APPENDICES
QUESTIONNAIRE PRESENTED TO THE REVOLUTIONARIES
AT THE TIME OF THE INTERVIEW.

1. Could you tell me the extent of your role and contribution in the freedom movement?

2. How do you view the revolutionary movement? What is the meaning of the word 'revolution'? Who, in the real sense is a revolutionary? Can you tell the differences between a terrorist revolutionary and a national revolutionary?

3. Who first suggested this course to you? What were the circumstances at that time? What was your response?

4. Did you know about Gandhiji at that time? Were you impressed by his work and personality? Did you ever think of joining him, or be a distant follower? If so, what influenced your decision? Did you ever show your appreciation or criticism of Gandhi or his movement through letters or in any other way?

5. Whenever a revolutionary was hanged by the British Government, what exactly was the reaction of:

   (i) the media—all kinds of publication,
   (ii) the congressmen,
   (iii) Gandhiji,
   (iv) other revolutionaries, and
   (v) masses.

6. Were you considered a criminal by the people? If so, did you agree with them? If you did not agree, did you try to correct that impression?

7. Do you feel that you were right in your violent ways? Do you favour violent methods in the present context?

8. What does the word non-violence mean? Will you follow it in today's world? Will it be effective?

9. Was the attainment of Independence totally due to Gandhiji's efforts or was it mainly because of the revolutionaries?

10. Was Gandhiji always right? Even when he termed the revolutionaries as anarchists or he purposely ignored their activities?
11. Do you think Gandhiji's influence on the people was more than that of the revolutionaries - or do you think people were attracted by both the camps?

12. (i) Do you think Gandhiji did not want revolutionaries to do well? Or be popular or become a big success? Or influence people more?

(ii) Had Gandhiji fully supported the revolutionaries, what would have been the result?

13. Did Gandhiji succeed in suppressing your movement? Or diluting it? Or discouraging you from continuing with it? If so, how?

14. Do you think Gandhiji himself was a revolutionary? If so in what way?

15. Do you think your means were correct? What is more important - Ends or means, and why? Should means be as noble as the end? If so, why did you not care for it at that time?

16. What according to you were the different trends amongst the revolutionaries?

17. What do you think was the motive of the Revolutionary movement? Was it national in character? Was it a mass movement? Did it have the mandate of the people?

18. Did you and your colleagues care for what Gandhiji thought of you? How did you respond? Was he able to influence any revolutionary? If so, whom and how? Were you influenced at all?

19. In your view, was Gandhiji non-violent in reality? Or was he only using it as mere a political weapon or strategy? Do you think your philosophy of violence for a good cause was better? Do you still feel that your philosophy was better than Gandhi’s?
A correspondent, who has given his name but not his address, has sent me what he calls "an open letter." ... The letter breathes love of the country, fervour and a spirit of self-sacrifice ...

"I think it my duty to remind you of the promise you made some time back that you would retire from the political field at the time when the revolutionaries will once more emerge from their silence and enter into the Indian political arena ..... 

 Practically the whole nation responded to your call (in 1920). We can safely say that the response was phenomenal if not miraculous... "In fact, your programme failed for no fault of the Indians ...To say that non-violent non-cooperation failed because the people were not sufficiently non-violent is to argue like a lawyer and not like a prophet ... I would like to say that they (the people) were non-violent to a degree which smelt of cowardice...

"Non-violent Non-cooperation movement failed ... because the movement was lacking in a worthy ideal. The ideal that you preached was not in keeping with Indian culture and traditions. It savoured of imitation. Your
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philosophy of non-violence,... was a philosophy arising out of despair .... It was an imperfect physical mixture of Tolstoyism and Buddhism and not a chemical mixture of East and West ... The non-violence that India preaches is not non-violence for the sake of non-violence, but non-violence for the good of humanity, and when this good for humanity will demand violence and bloodshed. India will not hesitate to shed blood ...

"It is simply inconceivable and incomprehensible to think that you still dare to entertain the slightest hope that England can be just and generous out of her free will ... A sovereign independent Indian Republic in alliance or in federation with the other independent nations of the earth is one thing, and selfgoverning India within this imperialistic British Empire is perfectly another thing ...

