Chapter 8
Perceptions of Industrial Scene

The role of trade union leader is a pivotal one in the context of its width and diversity as also its influence upon the growth sector of our economy. Therefore, the opinions expressed by our trade union leaders on some important topics which have far-reaching implication for our polity, economy and society, are discussed here. The topics selected for leaders' opinions are not intended to develop a scale but they are intended to cover a broad enough canvas in industrial relations, so that the knowledge of these opinions can be utilized in planning for industrial development and working for industrial peace.

Trade union leaders are part of the larger socio-economic system of the city and as such, they share with other citizens - in varying degree, of course - the cultural values of Ahmedabad - the values which we have described in Chapter one. As trade union leaders of Ahmedabad, they also claim to share the legacy of Gandhiji in trade union organizations. Thirdly, the narrow and sectional interest groups based on caste, region, language and religion, which are so powerful among most of these leaders, also shape their opinions on many issues. And lastly, the personal experiences of these leaders in their dealings with managerial bureaucracy, also play an important part in shaping their views.

As mentioned earlier, the main topics on which we have sought our respondents' opinion are: (1) nationalization (2) arbitration (3) strike (4) wages and production (4) rationalization (6) government officials (7) interests of owners and workers
Rationalization:

After independence, the policy of our government has been to accelerate the rate of economic development with a view to distributing the fruits of development to those who are underprivileged and downtrodden. The industrial workers have also received a fairly protective treatment from the government. The concern for economic development has prompted the government to take over many large-scale industries and also some of the 'sick' units of the private sector. At the same time various regulative measures in the form of, for instance the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 have also put some restrictions on the workers' ability to manage for their own interests.

Nationalization is one of the topics on which trade union leaders were asked to give their opinion. The statement was "Nationalization of industries is more harmful than advantageous to the workers" and the leaders were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement or remained undecided. The table indicating their responses to the statement is given in table No. 8.1.
Table No. 8.1

Percentage Distributions Of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To The Statement "Nationalization Of Industries Is More Harmful Than Advantageous To Workers" Separately For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insiders*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLA</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error.
Figures in the brackets indicate frequencies.
Before we begin interpreting the table, it should be made clear that some of the trade union leaders could not understand that the statement was not restricted to textile mills only and therefore, some of them said that they have no personal experience of the consequences of nationalization. There were also some, who understood the statement but preferred not to say anything in the absence of any personal experience.

The table shows that except a slight tilt against nationalization, the workers are almost equally divided on this topic. Among the outsiders, those considering nationalization as advantageous are twice the size of those who consider it harmful. More insiders, however, consider nationalization as harmful.

Union-wise, little less than 2/3rd of the TLA respondents consider nationalization as harmful. Whereas, among the non-TLA respondents, a large majority of Indicate and the two Communist unions are in favour of nationalization. Among the Mandal respondents 11 out of 12 feel that nationalization is not advantageous.

Some respondents have given additional comments which provide the raison d'etre for their beliefs.

The TLA respondents have largely favoured an anti-nationalization stand. Some of the insiders among them gave the following reasons. One of them said that nationalization is actually bureaucratization because the workers of nationalized industries do not receive any different treatment. Another said that in private ownership, you have only one master whereas, in nationalized industry, you have many. A third one said that it is easier to fight a private owner than the government. Quite a few of the
insiders, said that nationalization breeds irresponsibility as no one is the owner of the industry. This also leads to red tapism in solving workers' problems.

There were some who were in favour of nationalization because as they said "such mills do not get closed." Closure of some private mills and the eventual take over of such 'sick' mills by the government was fresh in the minds of some of these worker leaders. Some wanted improvement in the workers' loyalty to the industry to make nationalization a success.

The outsider leaders of TLA were more sophisticated in their views. One of them said that both private and nationalized industries should be given opportunities. Nationalization, according to another was not a panacea for all the ills of the industries. A third one cautioned against any political decision. He said that nationalization should be resorted to, not out of any political strategy, but only if there is a need for it.

The Indicate union was largely in favour of nationalization. Many of its respondents anticipated privileges enjoyed by government servants, like pension, seniority and security in nationalized industries. To some, it meant 'no victimization' and 'no cut in wages'. Some, however were hesitant about its favourable impact, in the absence of 'cadre of devoted management'.

