



NON-COOPERATION MOVEMENT: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

Mr. Bhosale S. N.
Assistant Professor
Head, Department Of Economics

ABSTRACT

The Non-Cooperation Movement (1920–1922) was a major phase of the Indian national movement under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. It emerged from growing dissatisfaction with British colonial rule, particularly following the Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre of 1919, and the political concerns associated with the Khilafat question. In 1920, the Indian National Congress adopted the programme of non-cooperation, encouraging the boycott of government institutions, educational institutions, courts, foreign goods, and official honours, while promoting Swadeshi and Khadi. The present study examines the major causes, objectives, methods, development, and consequences of the movement. It focuses on Gandhi's strategy of non-violent resistance and the participation of different sections of Indian society. The movement expanded nationalist political activity beyond established political circles and contributed to wider public participation in the freedom struggle. Evidence from different regions shows participation in boycotts, public meetings, Khadi promotion, picketing, and local campaigns.



The study also examines the limitations and eventual suspension of the movement. The Chauri Chaura incident of February 1922, in which a police station was set on fire and policemen were killed, led Gandhi to withdraw the movement because of his commitment to non-violence. The study concludes that the Non-Cooperation Movement marked an important transformation in the character of Indian nationalism by expanding mass political participation and strengthening the use of organized non-violent resistance. Although it did not achieve immediate independence and was withdrawn before its stated political objectives were realized, it had significant consequences for the growth of nationalist consciousness, political organization, and subsequent phases of the Indian freedom struggle.

KEYWORDS: *Non-Cooperation Movement, Mahatma Gandhi, Indian National Movement, British Colonial Rule, Rowlatt Act, Jallianwala Bagh Massacre, Khilafat Movement, Satyagraha, Non-Violence, Boycott.*

INTRODUCTION

The Non-Cooperation Movement (1920–1922) was an important phase in the history of the Indian national movement and marked a significant expansion of mass participation in the struggle against British colonial rule. Led by Mahatma Gandhi and supported by the Indian National Congress, the movement was

based on the principle that colonial rule depended partly on the cooperation of the people. Gandhi therefore advocated the peaceful withdrawal of cooperation from colonial institutions and promoted non-violent resistance. The movement developed in the context of widespread political dissatisfaction after the First World War. The Rowlatt Act of 1919, which extended extraordinary powers to the colonial government, generated strong opposition. The Jallianwala Bagh massacre of 13 April 1919, in which British Indian troops under General Reginald Dyer fired on a gathering in Amritsar, further deepened public resentment toward colonial rule. At the same time, the Khilafat issue created an opportunity for cooperation between sections of the Indian nationalist movement and Muslim political leadership.

In 1920, Gandhi proposed a programme of non-cooperation that included the surrender of titles and honours, boycott of government institutions, withdrawal from colonial educational institutions and courts, and promotion of indigenous goods. The Congress adopted the programme and sought to organize political participation on a wider social scale. The movement encouraged the use of Swadeshi and Khadi and emphasized self-discipline and non-violent political action. The Non-Cooperation Movement attracted participation from different sections of society, including students, lawyers, traders, peasants, workers, and women, although the extent and character of participation varied across regions. Boycotts, public meetings, demonstrations, picketing, and the promotion of indigenous products became important features of the movement. Regional and local grievances were often connected with the wider nationalist programme.

Despite its expansion, the movement faced important challenges. The level of participation differed from one area to another, and some local actions developed in ways that did not always correspond with Gandhi's emphasis on strict non-violence. The Chauri Chaura incident of February 1922, in which protesters killed police personnel after a police station was set on fire, led Gandhi to withdraw the movement because of his commitment to non-violent methods. The Non-Cooperation Movement did not achieve immediate independence, but it had important political consequences. It broadened the social base of the national movement, strengthened nationalist consciousness, encouraged indigenous economic practices, and established mass non-cooperation as an important method of political resistance. The movement also provided organizational and political experience that influenced subsequent phases of India's struggle for independence.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