The Indian revolutionaries request you to retire from the political field or else to direct the political movement in a way so that it may be a help and not a hindrance to the Revolutionary movement. They suspended their activities so long simply to comply to your requests ... They actually helped you in the carrying out of your programme to the best of their abilities. But now the experiment is over and therefore, the revolutionaries are free from their promise...

Can you deny that the Bengal partition was annulled through the efforts of the Bengal revolutionaries? Can you
doubt that the Morley-Minto reform was the outcome of the Indian Revolutionary movement which was mainly though not wholly instrumental in bringing about the Montford reform?...

Indians were miserably afraid of death and this revolutionary party once more made the Indians realise the grandeur and the beauty that lie in dying for a noble cause...

"You have said to the revolutionaries, "you may not care for your own lives, but you dare not disregard those of your countrymen who have no desire to die a martyr’s death." But the revolutionaries are at a sad loss to understand the meaning of this sentence ... The revolutionaries have perhaps a better knowledge of the mass psychology than most of the present leaders. And this was the reason that they never wanted to deal with the masses until they become sure of their own strength ... It was you and your lieutenants who misjudged the sentiments of the masses and dragged them into the satyagraha movement ...

"Lastly, I would like to say something about the remarks you have made in connection with the strength of the British empire ... If the English can be well-armed and well-organised why cannot the Indians be better armed and better organised still - Indians who are saturated with the high principles of spirituality ... ? And the spirit of non-
violence that arise out of this sense of helplessness and despair can never be the non-violence of the strong ...

"Excuse me Mahatmaji, if I am severe in criticising your philosophy and principles ... You preach tolerance but you have been violently intolerant in your criticisms of the revolutionaries. The revolutionaries have risked their everything to serve their motherland, and if you cannot help them, at least be not intolerant towards them."

* * *

I never made any promise to anybody as to when and how I should retire from the political life of the country. But I did say and now repeat that I would certainly retire if I find that India does not imbibe my message and that India wants a bloody revolution ...

I do believe that there was a wonderful response to the call of non-cooperation ... But I must reiterate my opinion that the observance of non-violence was far below the required standard.

I do not believe that "my philosophy" is an indifferent mixture of Tolstoy and Buddha. I do not know what it is except that it is what I feel to be true. It sustains me. I owe much to Tolstoy and much to Buddha ...

Let the philosophy I represent be tested on its own merits. I hold that the world is sick of armed rebellions ...

The non-violence I teach is active non-violence of the
strongest. But the weakest can partake in it without becoming weaker ...

I do not deny the revolutionary's the heroism and sacrifice. But heroism and sacrifice in a bad cause are so much waste of splendid energy and hurt the good cause by drawing away attention from it by the glamour of the heroism and sacrifice in a bad cause ....

I invite the attention of the revolutionaries to the three great hindrances to swaraj - the incomplete spread of the spinning-wheel, the discord between Hindu and Mussalmans and the inhuman ban upon the supressed classes. I ask them patiently to take their due share in this work of patient construction ...

All criticism is not intolerance. I have criticised the revolutionary because I have felt for him. He has the same right to hold me to be in error as I believe him to be in error.

There are other points that are covered by the "open letter." But I have omitted to refer to them because I think that they can be easily answered by the reader and in no case do they touch the vital issue.
The revolutionary whom I endeavoured to answer some time ago has returned to the charge and challenges me to answer certain questions that arise out of my previous answers to him. I gladly do so. He seems to me to be seeking light even as I am and argues fairly and without much passion... His first question is:

"Do you really believe that the revolutionaries of India are less sacrificing, less noble or less lovers of their country than the swarajists, moderates and the nationalists?... You are ready to make compromises with other parties, while you abhor our party and describe the sentiments as poison...

I do not regard the revolutionaries of India to be less sacrificing, less noble or less lovers of their country than the rest. But I respectfully contend that their sacrifice, nobility and love are not only a waste of effort, but being ignorant and misguided, do and have done more harm to the country than any other activity. For, the revolutionaries have retarded the progress of the country...