The outsider-leaders of Indicate union lauded nationalization as a step toward socialism. One of them said that the profit does not go to the private coffer but it goes to the nation.

A large majority of the two Communist unions also had pro-nationalization stand. However, some of their insiders said that
'nationalization of all industries' is required. To the respondents of these two unions, nationalization in a capitalist society had no meaning. Some of the insiders said that nationalization by the present government was not acceptable to them.

The outsider leaders among both the communist unions were emphatic about the benefits of nationalization. One of them gave an illustration. He said, "If I go to station by rickshaw, it will cost me two rupees, but if I go by the Public bus, I have to pay only fifteen paise. This is the difference between private and nationalized industry". Most of them however pointed out that the bureaucrats within the mills are not committed and the public does not get the real benefits because of them. The respondents of Mandal union were preponderantly against nationalization. For most of the insider respondents, it meant red tapism. One of them said, "you can convince a private owner, but in a nationalized industry such a situation is not easy to come by".

The Sarni union has more undecided respondents than any other union. But among those who have given their opinion, majority have favoured nationalization. The additional comments were not much different from those expressed above. One of them put it this way. He said that nationalization ensures working according to rules and the workers get all the benefits that the law provides. The Sangh respondents have not provided any such comments.

The above discussion shows that nationalization is not just a slogan for our respondents. The insiders have referred to
some of the consequences which are part of the life at the
level. The comments by the outsiders were ideological rather
than those which refer to the work situation in the industry.

**Arbitration:**

Like nationalisation, arbitration is a governmental measure. In the present industrial relations scene (i.e. after 1947), it has been provided as a technique of solving industrial disputes of workers. Voluntary arbitration and compulsory arbitration are the two major variants of this technique.

Arbitration, as a technique of solving disputes by a neutral party is not a new technique. It had been used, both in rural as well as urban India by caste-groups and the Mahajans (Guilds). Gillion (1968:22) notes that the Nagarsheth in Ahmedabad used to act as an arbitrator in case of disputes between the Mahajans or castes. The Kazi, among the Muslims also had a similar role to perform in case of disputes.

When Gandhiji was guiding the labour movement in Ahmedabad in 1918, he had emphasized the value of arbitration in solving labour-management disputes. Gandhiji was in favour of voluntary arbitration for various reasons. According to him, it avoids direct clash between workers and owners; allows a non-passionate solution of the dispute by a neutral party; and does not hamper production. The technique was also consistent with his ideas of class-harmony and non-violence. By avoiding overt conflict between labour and management, it was conducive to non-violence and provided atmosphere for class-harmony.
The technique also found favour with the trade union leaders as well as mill owners in Ahmedabad. For the Textile Labour Association, it was more welcome because, at that time, most of its members were illiterate or semi-literates and were not conscious of their trade union membership.

A permanent Board of Arbitration which was constituted by TLA and Mill Owners Association in 1920 had done a good job in solving many disputes which otherwise, might have vitiated the industrial peace in Ahmedabad (Karnik 1966:93). But as noted by Shethi (1962:113-114) the Board was loaded with numerous problems, with consequent delay in their solution.

Compulsory arbitration or referring industrial dispute to industrial court or tribunal by the government became part of industrial legislation in the Bombay Industrial Disputes Act 1938 and later on in The Industrial Dispute Act 1947. The compulsory arbitration has both strong supporters and strong opponents. Its supporters emphasized that the primacy of economic development of India and argue that through it (i.e. compulsory arbitration) strikes and lock-outs can be averted and weak and small trade unions which are not able to bargain with their powerful employers, can be protected. Its opponents, on the other hand charge that compulsory arbitration discourages trade unions to be self-reliant and strong, increases litigious tendency on both sides, and that the decisions arrived at by this method are more in the form of imposition than an acceptance by the workers as well as management. (cf. Shethi, 1962:68-77)

The importance of voluntary as well as compulsory arbitration
Table No. 8.2

Percentage Distributions Of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement
To The Statement "For settling Industrial Disputes, Arbitration Is The Best Method," Separately For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insiders.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNI</th>
<th>SANGH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agrees</strong></td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagrees</strong></td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undecided</strong></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.A.</strong></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(115) (54) (25) (25) (30) (41) (210) (251)

* The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding errors.
Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.