1. To examine the historical background and political circumstances that led to the Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920–1922.
2. To study the major causes of the movement, including the Rowlatt Act, Jallianwala Bagh massacre, Khilafat issue, and growing dissatisfaction with British colonial rule.
3. To examine Mahatma Gandhi's role in developing and leading the Non-Cooperation Movement.
4. To study the principles of non-cooperation, non-violence, Satyagraha, Swadeshi, and boycott associated with the movement.
5. To examine the programme adopted by the Indian National Congress and the methods used to organize the movement.
6. To analyse the participation of peasants, workers, students, women, traders, lawyers, and other sections of Indian society.
7. To study the regional variations in the implementation and experience of the Non-Cooperation Movement.
8. To examine the role of the Khilafat Movement and Hindu-Muslim political cooperation in the development of the movement.

9. To analyse the reasons for the withdrawal of the movement following the Chauri Chaura incident in February 1922.
10. To assess the political, social, economic, and organizational consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement and its significance in the subsequent Indian national movement.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920–1922 has been extensively studied by historians of modern India. Existing scholarship examines the movement from different perspectives, including nationalism, Gandhian politics, mass mobilization, regional participation, peasant movements, the Khilafat question, colonial repression, and the significance of the Chauri Chaura incident. These studies demonstrate that the movement was a complex historical process rather than a uniform nationwide campaign. Bipan Chandra and his collaborators, in *India's Struggle for Independence, 1857–1947*, examine the Non-Cooperation Movement within the broader development of Indian nationalism. Their analysis discusses the political circumstances leading to the movement, the role of Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress, the programme of boycott and non-cooperation, and the reasons for its withdrawal. The work is useful for understanding the movement as an important stage in the transformation of nationalist politics into a mass movement. Judith M. Brown, in *Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics 1915–1922*, examines Gandhi's emergence as a major political leader and the political developments leading to Non-Cooperation. Her study places the movement within the organizational and political changes taking place in the Indian National Congress and emphasizes the interaction between Gandhian leadership, Congress politics, and wider public participation.

David Hardiman's work on non-cooperation provides a detailed examination of the movement's regional and social dimensions. His scholarship demonstrates that the movement was experienced differently in different parts of India and that local grievances, economic conditions, and existing social conflicts influenced the forms of participation. His analysis helps to move beyond a purely national-level interpretation of the movement. Sumit Sarkar's *Modern India, 1885–1947* places the Non-Cooperation Movement within the longer history of Indian nationalism. Sarkar examines the political background of the movement, the relationship between Gandhian nationalism and popular action, the role of different social groups, and the limitations that affected the movement. His work is particularly useful for understanding the movement within the wider structural conditions of colonial India.

B. R. Nanda's writings on Mahatma Gandhi provide an important interpretation of the political ideas and strategies associated with Non-Cooperation. His work discusses Gandhi's emphasis on non-violence, non-cooperation, mass participation, and the relationship between political protest and moral discipline. These studies are valuable for examining the Gandhian framework underlying the movement. R. C. Majumdar's historical writings provide a broader account of the Indian national movement and offer a different interpretation of Gandhian politics. His work is useful for comparative historiographical analysis because it examines the achievements and limitations of the Non-Cooperation Movement while placing it within the wider history of Indian political developments.

Shahid Amin's *Event, Metaphor, Memory: Chauri Chaura, 1922–1992* provides a detailed micro-historical study of the Chauri Chaura incident. Amin examines the local circumstances surrounding the violence and the ways in which the incident was remembered and interpreted over time. The study is particularly important for understanding why Gandhi withdrew the movement and how national political decisions interacted with local social realities. Gyanendra Pandey's research on the rise of Congress politics in the United Provinces contributes to an understanding of regional participation in the Non-Cooperation Movement. His work demonstrates how Congress organization, local political leadership, and popular

mobilization developed in specific regional contexts. Such scholarship highlights the importance of studying the movement beyond its national leadership.