It is my certain conviction that had the Chauri Chaura...
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murders not taken place the movement attempted at Bardoli would have resulted in the establishment of swaraj. Is it, therefore, any wonder that with such opinion I call the revolutionary a misguided and dangerous nurse ... I do make certain compromises with the other parties because, though I disagree with them, I do not regard their activities as positively harmful and dangerous as I regard the revolutionaries ... There is no necessary charm about death on the gallows. Often such death is easier than a life of drudgery and toil in malarious tracts ... I suggest to my friend the revolutionary that death on the gallows serves the country only when the victim is a "spotless lamb."

* * *

"India's path is not Europe's". Do you really believe it? Do you mean to say that warfare and organisation of army was not in existence in India, before she came in contact with Europe? Warfare for fair cause - Is it against the spirit of India? ...

* * *

I do not deny that India had armies, warfare etc., before she came in contact with Europe. But I do say that it never was the normal course of Indian life. The masses unlike those of Europe were untouched by the warlike spirit ... I must be pardoned if I refuse to regard every revolutionary as an all-knowing god or an avtar. I do not
condemn everything European. But I condemn for all climes and
for all times secret murders and unfair methods even for a
fair cause.

"India is not Calcutta and Bombay." May I most
respectfully put it before your Mahatmaship that the
revolutionaries know the geography of India enough to be able
to know this geographical fact easily. We hold this fact as
much as we hold that a few spinners do not form the Indian
nation ...

If the revolutionaries knew the organic difference
between these, (cities and villages) they would, like me,
become spinners. I own that the few spinners we have do not
make India. But I claim that it is possible to make all
India spin as it did before, ... millions are even now in
sympathy with the movement, but they never will be with the
revolutionary. I dispute the claim that the revolutionaries
are succeeding with the villagers ... Cowardice, whether
philosophical or otherwise, I abhor. And if I could be
persuaded that revolutionary activity has dispelled
cowardice, it will go a long way to soften my abhorrence of
the method, however much I may still oppose it on principle
... I admit that non-violence is a weapon essentially of the
strong. I also admit that often cowardice is mistaken for
non-violence.
My friend begs the question when he says a revolutionary is one who "does the good and dies." That is precisely what I question. In my opinion he does the evil and dies. I do not regard killing or assassination or terrorism as good in any circumstances whatsoever ... And if the one who dies on the gallows is not innocent of another's blood, he never had ideas that deserved to ripen.

* * *

"One of your objections against the revolutionaries is that their movement is not mass movement, consequently the mass at large will be very little benefited by the revolution, for which we are preparing ... It is true that we will not drag the mass just now in the field of action, because we know that it is weak, but when the preparation is complete we shall call them in the open field ... 

* * *

I neither say nor imply that the revolutionary benefits if the masses do not. On the contrary, and as a rule, the revolutionary never benefits in the ordinary sense of the word ... It sounds very pleasant and exciting to talk of "the descendants of Shivaji, Ranjit, Pratap and Gobind Singh." But is it true? Are we all descendants of these heroes in the sense in which the writer understands it? We are their countrymen ...
"Last of all, I shall ask you to answer these questions: Was Guru Gobind Singh a misguided patriot because he believed in warfare for noble cause? What will you like to say about Washington, Garibaldi and Lenin? What do you think of Kamal Pasha and De Valera? Would you like to call Shivaji and Pratap, well meaning and sacrificing physicians who prescribed arsenic when they should have given fresh grape-juice? Will you like to call Krishna Europeanised because he believed also in the vinasha of dushkritis?

* * *

This is a hard or rather awkward question. But I dare not shirk it. In the first instance Guru Gobind Singh and the others whose names are mentioned did not believe in secret murder. In the second, these patriots knew their work and their men, whereas the modern Indian revolutionary does not know his work... Kamal Pasha and De Valera too I cannot judge. But for me as a believer in non-violence out and out, they cannot be my guides in life in so far as their faith in war is concerned... I have not the qualifications for teaching my philosophy of life.... The revolutionaries are at liberty to reject the whole of my philosophy. To them I merely present my own experience as a co-worker in the same cause... India is not like Turkey or Ireland or Russia and that revolutionary activity is suicidal at this stage of the country's life...
My revolutionary friend has returned to the charge, but I must tell him that he has not been as patient with his composition as before. He has introduced in his letter under discussion much irrelevant matter and has argued loosely ... I am anxious to keep in touch with the revolutionary and I can only do so through these columns. I have a soft corner for him in my heart for there is one thing in common between him and me - the ability to suffer ...