---

The table presents the percentage distributions of respondents' agreement or disagreement with the statement "For settling Industrial Disputes, Arbitration Is The Best Method," separately for each union and for outsiders/insiders. The data is accompanied by a note stating that the total is not equal to 100 per cent due to rounding errors, and figures in brackets indicate frequency.
for Indian trade unions does not need to be over-emphasized. To gauge the respondents' views about it, they were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statement, "For settling industrial disputes arbitration is the best method". The responses are presented in Table No. 8.2.

To begin with, the statement did not differentiate between voluntary and compulsory arbitration. When the statement was mentioned to the respondents, no one asked for any clarification also. This may be because, to most of the respondents, voluntary and compulsory arbitration did not make much difference.

If we look at the table, we find that little less than 2/3rd of all the respondents find arbitration as the best method of solving industrial disputes. Whereas the outsiders are equally divided on their responses to the statement, among the insiders, those in favour of the statement are twice the size of those who are against it.

If we see the union-wise responses we find that along with TLA, the Mandal, Sarni, and Sangh unions have a fairly high percentage of respondents who agree with the statement. In other words, they prefer arbitration as the best technique of solving their disputes.

Among the TLA respondents, a faith in the system of arbitration has been built up. This is periodically revived in the name of Gandhiji. The faith is not merely a blind faith but is based upon some concrete gains, the union members have received from time to time with the help of this method (Karnik 1966:93). In the comments by the TLA respondents, this is expressed by many. Some have favoured it because, according to them, it protects the
interests of the wider society. There are a few who have qualified their views by saying that direct negotiations should be attempted first and then only resort to arbitration be made.

The Mandal union also has a very high percentage of its respondents in favour of the statement. Being a small union, the respondents would naturally prefer arbitration. But one of its outsiders pointed out a different point in support of his views. He said, that collective bargaining as a democratic technique is always welcome, but in India, the agreements through collective bargaining lack legal binding and for that reason, arbitration is preferred. An insider respondent expressed the traditional reverence for arbitration (which incidently is equated with the 'panch' system in which, about five elders give their decision and is honoured as if it has been dictated by God*)

The Sarni union has a high percentage of respondents (83.3%) agreeing with the statement. Their preference for arbitration is inevitable because of their small size. In their additional comments, some have favoured arbitration because it excludes direct clash with the management, whereas some have expressed their apprehensions saying that the arbitrator might not remain neutral or that the process may get dilatory.

The two communist union respondents largely disagree with the statement. In fact the CPM-led Maha Gujarat union had all its respondents against arbitration. This is consistent with their ideology which emphasizes direct action rather than any compromise. An insider respondent of Maha Gujarat union characterized arbitration as harmful to the workers because it makes them

* The maxim 'Panch tyan Parmeshwar' which means where there are five elders there is God, indicative of the reverence.
inactive. Another expressed his distrust saying that it (arbitration) is always in favour of owners.

The respondents of the Lalvavta union were less radical in their expressions. One insider said that arbitration can be helpful to the workers only if the arbitrators are able to appreciate the class-interest of the workers. Another insider said that it is a method of befooling the workers.

In sum, the available information indicates that the opinions of the leaders about arbitration are limited in the sense that they have not been able to appreciate the wider implication—in terms of rapid economic progress versus freedom to bargain collectively—of arbitration as a process of settling disputes.

**Strike:**

Like arbitration, measure of government, strike as a technique of forcing the management to solve workers' problems has been controlled by the government legislation. Strike is a weapon used by the workers and leaders of trade unions, against the employers, and government as a regulative agency, has stepped in to control it. Thus it is a topic which covers all the three i.e. unions, employers and government.

"Strike is a collective stoppage of work by a group of employees, undertaken in order to bring pressure to bear on those who depend upon the sale or use of the product of work" (Vaid; 1965:155). It is an important weapon in the hands of workers against the economically powerful employers.

The productive process in an industrial establishment requires large number of workers at the place of work. The nature of
of industrial work gives rise to many problems but the impersonal, indirect and contractual relationship between the workers and employers come in the way of their speedy disposal. In such a situation, strike is an effective means of regulating the behaviour of the owners toward the workers.