Studies of the Khilafat Movement and Hindu-Muslim political cooperation also provide an important perspective on Non-Cooperation. These works examine the political relationship between the Khilafat leadership and the Congress and explain how the issue contributed to the expansion of anti-colonial mobilization during the early 1920s. The literature on peasant and popular participation further shows that local communities sometimes interpreted the Non-Cooperation programme according to their own social and economic circumstances. Research on rural movements indicates that nationalist appeals could become connected with questions of rent, landlordism, labour conditions, caste relations, and local authority. This scholarship helps explain both the strength and the uneven character of the movement.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study on “Non-Cooperation Movement: Causes and Consequences” adopts a historical, descriptive, and analytical research methodology. The historical method is used to examine the political, social, economic, and ideological conditions that led to the emergence of the Non-Cooperation Movement between 1920 and 1922. The study also examines the development, organization, participation, withdrawal, and consequences of the movement within the broader context of the Indian national movement. The study is based on both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include speeches, letters, political resolutions, contemporary newspapers, government reports, Indian National Congress records, writings of Mahatma Gandhi, and other contemporary documents relating to the movement. Secondary sources include books, biographies, research articles, dissertations, historical studies, and scholarly interpretations of Indian nationalism, Gandhian politics, the Khilafat Movement, and mass mobilization.

A descriptive approach is used to document the major causes and important events associated with the movement. Particular attention is given to the Rowlatt Act, Jallianwala Bagh massacre, Khilafat issue, Non-Cooperation programme, boycott of colonial institutions, promotion of Swadeshi and Khadi, and the participation of different social groups. The study also examines the Chauri Chaura incident and the subsequent withdrawal of the movement. An analytical approach is employed to examine the political and social significance of the movement. The study analyses the role of Mahatma Gandhi, the Indian National Congress, Khilafat leaders, regional organizations, peasants, workers, students, women, traders, and other participating groups. Regional variations are considered wherever relevant to understand differences in the nature and extent of participation.

The study also uses thematic analysis to examine major themes such as non-cooperation, Satyagraha, non-violence, Swadeshi, nationalism, mass mobilization, Hindu-Muslim cooperation, colonial repression, and political consciousness. Primary and secondary sources are compared and critically interpreted to identify different historical perspectives and avoid relying on a single interpretation. The research is primarily qualitative and does not depend on statistical analysis. Historical interpretation, source criticism, comparative analysis, and contextual analysis are used to understand the causes and consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement. Through this methodology, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive account of the movement, its historical development, its limitations, and its significance in the subsequent course of the Indian national movement.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920–1922 represented an important phase in the Indian national movement against British colonial rule. It emerged at a time of growing political dissatisfaction

caused by colonial policies, the Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, and the Khilafat question. Under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and with the support of the Indian National Congress, the movement sought to challenge colonial authority through non-violent non-cooperation and the withdrawal of support from colonial institutions. The central problem of the present study is to examine the causes, development, and consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement and to understand its place in the wider history of Indian nationalism. The study seeks to identify the political, social, economic, and ideological conditions that contributed to the emergence of the movement and to analyse the objectives adopted by its leaders.

Another important aspect of the problem is to examine the methods used during the movement. The study focuses on boycott of government institutions, educational institutions, courts, foreign goods, and titles, along with the promotion of Swadeshi and Khadi. It also examines the role of Satyagraha and non-violence in shaping the movement and the ways in which these methods influenced political participation. The study further examines the participation of different sections of Indian society. Peasants, workers, students, lawyers, traders, women, and other groups participated in varying forms and degrees across different regions.

The movement was therefore not experienced uniformly throughout India, making regional and social variations an important part of the research problem. A major issue is the relationship between the national leadership and local forms of participation. In some areas, people connected the national programme with their own social and economic grievances. The study therefore examines how local conditions influenced the character of the movement and contributed to both its expansion and its limitations. The Chauri Chaura incident of February 1922 is another central element of the problem. The violent incident and Gandhi's decision to withdraw the movement raise important historical questions concerning the relationship between non-violence, mass mobilization, political strategy, and leadership. The study examines the circumstances surrounding the withdrawal and its immediate and longer-term consequences.

