

PASSIVE PHASE (1922-27)

BACKGROUND : 1922 - NCM WITHDRAWN. 1922-24: MG in JAIL

1923 Elections Scheduled to CCA

All INC leaders Agreed to CDM

BUT Differences on ALTERNATIVE Course

∴ WITHIN INC, 2 GROUPS EMERGED - SWARAJISTS &

NO CHANGERS (*Ders)

PRO Ders / SWARAJISTS : AT GAYA 1922 - PROPOSED PROG OF ENDING
OR MENDING the Councils

(CR DAS, ML NEHRU
LAJPAT RAI, MM MALVIYA)

JUSTIFICATION :-

- # DO PROPAGANDA in Councils + Fill empty NEWSPAPERS
which will Fill POLITICAL void
- # We wont use Councils For DEMANDING
GRADUAL REFORMS BUT FOR POLITICAL STRUGGLE
- # Even WITHOUT INC, 1923 Elections will happen +
non INC forces will enter Councils which will
weaken INC
- # IF PPL vote in good numbers then loss of FACE
for INC.
- ① Br will claim success of 1919 REFORMS

No Ders : MG Supporters like PATEL, RAJENDRA PRASAD &

C RAJA GOPALA CHARJI i.e. those who still supported

Council Boycott & Constructive work of NCM

Council Entry will → to • Neglect of Constructive work
(important to prevent another CHAURI
CHAURA)

• LOSS OF REVOLUTIONARY ZEAL

• POLITICAL CORRUPTION

∴ Continue Non COOPERATION & BOYCOTT & CONSTRUCTIVE WORK
& WAIT FOR RELAUNCH OF CDM

This led to

Failure of "End or mend councils" Resolution at GAYA Session 1922

AFTER ↓ WHICH

Resignation by SWARAJISTS FROM "OFFICIAL POSTS" OF INC (not INC)

↓

SWARAJISTS FORMED CONG KHILAFAT SWARAJ PARTY & PARTICIPATED
in 1923 elections

Soln : MG : OPPOSED Council Entry BUT COMPROMISED

By Himanshu Khatri

AVOIDED SURAT SPLIT : How? What was different from 1907

(a) ALL ACCEPTED MG LEADERSHIP \therefore LEARNED FROM SURAT SPLIT THAT UNITY IMPORTANT.

(b) MG STYLE: TRUST & RESPECT TO SWARAJISTS EVEN WHEN ANTI SWARAJISTS

(c) MG PREVENTED BR DIVIDE & RULE SUCCESS BY SUPPORTING SWARAJISTS POST GOVT REPRESSION
C> BENGAL SWARAJISTS IN NAME OF FIGHTING TERROR.

(d) BY 1924 WHEN MG RELEASED, COUNCIL ENTRY ALREADY DONE & WITHDRAWING NOW OF NO USE.

(f)

MG PRAISED SWARAJISTS FOR THEIR GOOD WORK IN COUNCILS.

@ Councils : SWARAJISTS IN CLA :

M NEHRU DEMANDED NEW CONSTITUTION IN 1ST SESSION ITSELF

(GOI ACT 1919 HAD PROVISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW AFTER 10YRS
i.e. 1929)

DEMANDED CIVIL LIBERTY VIA REPEAL OF REPRESSIVE LAWS

DEMANDED CONCESSIONS FOR INDIAN INDUSTRY

\therefore DID GREAT WORK IN COUNCILS & FILLED POLITICAL VOID

WORK in The Streets & Relied ONLY on
NEWSPAPERS.

(b) CR DAS Died in 1925. This WAS a Blow to
SWARAJISTS.

(c) LOST SUPPORT OF ML \therefore DIDNT SUPPORT
MUSLIM TENANTS CAUSE in BENGAL

(d) RIOTS in 1924 \rightarrow to Division on Communal
Lines in Council

Post Riots, **Responsivists** within SWARAJ PARTY WANTED
to support Govt & were \leftrightarrow END OR MEND ATTITUDE
 \leftrightarrow OBSTRUCTING COUNCILS

\therefore WANTED Br SUPPORT FOR PROTECTION OF HINDU INTERESTS
E.G. RAJPARNAI & MALVIYA

WERE SEAT HUNGRY i.e. HOLD POSTS WHEREVER POSSIBLE

E.G. N.C. KELKAR, JAYAKAR - joined Executive Council
in CENTRAL PROVINCES



**SWARAJISTS Response to Responsivists & other -ves of
Council ENTRY:**

REITERATED SUPPORT TO MASS CDM

(+) INC DECIDED TO WITHDRAW FROM COUNCILS in 1926

(* ALL WITHDREW in 1930 AFTER LAHORE CONGRESS RESOLUTION
OF 1929 FOR PURNA SWARAJ)

types of Constructive Work:

- ① WORK TO PARTY CADRE during Politically inactive phase OF 1922-27.
- ② Boosted Unity among community as Upper castes of URBAN AREAS BECAME AWARE OF PROBLEMS OF LOWER OF RURAL AREAS ∴ BRIDGED RURAL - URBAN divide
- ③ Ped INC HOLD in RURAL AREAS (+) CONSTRUCTIVE WORK BECAME MAJOR RECRUITMENT TOOL FOR INC
- ④ CONFIDENCE OF MASSES Ped as FOUND HOPE in INC, FOR THEIR GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL
- ⑤ Non Colonial EDUCATION to masses via SWADESHI EDUCATION Ped NATIONALISM.

1922-27 : PASSIVE PHASE

Announcement OF SIMON Commission (1927) REKINDLED INM.

Only for nagendrarajput9753@gmail.com