In spite of the many inadequacies of Indian industrial workers—their poverty, illiteracy, low socio-economic status and irrational and conservative outlook and the consequent weakness of their organizations, workers in India have gone on strike frequently and have stayed on, for a sufficiently long time. The freedom movement, which was brought to the level of mass movement by Gandhiji, provided a new dimension to strike and such other techniques of direct action. This also led to the increase in the frequency of strikes by the workers, because along with the economic causes, there were strikes for political reasons also.

As a trade union leader, Gandhiji organized the textile workers of Ahmedabad at a time when TLA was in its infancy. He termed strike as an "inherent right of the working men for the purpose of securing justice" (quoted by Soman, 1957:69). But he cautioned workers to realize that it was an extreme measure and should be resorted to, only when all possible efforts at reconciliations have failed.

Consistent with his philosophy of non-violence he taught workers how to conduct a strike in a non-violent manner. For instance, he emphasized that the demands by the workers should be reasonable. Moreover, throughout the period of strike, workers
should maintain discipline. That is, they should not use abusive language and should not entertain ill feelings toward the owners. Once a reasonable demand is made and strike declared, workers should steadfastly wait till the demand is satisfied. Throughout their struggle, workers should not depend upon the subscription from others but must find out alternative, temporary employment. (Cf. Soman; 1957:69–70).

At the time of his 'righteous struggle' in which he guided textile workers of Ahmedabad, Gandhiji also emphasized that it was essential to solve workers' problem and suggested arbitration as an alternative. The subsequent result was that arbitration became more common and strike became less frequent.

In the above contexts our respondents were asked whether they would hesitate to go on strike for their demands. The information about their responses is presented in the table No. 8.3.

Before we try to interpret the table, it should be made clear that, to many respondents, the statement meant that they were being asked, whether they were in favour or against strike. So in its simplest meaning, the table indicates respondents' opinion about strike.

The table indicates that little more than half the number of respondents are in favour of strike. They feel that strike is a weapon of the workers and they should use it. A large number of outsider leaders (73.2%) are in favour of strike.
Table No. 9.3

Percentage Distributions of the Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To the Statement "Strike is a Fundamental Right of the Workers and They Should Not Hesitate in Making Use of It," Separately for Each Union and for Outsiders/Insiders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNI</th>
<th>SANGH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS / INSIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OUTSIDERS INSIDERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100.0 100.0 100.0 [11] [12] 99.9 [4] 100.0 100.0 100.0
(115) (54) (25) (30) (41) (210) (251)

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error. Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.*
whereas the percentage of insider leaders favouring strike is not that high (52.9%). While it is difficult to guess why fewer insiders than outsider ones have favoured strike, it may be due to the fact that the real pangs of strike are suffered by the rank and file rather than the outsiders.

If we analyze the information union-wise, we find that Mandal, Sarni and TLA have more respondents against strike. This is largely in tune with ideologies of all the three unions. Both TLA and Mandal do not follow militant ideology, while Sarni union does not have any specific ideology of its own, but its size and structure impose an anti-strike bias in it.

In their comments some TLA respondents emphasized that, instead of strike, arbitration should be resorted to. Some four respondents said that strike creates problems for workers and only in rare cases should they resort to strike. In short, the TLA respondents convey the feeling that they would hesitate rather than go all out for strike.

The respondents of Mandal union have also expressed their anti-strike bias. Most of the respondents of this union have gone to court in connection with their problems and have won. So they prefer litigation to strike. An outsider from this union said, that the industrial law is such an elaborate piece of legislation that it is not necessary to go on strike. Two of the insider were able to appreciate the small size of the union, and so, they said that on its own, their union cannot go on strike.

Like the Mandal, Sarni union is also very small and its respondents also mentioned that on their own, they cannot go on strike.
However the union had once decided to go on strike and though it was long back in 1938, many of its respondents mentioned this fact. It may be because of this that some 43.3% of its members were in favour of using strike as a weapon.

The remaining four unions, viz. the two Communist unions, the Indicate and the Sangh unions have pro-strike bias. The Maha Gujarat union has all its respondents, while Lalvavta has some 96.0% respondents, in favour of strike. This goes very well with their avowed policy of revolutionary changes. In fact, as mentioned in chapter two, a respondent of the Maha Gujarat union had made it clear that, theirs is a movement rather than a trade union. A respondent of the Lalvavta union said, that the employers deliberately create a situation which leads to strike. Another said that the workers have only one weapon and they should use it whenever necessary.