Finally, the study seeks to assess the broader consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement. Although the movement did not achieve immediate independence, it contributed to wider political participation, nationalist consciousness, organizational development, and subsequent phases of the freedom struggle. The present study therefore attempts to provide a comprehensive historical analysis of the causes, course, limitations, withdrawal, and consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement.

NEED OF STUDY

The study of "Non-Cooperation Movement: Causes and Consequences" is important for understanding a major phase in the development of the Indian national movement. The movement emerged in a context of growing opposition to British colonial rule, including dissatisfaction following the Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, and the Khilafat question. Examining these circumstances helps explain the political environment in which mass non-cooperation developed. The study is needed to understand the political ideas and methods associated with the movement, particularly Satyagraha, non-violence, boycott, Swadeshi, and Khadi. These methods represented an important change in the organization of nationalist protest and contributed to the expansion of political participation beyond established political groups. The study is also necessary to examine the role of Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress in organizing the movement. It helps explain how the Congress developed a wider programme of political mobilization and how the movement encouraged participation by students, lawyers, traders, peasants, workers, women, and other sections of society.

Another important need of the study is to understand the regional and social variations in the movement. The Non-Cooperation Movement did not develop in exactly the same manner throughout India. Local political conditions, economic grievances, social relations, and existing organizations influenced participation in different areas. Studying these variations provides a more complete understanding of the movement. The study is further needed to examine the relationship between the national programme and local grievances. In several regions, people connected the call for non-cooperation with their own concerns relating to rents, agricultural conditions, labour, social inequalities, and local authority. This aspect helps explain both the expansion of the movement and the challenges faced by its leaders. The Chauri Chaura incident and the withdrawal of the movement in 1922 also require careful study. Examining the circumstances of the incident and Gandhi's decision to suspend the movement provides insight into the difficulties of maintaining non-violent discipline during large-scale political mobilization and the debates surrounding nationalist strategy.

Finally, the study is significant for assessing the consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement. Although it did not achieve immediate independence, it contributed to broader nationalist consciousness, mass political participation, organizational experience, and the development of subsequent phases of the freedom struggle. A systematic study of its causes and consequences therefore contributes to a deeper understanding of the history of Indian nationalism and the struggle against colonial rule.

FURTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR RESEARCH

Further research on "Non-Cooperation Movement: Causes and Consequences" can examine the movement at regional and local levels to understand differences in its development and participation across India. Detailed district-level studies may reveal how local political conditions, social structures, and economic grievances influenced participation in the movement. Future research can focus on the participation of different social groups, including peasants, workers, students, women, traders, lawyers, and marginalized communities. Such studies can examine their motivations, forms of participation, organizational networks, and experiences of colonial repression. Comparative research may examine the relationship between the Non-Cooperation Movement and other contemporary movements, particularly the Khilafat Movement and regional peasant movements. Such research can provide a clearer understanding of the interaction between national political programmes and local social and economic issues.

Further studies can investigate the role of newspapers, journals, pamphlets, speeches, public meetings, and other forms of political communication in spreading the message of non-cooperation. Research into vernacular sources can be particularly useful for understanding how the movement was communicated to different sections of society. The Chauri Chaura incident deserves further micro-historical research using police records, court documents, newspapers, local testimonies, and administrative reports. Such studies can examine the local circumstances of the incident and its relationship with the wider national decision to withdraw the movement. Future researchers can also study the economic dimensions of the movement, including the boycott of foreign cloth, promotion of Khadi, Swadeshi activities, and their effects on traders, consumers, artisans, and local industries. This would provide greater understanding of the economic aspects of nationalist politics.

