the secret societies in Bengal, used to get involved in public welfare activities for gaining the goodwill of the masses, since they needed them for a successful revolution. Congress, too, adopted such tactics to woo the masses so that it could use them later for withholding the payment of taxes and thereby paralyse the administration.\(^6\)

At some places especially in Bengal the possibility of help by a net work of secret organisations for non-cooperation cannot be ruled out as the Congress did not have its organisational set up at that time. Bhabesh Chandra Nandy, a Jugantar member said, "The Congress during this


period had no organisation of its own. The revolutionaries who started a movement against the British as early as 1905, had units of their organisation throughout the provinces in different names. When they decided to work for the Congress in 1920-21 they converted these units into Congress organisational units, manned by their workers ... "7

The participation of the revolutionaries in the Non-cooperation movement however, was shortlived. The withdrawal of the proposed Civil Disobedience movement at Bardoli, after the violent incident at Chauri Chaura, led to the revival of the revolutionary activities in the twenties, whereas Gandhi concentrated on promoting his Constructive Programmes. The second phase of the revolutionary activities, however, turned out to be different from the earlier one. Though, it was still marked by heroism, exemplary courage and self-sacrificing tendency on the part of the revolutionaries, there were certain developments in their organisation and ideology that gave them a distinct character of their own.

The stress on religion one witnessed in the early phase was literally conspicuous by its absence in this phase. Though, the personification of the motherland as Shakti continued, there was no excessive indulgence in religious ceremonies like oath taking before one joined revolutionary

groups. The organisations developed a secular outlook and the participation of Muslims increased slowly. The members of the new revolutionary outfits were clear in their minds as regards the goal towards which they were moving. They could also comprehend the meanings of "violence" and "revolution" as is evident from the Manifesto of the HSRA "Philosophy of the Bomb" and the statement of Bhagat Singh and Bhatukeshwar Dutt in the Assembly bomb case. There was greater clarity of thought regarding the ideology of the revolutionary movement after the formation of the HSRA. The complete futility of individual murders had been recognised by leaders like Chandra Shekar Azad, Bhagat Singh and others, and it was felt both in Bengal and in the Punjab that such acts were not as important as they used to be.

With the importance of the individual assassinations going down, the necessity of a mass revolution came to be accepted and more stress was being laid on propaganda for attracting the attention of the masses. Reading of literature on Marxian Socialism, interaction with people having communistic leanings and discussions on the new theories in those places where the revolutionaries were kept under detention, gradually resulted in their leaning towards other new political beliefs and alignments.

They wanted to usher in a new social order where the exploitation of man and of nation by other nations would be
brought to an end. Like Gandhi who was involved in his Constructive Programmes, the revolutionaries too in this period envisaged a society on the basis of equality. But the major difference in their plans for Social Reconstruction revolved round the fact that while Gandhi favoured truth and non-violence as the only means the revolutionaries desired fundamental changes in the social order through a violent revolution. The HRA and HSRA people were also clear in spelling out the type of new government they wanted. The HRA claimed that it wanted to establish a "Federated Republic of India." Subsequently, after assuming the title of HSRA it aimed at the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

There were definite improvements in the organisational set up of the revolutionary groups and their outlook had widened. S.N. Mazumdar pointed out that the HRA organisations had begun to understand the international character of the national liberation movement and had also introduced the principle of democratisation in their party. Later, the Philosophy of the Bomb proclaimed that "the deliverance of their country will come through revolution ... The revolution will ring the death knell of Capitalism and class distinctions and privileges ..."

While the impact of the propaganda activities was becoming more visible, the leadership of Gandhi and his

complete sway over the masses, was also increasing manifold. He was highly apprehensive of the recurrence of violent activities and its acceptance by the Indian masses. He, therefore decided to launch the Civil Disobedience movement in the year 1930. Surprisingly, the second major non-violent movement of Gandhi was accompanied by an unabated wave of revolutionary activities for the next four years in spite of the highly repressive policy of the government.