The Indicate union has a mixed composition. Some of its members have TLA background and they are mild in their views. There are quite a few, who have come from the Communist or Socialist unions and have radical views. There are more respondents (61.1%) who favoured the use of strike as a weapon. Nearly 1/3rd are also against strike, respondents.

The comments by the Indicate/are indicative of the political philosophy of the party to which the union is affiliated. For instance some five respondents, all insiders - opposed strike saying that it is harmful to the nation. Some said that it is harmful to both the parties involved. Those who favoured strike said that in case of their rightful demands which are not met, they
should go on strike. A former member of the Janata Parishad and an insider leader was more forthright. He said that strike is not a thing of bravery. It is indicative of the helplessness of the workers. The workers are forced to strike; they don't enjoy resorting to strike for the hack of it.

The Sangh union has four respondents but out of it three favoured strike. There is no specific trade union policy of the political party to which the trade union belongs, but the party does emphasize national interests - sometimes in a very narrow and communal sense - and to that extent the respondents have given a contrary view.

The overall picture is that workers do not like to go on strike for flimsy reasons, but they also do not feel hesitant about its use, should situation arise.

Wages and production:

One of the major demands of workers is wage-increase. When such demands are not fulfilled, trade unions resort to strikes. Wages are closely linked with production in the sense that it is the level of productivity which largely determines the prevailing wage-level. The wage-production topic concerns workers and employers directly, and Government indirectly. But as the employer of the largest labour force, Government of India is directly concerned with it.

The sum of money which a worker gets under contract from his employer for the services he has rendered is termed as wages. Wage policy is a 'sensitive area' as the report of the National Commission on Labour puts it because "the relative status of workers in the
society, their commitment to industry, and attitude toward management, their morale and motivation toward productivity, their living standard and in fact their way of life, are all conditioned by wages". (1969:220). The basic conflict of interest between the workers and employers rests on the wages demanded by the workers and the profit which goes to the employers.

Unlike the advanced economies or some of the socialist countries, India has a developing economy and has accepted a democratic setup. Therefore the wage-policy has developed in a situation beset with many problems.

In the early years of industrialization, in the absence of any governmental regulations, wages were inadequate and arbitrary cuts by way of fines and delay in payment were common features. As late as in 1936 The Payment of Wages Act was passed. The Act provided that wages be paid on due dates and no arbitrary cuts be made. But before this statutory provision was made, Gandhiji in 1918 had made attempts to solve the wage problem of Ahmedabad workers. The wage-cut which the millowners had effected had become a major issue of protest and under Gandhiji's leadership workers received 35 percent increase as per their demand. (Cf. Soman; 1957: 233-48)

Though workers' share in production cannot be measured precisely and other factors like management, stage of machinery and availability of raw material also influence production, it has been a common practice to relate wages and production. In the wage-history of textile workers of Ahmedabad there are instances when millowners have
Table No. 874
Percentage Distributions Of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To the Statement, "In The Present Times, Unions Should Accept A Policy Of Higher Production With Demand Of Higher Wages," Separagely For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insiders*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNI</th>
<th>SANGH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS</th>
<th>INSIDERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agrees</strong></td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagrees</strong></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undecided</strong></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.A.</strong></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error; Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.*
reduced wages in the face of fall in production (for whatever reasons) and workers and TLA have asked for increase in wages, when the situation had improved. (cf. Majmudar 1970: 76-108).

Looking at the wage problem, in the wider perspective, we know that as an underdeveloped country, India has her major goal of rapid economic development. In this context the trade union leaders are expected to exercise restraints in their wage-demands; work for increase in production. The respondents were therefore asked, whether or not they agreed with the statement like this: "In the present time trade unions should accept a policy of higher production, with the demand for higher wages." Table No. 8.4 shows the responses of our respondents.

The table shows that an overwhelming majority (85.3%) of our respondents agree with the statement. The percentage is still higher (89.5%) if only the insiders are considered. Among the outsiders those agreeing with the statement, are less than those of the insiders. This requires explanation. It may be that, because of their higher educational level, the outsiders are able to see various dimensions of the situation and, therefore, they may not have imaged a simple relationship between wages and production.

Indeed, as one of the outsider leaders said, "This is a slogan which has more propaganda value than any real significance."