Comparative studies of the Non-Cooperation Movement with later campaigns such as the Civil Disobedience Movement and Quit India Movement can examine changes in political strategy, organization, participation, and colonial response. Such research can help trace the evolution of mass nationalism during the freedom struggle. Greater use of archival and digital sources is also recommended. Congress records,

government reports, contemporary newspapers, private correspondence, regional archives, and oral-history collections can provide additional evidence for reconstructing the movement and its consequences.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

Scope of the Study

The present study, “Non-Cooperation Movement: Causes and Consequences,” focuses on the historical background, emergence, development, and consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920–1922. It examines the political, social, economic, and ideological circumstances that contributed to the rise of the movement against British colonial rule. The scope of the study includes the major causes of the movement, particularly the Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, the Khilafat question, and growing dissatisfaction with colonial policies. It also examines the role of Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress in developing and implementing the programme of non-cooperation.

The study covers the major methods associated with the movement, including the boycott of government institutions, educational institutions, courts, foreign goods, and official honours, along with the promotion of Swadeshi and Khadi. It also examines the principles of Satyagraha and non-violence and their relationship with the organization of mass political action. Another important area within the scope is the participation of different social groups, including students, lawyers, traders, peasants, workers, women, and local political organizations. Regional variations in participation and the relationship between the national programme and local grievances are also considered. The study further examines the Chauri Chaura incident, the withdrawal of the movement in February 1922, and its broader political, social, economic, and organizational consequences. It considers the movement’s significance for the subsequent development of the Indian national movement.

Limitations of the Study

The study is primarily historical and qualitative and depends on the availability and reliability of primary and secondary sources. Some local records, private correspondence, regional newspapers, administrative documents, and accounts of participants may be incomplete, inaccessible, or unevenly preserved. The Non-Cooperation Movement covered a large geographical area and involved diverse social groups. Therefore, the present study cannot provide an equally detailed account of every province, district, organization, or local participant. Greater emphasis is placed on the major national developments and selected regional dimensions.

Another limitation is that the movement was closely connected with several contemporary developments, including the Khilafat Movement, peasant mobilization, labour activities, and regional political struggles. While these are considered where relevant, the study does not attempt an exhaustive history of all parallel movements. Interpretations of the causes, achievements, limitations, and consequences of the Non-Cooperation Movement differ among historians. The study considers available historical perspectives, but it cannot resolve every historiographical debate concerning Gandhi’s strategy, Congress politics, mass participation, or the withdrawal of the movement.

FINDINGS

The study of “Non-Cooperation Movement: Causes and Consequences” finds that the movement emerged from a combination of political, social, and economic factors that had intensified after the First World War. The Rowlatt Act of 1919, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, dissatisfaction with British colonial policies, and the Khilafat question contributed significantly to the political environment in which the movement developed. The study finds that Mahatma Gandhi played a central role in formulating and

organizing the Non-Cooperation programme. His emphasis on Satyagraha, non-violence, boycott, Swadeshi, and Khadi provided the movement with a distinctive method of political action. The programme sought to withdraw Indian cooperation from colonial institutions and thereby challenge the functioning of colonial authority. The findings show that the Indian National Congress adopted the Non-Cooperation programme and expanded its organizational activities. The movement contributed to the transformation of Congress politics by encouraging wider participation and strengthening local and regional political networks.

The study further finds that the movement attracted participation from different sections of Indian society, including students, lawyers, traders, peasants, workers, women, and political volunteers. However, participation varied considerably across regions, and different groups often interpreted the movement according to their own social and economic circumstances. Another important finding is that the movement became connected with local grievances in several areas. Questions relating to agricultural conditions, rents, labour relations, local authority, and social inequality sometimes became associated with the national programme. This demonstrates that nationalist politics interacted with existing regional and local struggles. The study finds that the Khilafat Movement played an important role in the expansion of early 1920s mass politics and contributed to a period of Hindu-Muslim political cooperation in the national movement. At the same time, the relationship between Khilafat politics and Non-Cooperation developed differently in different regions and historical circumstances.