Charles Tegart, the Police Commissioner, who was often the target of the revolutionaries, differentiating between the Revolutionary Terrorist movement and the Civil Disobedience movement, said, though both aimed at paralysing the government, they were fundamentally different. While the Civil Disobedience movement was an all India movement, based on non-violence, involving reliance on mass demonstrations and picketing, the Revolutionary Terrorist movement was mostly run by students relying on secrecy, underground activities and striking the enemy in the back.9

Both the movements were a negation of each other but both were in their most perfect form in those years. If, one had the support of the masses, the other commanded their appreciation. Running parallel to each other these two forces brought to light certain factors.

Unlike the days of non-cooperation, Gandhi did not make any conscious attempt to involve the revolutionaries in his Civil Disobedience movement. In this period he mostly condemned the revolutionaries activities and appealed to the revolutionaries to refrain from their violent deeds. Whereas, Gandhi's movement had a much wider base, the revolutionary activities were confined to specific areas and particular groups. While the report from Bengal stated that there had been no enthusiasm to initiate Gandhi's activities, the one from the Punjab mentioned that the popular interest was much less than what might have been anticipated.10

There were however, some veteran revolutionaries in Bengal like Jibanlal, Surendra Mohan Ghose, Shyam Sunder Chakraborty and Jaduda who participated in the movement. It was more due to their inability to carry on with their revolutionary activities openly, that motivated them to participate. In Punjab too, the members of the Nau Jawan Bharat Sabha were still literally preaching the cult of the bomb as against Gandhi's satyagraha. According to a fortnightly report from the Punjab, "a most objectionable speech was made by Milkhi Ram who ridiculed the idea that the adoption of Khaddar and the boycott of foreign clothes would lead to the emancipation of the country and advised those

present to wear hats and keep pistols.\textsuperscript{11} Moreover, Gandhian ideology could not deeply penetrate into these two provinces because of the Muslims concentration and accentuation of the communal differences in these areas.\textsuperscript{12} The revolutionary parties therefore, had an open field to themselves. On the other hand in those provinces where Gandhian influence was more, the revolutionary activities were almost negligible.

If the Civil Disobedience movement portrayed the full potential of satyagraha and captured world attention with the participants displaying their ability to be non-violent, even in the face of organised official violence, the Revolutionary movement too reached its highest water mark during the same time. The Chittagong Armoury Raid by a small group of revolutionaries in a remote part of India came as a surprise to both the Government and Gandhi.

Many revolutionaries who began their political career by joining the Non-cooperation movement of Gandhi did not participate in the Civil Disobedience movement. Some of the veteran Anushilan and Jugantar leaders who had participated in the Non-cooperation movement changed their mode of functioning. Leaders like A.C. Guha, Manoranjan Gupta and Bhupen Dutta continued to pursue revolutionary activities

\begin{itemize}
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\end{itemize}
while being members of the Congress. Surjya Sen, Rajen Lahiri, Chandra Shekar Azad and many others got deeply involved in revolutionary activities.

In the initial stages of the Civil Disobedience movement the activities of the revolutionaries were prompted by frustration because of Gandhi's insistence on constructive programmes alone. Talking about the same Subhas Chandra Bose said, "It gave them the impression that the Mahatma was a spent force and that a mass movement under the leadership of the Congress was highly improbable. Owing to this feeling a section of the youth began to prepare for independent action on their own behalf on revolutionary lines.\textsuperscript{13}

Another conspicuous feature is the induction of women, both in the Congress and the revolutionary activities. The women were ready to participate in the non-violent as well as violent activities. The part played by Bina Das, Preeti Lata, Shanti Ghosh, Kamla Das Gupta and Leela Nag was nothing less when compared to the women in the Congress ranks.

This period also witnessed the exchange of ideas between Gandhi and the revolutionaries through letters and pamphlets. The revolutionaries emphasized that violence was equally important and effective for obtaining freedom. In order to bring them round to his views, Gandhi had to explain

and defend his stand through his replies published in Young India. He tried to dissuade the revolutionaries from their violent acts by pointing out the shortcomings of their chosen path. The exchange of letters between Gandhi and the revolutionaries are comparatively few in number, but rich in their content. They contain a wealth of information regarding Gandhi’s attitude towards the revolutionaries and the light in which Gandhi was held by those men.