If we see union-wise breakdown of the responses, we find that, with an exception of Lalvavta, all other unions have high percentage of respondents agreeing with the statement. Even among the Lalvavta respondents, those agreeing with the statement constitute little less than 2/3rd of the total respondents.
We shall now examine the extra comments made by some of the respondents. One TLA respondent said that increase in production can be achieved by changing managerial techniques and workers don't have to work extra for it. Another from the same union said, that wages had not increased with increase in production. Two of the outsiders mentioned that wages and production are not so closely related!

Some of the respondents of Indicate union, also complained that they are being asked to work more, to increase production but there is no increase in wages. One of them said that if workers are given chance to participate in management, production will increase.

The two Communist unions provided somewhat different comments from the usual ones mentioned above. A respondent from Lalavta said that if wages are increased, production will also increase. Another said that if the modern techniques are used by the mills, production will go up. A third one said that the method of fixing wages is more important. A Maha Gujarat respondent mentioned how owners actually decrease production to increase their profit. An outsider from the same union said that only if the increased production is equitably distributed in the society, can one ask for the same. He also pointed out that, when there are so many people without clothes, there are mills which have stocks piled up in their godowns. This is because production is for private profit, he added.

The picture that emerges is that a large percentage of workers believe in working for increase in production, with their demand for wage-increase. There is also an awareness among some insiders that the relationship between wages and production
is not so simple as is imagined by many.

Rationalization:

One way of increasing production and getting higher wages is by rationalizing the industrial organizations. Rationalization as a topic concerns workers, employers, as well as Government. As a volatile issue which often leads to strike, it has led Government to formulate some broad principles of rationalization to be followed by employers and workers.

A progressively rational use of labour and capital for the purpose of increasing production and of improving its quality is a built-in character of all industrial establishments. Rationalization in this sense is intended to increase efficiency of the labour, streamline the managerial and supervisory processes and reduce waste of personnel, money, time, and human labour. To be useful then, rationalization should be effected at all levels. The workers then, will have no complaints against it. If, however, it is a partial attempt meant only for workers, then the workers see in it evil design to get rid some of them.

The aim of rationalization is not only to increase the profit margin of the owners. Rather, share of the increased profit should go to workers and consumers as well. In a country like India where problem of unemployment is very acute, unemployment through rationalization has to be contained to manageable proportion.

Rationalization is a process which is associated with higher stages of industrial development. As science and technology advance, newer and more efficient machines and managerial practices are invented and with the increasing competition around, these are introduced to increase productivity and improve quality. Ahmedabad workers first experienced the pangs of rationalization in 1933,
When millowners introduced wage-out as well as rationalization, in the bipartite agreement between the millowners Association (MOA) and the TLA, it was agreed inter alia that: (1) rationalization be carried out under certain restrictions relative to unemployment and its effect on the health of workers (2) unemployment incidental to rationalization will be confined to: (a) married women whose husbands are benefitted by the rationalization (b) persons who have less than one year's service in the mill (3) a joint committee of the MOA and TLA will be appointed to regulate the working under rationalization scheme. (cf. Soman; 1957: 272) Thus some of the basic precautions were taken right from the beginning of the process.

At the 15th Indian Labour Conference, (1957), a 'Model Agreement to guide employers in regard to Rationalization' was adopted. The agreement laid down among other things:

(a) There should be no retrenchment or loss of earnings of the existing employee workers could however, be provided with suitable alternative jobs in the same establishment or under the same employer, subject to agreement between the employer and his workers;

(b) there should be an equitable sharing of benefits of rationalization as between the community, the employer and the worker and

(c) there should be a proper assessment of work-load made by an expert or experts, mutually agreed upon and also suitable improvement in the working condition.

The agreement also provided for prior consultation with the unions before the instalation of rationalized equipment (National Commission on Labour, 1969: 261).
Table No: 8.5

Percentage Distributions of the Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement to the Statement, "Rationalization is Advantageous to the Owners; But Workers on the Whole, Are the Loser." Separately for Each Union and for Outsiders/Insiders.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLA</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error.*

Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.
In the context of the manifold consequences of rationalization for the workers, the respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: "Rationalization is advantageous to the owners but workers on the whole are the losers." The information available from the respondents is presented in Table No. 8.5.