The findings also indicate that the movement faced limitations in maintaining uniform organization and non-violent discipline on a nationwide scale. Local conditions, differing political expectations, and variations in leadership affected the implementation of the programme. The Chauri Chaura incident of February 1922 was a major turning point. The violence that occurred during the incident led Gandhi to withdraw the movement because he considered non-violence essential to the political strategy of Non-Cooperation. The withdrawal brought the movement to an early end despite its substantial expansion. The study further finds that the movement did not achieve immediate independence, but it had significant consequences for the development of Indian nationalism. It expanded mass political participation, strengthened nationalist consciousness, increased organizational experience, and established non-cooperation and boycott as important forms of anti-colonial political action.

DISCUSSION

The present study demonstrates that the Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920–1922 represented an important stage in the transformation of Indian nationalist politics. It emerged from a combination of political dissatisfaction, public resentment against colonial policies, and the growing desire for a more active form of resistance. The Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, and the Khilafat question contributed to the political circumstances in which the movement developed. A major theme emerging from the study is the importance of Mahatma Gandhi's method of non-cooperation. Gandhi argued that colonial authority could be challenged by withdrawing voluntary support from colonial institutions. The emphasis on non-violence, Satyagraha, boycott, Swadeshi, and Khadi provided a framework for political action that sought to involve ordinary people in the national struggle. The role of the Indian National Congress was also significant. The adoption of the Non-Cooperation programme required changes in Congress organization and encouraged greater political activity at local and regional levels. The movement therefore contributed to the expansion of political networks and encouraged the development of a broader base for nationalist politics.

The discussion further shows that the movement involved diverse sections of Indian society. Students participated through the boycott of government educational institutions, lawyers withdrew from colonial courts in some areas, traders and consumers supported the boycott of foreign goods, and peasants

and workers participated in different regional contexts. Women also became increasingly visible in nationalist activities. However, participation was uneven and depended on local social, economic, and political conditions. An important aspect of the movement was the interaction between nationalist objectives and local grievances. In several regions, people connected the call for non-cooperation with concerns about rents, agricultural conditions, labour relations, social inequalities, and local authority. This interaction helped expand participation but could also produce forms of action that differed from the intentions of national leaders.

The discussion also highlights the significance of the Khilafat Movement. Cooperation between Khilafat leaders and the Congress helped create a period of joint political mobilization. The relationship demonstrated the possibility of combining different political concerns within a wider anti-colonial campaign, although the nature and extent of this cooperation varied across regions and over time. The Chauri Chaura incident of February 1922 reveals one of the major challenges of mass non-violent mobilization. The violence at Chauri Chaura led Gandhi to withdraw the movement because maintaining non-violence was central to his political approach. The decision generated debate within nationalist politics concerning political strategy, mass participation, and the timing of confrontation with colonial rule.

The study also indicates that the movement had important consequences despite its withdrawal. It strengthened nationalist consciousness, expanded participation in politics, developed organizational experience, encouraged the use of Swadeshi and indigenous goods, and prepared the ground for later phases of the national movement. At the same time, it did not secure immediate independence and exposed the organizational and strategic difficulties involved in sustaining a nationwide campaign. Another important point is that the Non-Cooperation Movement should be understood as a diverse and regionally varied historical process. Its national programme provided a common framework, but local leaders and communities interpreted and implemented it according to their own circumstances. This regional variation is essential for understanding both the achievements and limitations of the movement.

CONCLUSION

The study of “Non-Cooperation Movement: Causes and Consequences” establishes that the Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920–1922 was an important phase in the development of the Indian national movement. It emerged from growing dissatisfaction with British colonial rule, particularly in the context of the Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, and the Khilafat question. These developments created a political environment in which large sections of Indian society became increasingly receptive to organized nationalist resistance. The study concludes that Mahatma Gandhi’s principles of Satyagraha, non-violence, non-cooperation, Swadeshi, and Khadi provided an important framework for the movement. The boycott of colonial institutions, foreign goods, educational institutions, courts, and official honours demonstrated a new form of political resistance based on the withdrawal of cooperation from colonial authority.