It is also observed that Gandhi’s reactions to the revolutionaries’ ideology, acts and their philosophy as expressed through the letters are much more stronger in this period than in the days of the Non-cooperation movement.

The revolutionaries in their correspondence invariably attacked Gandhi’s principle of non-violence, its conception, nature and efficacy in all their letters. They held that violence was the norm and so it cannot be overlooked or ignored. Gandhi, on the other hand, held that violence begets violence and so should be avoided at all cost in all the fields viz. political, social and the religious. The Report sent to the secretary of state for India stated, "Gandhi’s utterances on subject of violence appear to be becoming more equivocal than in the past and young men who believe in violence are plainly critical of his attitude."  

Gandhi and the Revolutionaries were conscious of each other’s contribution towards the cause of freedom, in the eyes of the Indian masses and therefore displayed great respect for each other. Gandhi, did not hesitate to recognise the merit of either Savarkar or Bhai Parmanand, who could not be converted to his philosophy, and happily defended such total converts like Mohan Lal Pandya when the Government showed displeasure over their contact with Gandhi. The revolutionaries, too, on the other hand held Gandhi in high esteem and sought his approval for their constructive activities (as shown by his visit to Motilal Roy’s and Jiten Kushari’s Ashram). Thus, the thread of mutual respect between the two, irrespective of their faith in contradictory ideologies is easily discernible.

Gandhi’s contact and inter-action with the revolutionaries was not confined to writing letters alone. Their co-existence between 1915 and 35 and Gandhi’s efforts to persuade his misguided friends to leave their path resulted in the development of personal contact and relationship between them. A close study of their inter-relationship reveals the causes that contributed to the conversion of some revolutionaries to Gandhian ideals.

Some of the revolutionaries belonging to the old school who had started their career in the first decade of the 20th century came into Gandhi’s fold. This group.
includes Kaka Saheb Kalelkar, Sunder Lal Pandit, Mama Saheb Phadke and others who were already disillusioned with the violent methods. These converts joined hands with Gandhi in his constructive programmes and paid more attention to the promotion of language, culture and removal of untouchability rather than coming to the forefront of the political platform. However, some other revolutionaries like Shyamaji, Savarkar and Bhai Parmanand belonging to the early revolutionary school of thought were not influenced politically by Gandhi.

The same is true of the revolutionaries belonging to the period of Bhagat Singh who remained almost untouched by Gandhian philosophy irrespective of the fact whether they came into contact with Gandhi or not. It is certain that they were not convinced of the efficacy of non-violence in the field of politics. Baba Prithvi Singh who came into contact with Gandhi rather late also maintained his faith in revolutionary methods and an armed conflict.

A careful study of the Gandhian thinking and strategies on one hand and that of the revolutionary ideology and activities on the other during the long stretch of twenty years beginning from 1915 reveals that Gandhi treated the revolutionaries as a father would treat his prodigal son. He tried to wean his "misguided friends" from the path of violence by appealing to them directly as he did during the
days of the non-cooperation, by criticizing their activities during the Civil Disobedience movement by corresponding with those leaders who asked him to clarify his stand and also by establishing personal contact with some of them for the specific purpose of converting them to his fold. From their contact it might be inferred that the revolutionaries had no animosity towards Gandhi as such and some of them even had great respect and regard for him. In fact, they did not hesitate to see Gandhi's opinion on certain matters.\(^{15}\) Kaka Saheb Kalelkar admitted that Gandhi had great regard for the revolutionaries but he never showed it because it might have strengthened the cult of violence.\(^{16}\)

However, in the ensuing period, the increased correspondence between Gandhi and the revolutionaries manifest the stand taken by both of them regarding the methods to be followed for obtaining freedom. Gandhi tried to outline the reasons as to why, one should not pursue violent methods. Gandhi's arguments against violence, more or less, remained constant throughout this period. He himself summarized all his arguments thus,

"a) The revolutionary activity has not brought us near our goal."