My revolutionary friend’s first question is

"The revolutionaries have retarded the progress of the country." Do you differ with your own view, when you wrote in connection with the Bengal partitions ... The movement which followed the partition was the revolutionary movement, and the best sons of India you speak of are mostly revolutionaries or semirevolutionaries... Would you be so intolerant as to call the revolutionaries ignorant, because they cannot understand your peculiar dogma of non-violence."

There is no difference between the view expressed in Indian Home Rule and the views now expressed by me. Those who led the partition movement, whatever and whoever they were undoubtedly shed the fear of Englishmen. That was a distinct service to the country. But bravery and selfsacrifice need
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not kill ... I do not call the revolutionary ignorant, merely because he does not understand or appreciate my method, but because he does not even appear to me to understand the art of warfare ...

The second question is:

"Was Terence MacSwiney a "spotless lamb" when he died of hunger-strike of 71 days? Please remember that he was to the last an advocate of conspiracy, bloodshed and terrorism ..."

I am sorry to say I do not know enough of the life on MacSwiney to be able to give an opinion. But if he advocated "conspiracy, bloodshed and terrorism" his method was open to the same objections that have been advanced in these pages. I never regarded him as a "spotless lamb." I gave my humble opinion when his fast was declared, that from my standpoint it was an error. I do not justify every fast.

"Along with it I shall ask you the following questions, which directly arise from your statement. In your swarajya is there any place for soldiers? Will your swarajya government keep armies? If so will they fight - I mean use physical force, when necessary, or will they offer satyagraha against their opponents?"

I have room in my philosophy of life for Kshatriyas. But my definition of him I take from the Gita. He who does not run away from battle, i.e. danger is, Kshatriya ...
I heartily endorse, however, the statement that he alone is truly non-violent who remains non-violent even though he has the ability to strike. I do therefore claim that my disciple (I have only one and that is myself) is quite capable of striking, very indifferently and perhaps ineffectively I admit; but he has no desire to do so.

Alas! In my swaraj of today there is room for soldiers... I have not the capacity for preaching universal non-violence to the country. I preach therefore non-violence restricted strictly to the purpose of winning our freedom... I must be wholly free from passions. I must be wholly incapable of sin. Let the revolutionary pray with and for me that I may soon become that. But meanwhile let him take with me the one step to it which I see as clearly as day light, i.e. to win India's freedom with strictly non-violent means...
TEXT OF MAHENDRA PARTAP’S LETTER - DESTROY ALL HIMSA*

( Raja Mahendra Partap is a great patriot ... Raja Saheb often corresponded with me. And I have with held from publication communications from him. But the latest received from him I have not the heart to withhold ... M. K. G. )

"I assert that I am a true follower of ahimsa. But it needs an explanation of this word to clear my position ... "Ahimsa, as I understand it, is ‘not to give pain to anybody in mind or body by one’s thought, talk or action’... A follower of ahimsa has to change all those conditions under which himsa is practised or becomes possible. I call it worst kind of himsa opposite of ahimsa when a man tolerates or aids himsa of others ..."

"Of course, no one can deny that our great leader Gandhiji has a very sincere desire to serve the Indian nation. However, I am afraid that his methods alone, unsupported by some more energetic active programmes, cannot bring relief to the people.

"I highly appreciate and strongly endorse the Khadi movement of Gandhiji. It may or may not appreciably better the economic condition of the masses ...

"I must, however, add that we need much more. We have to destroy in the true spirit of ahimsa all that British organisation which is himsa personified ...
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THE CULT OF THE BOMB

There is so much violence in the atmosphere immediately surrounding us, politically minded part of India, that a bomb thrown here and a bomb thrown there causes little perturbation ... If I did not know that this violence was like froth coming to the surface in an agitated liquid, I should probably despair of non-violence succeeding in the near future ... I have a certain belief ... that the vast masses who have become conscious of the fact that they must have freedom are untouched by the spirit of violence ... It is because of my increasing faith in the efficacy of non-violence in political warfare and the possibility of its being practised by masses of people that I propose to reason with those who may not be so much saturated with violence as to be beyond the pale of reason ...