The movement also marked an expansion of mass participation in nationalist politics. Students, lawyers, traders, peasants, workers, women, and political volunteers participated in different ways and to varying degrees. The interaction between the national programme and local social and economic grievances contributed to the movement’s expansion and produced considerable regional variation. The study further concludes that the Chauri Chaura incident of February 1922 became a decisive turning point. Gandhi’s withdrawal of the movement reflected his commitment to non-violence and demonstrated the difficulties involved in maintaining uniform discipline during a large-scale mass campaign. Although the movement ended without achieving immediate independence, its withdrawal did not eliminate its broader historical significance.

The consequences of the movement were substantial. It contributed to the expansion of nationalist consciousness, increased political participation, strengthened Congress organization, and provided valuable experience in mass mobilization and anti-colonial protest. The movement also influenced the methods and strategies of later phases of the Indian national struggle. At the same time, the Non-Cooperation Movement was not a uniform or exclusively national-level process. Its development was influenced by regional conditions, local leadership, social structures, and economic grievances. Understanding these variations is essential for interpreting both the achievements and limitations of the movement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study of “Non-Cooperation Movement: Causes and Consequences” recommends that greater attention should be given to the movement in the teaching of modern Indian history, particularly its political, social, economic, and regional dimensions. Students should be encouraged to examine the movement through contemporary documents, newspapers, speeches, and archival records. Educational institutions should provide systematic study of the major causes of the movement, including the Rowlatt Act, Jallianwala Bagh massacre, Khilafat question, and growing opposition to British colonial policies. This would help students understand the historical circumstances that shaped the development of mass nationalist politics.

Universities and research institutions should encourage detailed regional studies of the movement. District-level research can examine local leadership, participation, organizational structures, economic conditions, and the relationship between national political programmes and local grievances. Greater research attention should be given to the participation of peasants, workers, women, students, traders, lawyers, and marginalized communities. Such studies can provide a broader understanding of the social composition of the movement and the different forms of participation adopted in various regions. Further research should examine the role of the Khilafat Movement and the nature of Hindu-Muslim political cooperation during this period. Comparative studies can help explain the development, achievements, and challenges of joint political mobilization in the early 1920s.

The Chauri Chaura incident should receive greater micro-historical attention through the study of police records, court proceedings, newspapers, administrative documents, and local accounts. Such research can provide a more detailed understanding of the circumstances surrounding the incident and the subsequent withdrawal of the movement. Research should also examine the economic dimensions of the movement, particularly the boycott of foreign cloth, promotion of Khadi, Swadeshi activities, and their effects on consumers, traders, artisans, and local production. This can provide a clearer understanding of the relationship between economic nationalism and political resistance. Archives and libraries should prioritize the preservation and digitization of primary materials relating to the Non-Cooperation Movement. Greater accessibility to Congress records, government reports, newspapers, personal correspondence, and regional documents would support more comprehensive and source-based research.

REFERENCES

1. Chandra, Bipan, Mridula Mukherjee, Aditya Mukherjee, K. N. Panikkar, and Sucheta Mahajan. *India's Struggle for Independence, 1857–1947*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 1988.
2. Brown, Judith M. *Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics 1915–1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
3. Hardiman, David. *Noncooperation in India: Nonviolent Strategy and Protest, 1920–1922*. London: Oxford University Press, 1984.

-
4. Sarkar, Sumit. Modern India, 1885–1947. New Delhi: Macmillan India, 1983.
 5. Nanda, B. R. Mahatma Gandhi: A Biography. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1958.
 6. Majumdar, R. C. History of the Freedom Movement in India, Vol. III. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1963.
 7. Amin, Shahid. Event, Metaphor, Memory: Chauri Chaura, 1922–1992. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
 8. Chandra, Bipan. The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India. New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1966.
 9. Gandhi, M. K. Non-Violence in Peace and War. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1942.
 10. Brown, Judith M. Gandhi: Prisoner of Hope. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.