---

15. Vide Infra, Appendix pp. 308, 313–4; Letter's written by Rash Behari Bose and Barindra Kumar Ghose.

b) It has added to the military expenditure in the country.
c) It has given rise to reprisals on the part of the Government without doing any good.
d) Whenever revolutionary murder has taken place, it has, for a time and in that place, demoralized the people.
e) It has in no way contributed to mass awakening.
f) Its effect on the masses has been doubly bad in that they had to bear the burden ultimately of additional expense and the indirect effect of Government wrath.
g) Revolutionary murder cannot thrive in the Indian soil, Indian tradition, as history teaches us, being unfavourable to the growth of political violence.
h) If the revolutionaries seek to convert the masses to their method, we would have to wait for an indefinitely long time for it to permeate to the masses and then to gain freedom.
i) If the method of violence ever becomes popular, it is bound to recoil, as it has done in other countries, on our own heads ... "17

In Gandhi’s opinion, "the people of Europe gained their freedom by violent methods because they were more or less trained in the use of arms."18 But that was not the case with Indians. This could have been one of the factors which

17. Young India, April 23, 1931.
18. Ibid., April 16, 1931.
made Gandhi adhere to non-violence as the core of his satyagraha and he never swerved away from it irrespective of the efforts of the revolutionaries to counter all his allegations.

The revolutionaries on the other hand, wanted to bring about a revolution by violent means because they were aware that it had always succeeded in bringing about changes everywhere in the world. They were, as a result apprehensive of supporting a novel method, the efficacy of which had not yet been proved anywhere. They were also greatly perturbed by two issues, important in their eyes. According to them, Gandhi the accepted leader of the masses ignored their group and their contribution to the struggle for freedom. They also probably felt insulted by his repeated impersonal appeals.

Both, however, remained steadfast in their views. While the revolutionaries could not accept Gandhi’s principle of non-violence under any condition, as being productive Gandhi too, refused to have faith in the violence of the revolutionaries. Shiv Verma said that Gandhi honestly believed in his ability to change the heart of the imperialists through non-violence and so was reluctant to accept the revolutionaries’ ideology. The revolutionaries clung to their ideals because they recognised that the public were sympathetic to those who were being sent to the gallows.
Therefore they preferred to die in order to keep the flame of independence burning.

Though Gandhi claimed that many revolutionaries had been converted to his faith, the known converts on whom the Gandhian philosophy had an impact were not too many according to the available resources. Non-violence, in fact did not appeal to the revolutionaries, as a useful policy to be followed in the country's struggle for freedom. In the words of L.R. Acharya, "non-violence and all preachings about non-violence were much ahead of times, but they were probably the final thinking on human lives - they bring solace and of course, they brought solace to the country also, in the shape of final emancipation from the British clutches." Guha too agreed that non-violence was never a creed with him but considering the strength of any government he felt that the technique of non-violence was the appropriate technique for effecting a popular revolution. Almost all the revolutionaries who were interviewed admitted that they did not develop complete faith in Gandhian non-violence. Some of

19. Collected Works, op.cit., vol. VII, p. 98; In a talk with Bhai Parmanand in 1940, Gandhi mentioned that Prithvi Singh's case was not the first one, of the conversion to non-violence and that it was not going to be the last.


them grudgingly admitted that Gandhi's creed of non-violence had a definite role to play in the freedom movement.

Gandhi repeatedly condemned the activities of the revolutionaries but praised their bravery and courage. He was apprehensive of the Western influence on the Indians that encouraged them to adopt violent methods. He wrote, "I object to violence because when it appears to do good, the good is only temporary. The evil it does is permanent." This was why he advised non-violent non-cooperation in the twenties. Gandhi's non-cooperation was thus his alternative to violent and untruthful methods which threatened to gain ascendancy in Indian politics. His decision to start the Civil Disobedience movement in 1930, was to counter-act the violence of the government and also of the party of revolutionaries. The support of the revolutionaries who had infiltrated into the Congress rank, to Subhas Bose, was one reason for Gandhi's acceptance of the issue of complete independence. Whenever a resolution was passed by the Congress on the martyrdom of a revolutionary, Gandhi literally opposed it and came under scathing criticism. As a result he often had to change his stand. Though Gandhi's decision to resume the Civil Disobedience movement in 1932 after returning from London, was mainly due to the repressive policies of the British Government, yet the

increased activities of the revolutionaries also played a significant role. The recurring incidents of overt activities helped Gandhi to ponder over the acquisition of the spirit of non-violence on the part of the satyagrahis. By 1934, he had started feeling that the civil resisters had not been non-violent enough in their activities. He wrote, "Nor were we able to show to the terrorists that we had greater faith in our non-violence than they in their violence. On the contrary many of us made them feel that we had the same spirit of violence in our breasts that they had. Only we did not believe in deeds of violence.