Take again the net result of political violence practised in this country. Every time violence has occurred we have lost heavily, that is to say, military expenditure has risen ... If we would only realise that it is not by terrorising the foreigner that we shall gain freedom, but by ourselves shedding fear and teaching the villager to shed his own fear that we shall gain true freedom, we would at once perceive that violence is suicidal.
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Then consider its reaction on ourselves. From violence done to the foreign ruler, violence to our own people whom we may consider to be obstructing the country’s progress is an easy natural step ...

But in the duel between forces of violence and non-violence the latter have always come out victorious in the end ... We are now entering upon a new era. Our immediate objective and not our distant goal is complete independence. ... We can establish independence only by adjusting our differences through an appeal to the head and heart, by evolving organic unity amongst ourselves, not by terrorising or killing those who, we fancy, may impede our march, but by patient and gentle handling, by converting the opponent, we want to offer mass civil disobedience..... Let those who are not past reason then cease either secretly or openly to endorse activities such as this latest bomb outrage. Rather let them openly and heartily condemn these outrages, so that our deluded patriots may for want of nourishment to their violent spirit realise the futility of violence and the great harm that violent activity has every time done.
THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE BOMB*

Recent events ... clearly show that the Indian National Congress, in conjunction with Gandhi, has launched a crusade against the revolutionaries ... It is a pity that they have all along been, either deliberately or due to sheer ignorance, misrepresented and misunderstood. The revolutionaries do not shun criticism and public scrutiny of their ideals, or actions ... It is hoped that this article will help the general public to know the revolutionaries as they are and will prevent it from taking them for what interested and ignorant persons would have it believe them to be.

Violence or non-violence.

Let us, first of all, take up the question of violence and non-violence. We think that the use of these terms, in itself, is a grave injustice to either party for they express the ideals of neither of them correctly. Violence is physical force applied for committing injustice, and that is certainly not what the revolutionaries stand for. On the other hand, what generally goes by the name of non-violence is in reality the theory of soul-force, as applied to the attainment of personal and national rights through courting suffering and hoping thus to finally convert your opponents to your point of view ... The question really,
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therefore, is not whether you will have violence or non-violence, but whether you will have soul-force plus physical force or soul-force alone.

Our Ideal.

The revolutionaries believe that the deliverance of their country will come through Revolution. The Revolution, ... will not only express itself in the form of an armed conflict ... it will also usher in a New Social Order ... Above all, it will establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat ...

The Congress and the Revolutionaries.

Meanwhile, what has the Congress been doing? ... The first offensive of the Congress came in the form of a resolution deploring the attempt made on the 23rd December 1929, to blow up the Viceroy's Special. It was drafted by Gandhi and ... was passed by a trifling majority of 81 in a house of 1,713 ... Inspite of the fact, that the Congress is pledged to non-violence and has been actively engaged in carrying on propaganda in its favour for the last ten years, and, inspite of the fact also, called the revolutionaries "cowards" and described their actions as "dastardly" ... the resolution could only be adopted by a dangerously narrow majority. That demonstrates, beyond the shadow of doubt, how solidly the country is backing the revolutionaries. In a way Gandhi deserved our thanks for having brought the question up
for discussion and thus having shown to the world at large that even the Congress - that stronghold of non-violence - is at least as much, if nor more, with the revolutionaries than with him ...

**Do the Masses believe in Non-Violence?**

He thinks that ... the large masses of Indian Humanity are yet untouched by the spirit of violence and that non-violence has come to stay as a political weapon. Let him not delude himself on the experiences of his latest tour in the country ... The way of the world is like this. You have a friend: you love him, sometimes so much that you even die for him. You have an enemy, you shun him, you fight against him and if possible, kill him. The gospel of the revolutionaries is simple and straight ...

**The Gospel of Love.**

Gandhi declares that his faith in the efficacy of non-violence has increased. That is to say, he believes more and more, that through his gospel of love and self-imposed suffering, he hopes someday to convert the foreign rulers to his way of thinking ... How many O’Dwyers, Dyers, Readings and Irwins has he been able to convert into friends of India? ...

**The Future of the Congress.**

There might be those who have no regard for the Congress and hope nothing from it. Gandhi thinks that the
revolutionaries belong to that category, he wrongs them grievously. They fully realise the part played by the Congress in awakening, among the ignorant masses, a keen desire for freedom. They expect great things of it in the future ... This year it (Congress) has accepted the ideal which the revolutionaries have preached and lived upto for more than a quarter of a century. Let us hope the next year will see it endorse their methods also.

**Violence and Military Expenditure.**

Gandhi is of opinion that as often as violence has been practised in the country, it has resulted in an increase of military expenditure ... Mass action, whether violent or non-violent, whether successful or unsuccessful, is bound to produce the same kind of repercussions on the finances of a state.

**The Reforms.**

Why should Gandhi mix up the revolutionaries with the various constitutional reforms granted by the government? They never cared or worked for the Morley-Minto Reforms, Montagu Reforms and the like ... The revolutionaries never claim the Reforms as their achievements ...

**Failure of Non-cooperation.**

Gandhi is of opinion that the great awakening in the people, during the days of non-cooperation, was a result of the preaching of non-violence. It is wrong to assign to non-
violence the widespread awakening of the masses which, in fact, is manifested where ever a programme of direct action is adopted ... It is claimed that non-violence can be used as a weapon for righting political wrongs. To say the least, it is a novel idea, yet untried.

Is it a new Era?
We are entering upon a new era' thinks Gandhi. The mere act of defining swaraj as Complete Independence, this technical change in the Congress constitution, can hardly constitute a new era ...

No Bullying please.
Gandhi has called upon all those who are not past reason to withdraw their support from the revolutionaries and condemn their actions ... How easy and convenient it is to call upon the public to withdraw its support and condemn them so that they may get isolated and be forced to suspend their activities ... To think, that a revolutionary will give up his ideals if public support and appreciation is withdrawn from him, is the highest folly ... If you will have the revolutionaries suspend their activities, reason with them squarely. That is the one and the only way ...

Long live revolution!
Kartar Singh,
President, HSRA.
Dear Mahatmaji Maharaj,

A certain Mr. Sohan Singh who came here year before last and who is now actively supporting one of the Communist parties of Japan, is giving out to the public here that he is a great disciple of you and has regular correspondence with you. None of the 200 Indian residents of Japan knows this gentleman’s antecedents. Will you kindly let me know whether you know him and have regular correspondence with him.

With pranams,

Yours respectfully,

(Rash Behari Bose)
Hon’ble Comrade Gandhi,

Apostle of non-violence! We know not how to address you. Comrade thou art though not a comrade in arms. We read ... your remarks on violence and lack of organising power of Revolutionary Societies in your last ultimatum to H. E. The Lord Irwin.

We assure you sir, we retreat from the field of glory and henceforth we shall devote our best energies to discipline and organising strength of Revolutionary Societies all over the country for full three years ... if by that time your non-violence fails, we shall be at liberty to declare a Civil War on the 12th March 1933 ...

We appeal to the Young Revolutionary last, ... to suspend all their activities so as to give another chance to Gandhism ...

We are sir your

Comrades,

Delhi

11th March, 1930.

Members of the Executive Council of R.L.R. Represented, through Secretary Colonel Bedy.
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LETTER FROM SUKHDEV*

Most Gracious Mahatmaji,

Recent reports show that since the successful termination of your peace negotiations you have made several public appeals to the revolutionary workers to call off their movement at least for the present and to give you a last chance to try your non-violent cult. As a matter of fact, the calling off of any movement is neither an ideological nor a sentimental act. It is the consideration of the peculiar needs of different times that force the leaders to change their tactics.

Let us presume that at the time of peace parley, you did not overlook the fact ... that this was not going to be the final settlement .... In face of that (Lahore) Resolution, the peace and compromise is but a temporary truce which only means a little rest to organize better forces on a larger scale ...