Terrorists rightly argued that if the spirit of violence was common to both, the policy of doing or not doing violence was a matter of opinion. All I want to say is that ours has not been unadulterated non-violence, thought, word and deed ... 

It is, now my paramount duty to devise ways and means of showing demonstrably to the Government and the terrorists, the efficacy of non-violence as a means of achieving the right thing including freedom in every sense of the term." 23

Thus in the year 1934, Gandhi was found relenting over the fact that the people still had not acquired the non-violence that he had been talking about since 1915, and planning to devise better ways and means to achieve the same.

This realisation on the part of Gandhi was essentially brought home to him due to the revolutionaries’ display of the violent activities having a considerable appeal to the emotion of the masses.

Undoubtedly, the revolutionary movement caused great worry to the British Indian Government too. Almost all the fortnightly reports from the provinces for the period between 1930-34, continued to concentrate more on the terroristic activities, how these were being promoted and how these aided the cause of Civil Resisters while minimising the role of the followers of the Congress. It shows that the British were more apprehensive about the rise in the revolutionary activities. They had a fear lurking in their minds which definitely influenced them to deal with Gandhi and the other national leaders.

In the period, under study the controversy between the soul-force of the non-violent Gandhi and the physical force of the revolutionaries tried to overtake each other. They moved along trying to explain their respective stand and both claimed that their own method was superior to the other. Each force had a definite role to play in the national movement and each had a character of its own. Both the movements appeared to have become agreeable to the masses.

The revolutionaries had prepared the ground and Gandhi could utilise it for sowing his seeds of non-violence.
The romanticism of the young revolutionaries were constant reminders to the public that bravery and self-sacrifice might yield good results; the masses were at the same time gripped by the power of non-violence as suggested by Gandhi; they realised that they had the required moral strength to fight for their rights.

As the years rolled by, it became apparent that the masses were not worried by the fact whether they used violent or non-violent methods. They knew that they desired independence and Gandhi made them realise their moral strength while the revolutionaries reactivated their physical abilities. Somewhere in the middle, the public overlooked the fact that violence would always beget violence. Gandhi’s insistence, that a swarajya won through violent methods could never be a real Swarajya was completely forgotten.

After the Civil Disobedience movement, while Gandhi was more involved with the communal issue, the revolutionaries who had understood that their activities must be supplemented by mass movements, started leaning towards socialism and communism. The romanticism of attracting mass attention through violent acts, however, mingled with Gandhi’s strategies during the days of the "Quit India Movement" in 1942. Coupled with the international situation and pressures, the cumulative impact of the two forces resulted in the Independence of India in the year 1947.
There are no two opinions in so far as the role of the revolutionaries in attaining independence for the country is concerned. Nothing is absolute in this world. Every ideology is a mixture of good and bad and has its own merits and demerits, though the proportion varies. In the pre-independence days, seasoned revolutionaries and the youth involved themselves totally with one aim and goal to achieve independence for the country through their revolutionary acts. It cannot be denied that their motive was simple and straightforward under the prevalent conditions. Gandhi on the other hand, was right in his own way to dissuade the revolutionaries from adopting violent means to achieve the end because he had an unshakable faith that freedom won through violence could never be permanent.

At the same time, it must be remembered that the short period of two years when Gandhi and the revolutionaries cooperated with each other during the non-cooperation days was a period, generally devoid of violence. Since both the streams of thought had something positive to contribute towards the establishment of an improved social and political order, their coming together later too could have prevented the violence one witnessed in the last stages of the Indian Freedom Struggle and also the generally prevalent violent conditions of the modern Indian Society.