As regards the proper opportunity and the conditions on which any truce can be affected, it rests with the leaders of the movement to decide ... Similarly, as is evident from the very name - Hindustan Socialist Republican party - the revolutionaries stand for the establishment of the Socialist Republic ... They are bound to carry on the struggle till their goal is achieved and their ideal is consummated ...

*. Young India, April 23, 1931
Since your compromise you have called off your movement and consequently all of your prisoners have been released. But what about the revolutionaries prisoners? ... More than half a dozen prisoners are actually waiting for their execution. What about all of these people? The three Lahore conspiracy case condemned prisoners, who have luckily come into prominence and who have acquired enormous public sympathy, do not form the bulk of the revolutionary party ... As a matter of fact their executions are expected to do greater good than the commutation of their sentences.

But in spite of all this, you are making public appeals asking them to call off their movement. Why should they do so? You have not mentioned any definite thing ...

The present policy of the Government towards them is to deprive them of the sympathy and support of the masses which they have won in their movement, and then crush them ... Therefore we request you either to talk to some revolutionary leaders - they are so many in jails - and come to terms with them or to stop these appeals ...

Or if you seriously mean to help them, then have a talk with them to understand their point of view, and discuss the problem in detail.

Hope you will kindly consider the above request and let your view be known publicly.

Yours,
One of the many,
The open letter written by "One of the Many" is the late Sukhdev's letter ... The writer is not "One of the Many". Many do not seek the gallows, for political freedom. However condemnable political murder may be, it is not possible to withhold recognition of the love of the country and the courage which inspire such awful deeds ... 

The writer does me less than justice when he says that I have made no more than sentimental appeals to the revolutionaries to call off their movement, and I claim on the contrary that I have given them hard facts ...

The writer further objects to my making public appeals to the party and suggests that thereby I help the bureaucracy ... the bureaucracy ... scents more danger from the non-violent movement than from the violent. It knows how to deal with the latter. It is baffled by the former ...

And seeing that the revolutionary party must work in secret, I have no other way open to me but that of making public appeals to its unknown members ...

The open letter complains that prisoners other than satyagrahis have not been released ... I can only give the assurance ... that the delay is due not to want of will but to want of ability ... when the final settlement comes ... all political prisoners must be discharged ...
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My dear Mahatmai,

I am glad you have remembered me at last. But I am afraid the psychological moment in Bengal is past to some extent. In politics you have to strike when the iron is hot as delay sets unforeseen forces at work and creates new and difficult situations.

In matters social I am a revolutionist and believe in an upheaval which can release latent and rigid forces and set them free for new creations. We need a new India standing unshackled of the old sanskaras free at last to dream of the future and dare to create like gods.

A man of faith and vision is needed who can go out to the young men of India and tell them the truth straight away. They must be made to feel that India is waking up, not for her own political independence alone but for deliverance of men from bondage created by human tyranny in the name of religion, society and state. These three and all the other spheres of life spell for her own spiritual movement of integral life which alone can do away with all these warring creeds and dogmas and heal humanity.

This great work has to begin soon. We have to do away with all the accretions of the past, such as caste, untouchability, narrow and selfishly aggressive nationalism,

egoistic creeds in the name of dharma and hatred of m. based on colour or pride of race and civilisation. For this we shall need an army of workers free from all political and racial bias, daring beyond measure who will bring a new wave big enough to wash away all landmarks and give man a new start. Whatever is true in all that is old cannot die; it will come back in new form and then only it will be effective. However truth becomes dynamic only when it can renew and recreate itself in the spirit of the age.

The West is already at our door clamouring for admission with her rajasic and imperfect half-truths and ideals like Socialism, Communism and so on. The visions of our young people is easily coloured and their imagination captured by those because they have not been helped to glimpse, the full stature of man, reading which, he becomes the image of God.

I wish to take up this work and come in personal touch with the young people all over India. Please help me to get somebody who will help me with money for my tour.

My paper "Bijali" is discontinued for the present for want of funds. I am a paper-examiner in the Calcutta University and am going to accept extra lecturership for my manitainance. I believe you know I am Aurobindo's youngest brother.

Yours Sincerely,
(Barindra Kumar Ghose)