The table indicates that little less than 3/4th of the respondents feel that rationalization is advantageous to the owners but workers, on the whole, are the losers. If we see the outsider-insider category, we find that more insiders, i.e., more than 3/4th feel that workers have to lose in rationalization whereas among the outsiders nearly 46.3% feel that workers are not losers, as against 41.5% who feel otherwise. The plausible explanation can be that, outsiders being more educated, are more likely to take a broader view of the effects of rationalization.

The union-wise breakdown reveals that in all the unions, more than a simple majority of respondents have agreed with the statement. The proportion of those agreeing with the statement is lowest (62.6%) among the TLA. This may be because, as it has the right to enter into agreement with the owners and, therefore, its members cannot find fault with rationalization, which is being introduced as per the terms and conditions agreed upon by their own union. The smaller unions are largely of the view that rationalization harms workers more.

In their comments some of the TLA respondents have emphasized the positive aspects of rationalization. Out of those who offered extra comments, some ten respondents said that rationalization is
advantageous to both, workers as well as employers. The advantages mentioned are (1) workers get more wages (ii) industry becomes sound and hence the workers also benefit (iii) old workers get money, if they volunteer to retire early. The disadvantages were mentioned by more respondents. Increase in work-load, harmful effect on health and unemployment for some — these were the three major disadvantages mentioned.

The outsiders, however, presented a balanced picture. One said that rationalisation is inevitable. Another said that it should be introduced only after taking workers into confidence, and it should not lead to unemployment.

Practically the same points were made by respondents of other unions. It was significant to note that no respondent mentioned the consumer's share in the profits, due to rationalisation.

Thus, the trade union leaders' views conform to the general view held by most of the trade union leaders that rationalisation is harmful to workers.

**Trade Unions and Government Official**

Government has to deal with trade unions and their leaders, not only as one of the biggest employer, but also through its three organs, viz. legislature, executive and judiciary. With the increase in labour legislation, the number of government officials of different level, capacity and orientations, who come in contact with trade union leaders goes on increasing.

In the initial period of industrialisation, the British government had assumed a policy of non-interference in economic matters. But gradually, the compulsion of the various situations forced it to change its policy. With this change in the policy, came various pieces of legislation and their implementation required various government officials. Being a foreign power, the British/
do much to expand the industrial base of our country, but in their
own limited way, they did provide a base for the industrial legis-
lation which was welfare-oriented and democratic in spirit.

After independence, the welfare orientation became more
pronounced, and a large body of industrial legislation was
enacted, to provide protection to the industrial workers and their
interests. At the same time, the goal of economic development
five
led the government to initiate five years plans and start large-scale
industries in public sector. The concern for industrial peace
so essential for increased production, came to be overemphasized,
resolve industrial disputes, and this led government to institute a chain of machinery to/
The Industrial Disputes Act 1947, provided, among other things,
compulsory arbitration which became a controversial machinery
for the future development of trade unions. Numerous Government
officials, in various capacities - conciliators, arbitrators,
judges of industrial courts, factory inspectors, labour welfare
officials - to name but few, came to be associated, in their
dual role of helping workers to protect their own interest, and
restraining them from violating industrial peace. The result
was that, workers and their trade union leaders changed their
target, and instead of presenting their demands to the employers
and pressurizing them to concede to their demands, they turned
to government and started bringing pressure upon it. Thus,
in spite of good intentions of the government, the gulf between
it and the trade union leaders got widened.

The Communist ideology of class conflict and the rule of the
proletariat, has a special appeal to the industrial workers. The
government, according to this ideology, is the instrument of
officials, in a
exploitation in the hands of the capitalists, and the government/
Table No. 8.6
Percentage Distributions Of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To The Statement, "In The Problems Involving Owners And Workers, Government Officials Usually Satisfy The Interests Of The Former," Separately For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insiders*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNT</th>
<th>SANGH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agrees</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. A.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error. Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.*
capitalist economy do not serve the class interest of the workers.
Thus, where workers are influenced by Communist ideology, they
do not take kindly to government officials.

From all these points of view, the respondents were asked
to react to the statement like this: "In the problems, involving
owners and workers, government officials, usually satisfy the
interest of the former." The result of the responses is presented
in Table No. 8.6.

The statement in Table No. 8.6 does not specify the level and
type of government official, because it was intended to included a
generalized view about such officials, irrespective of their status.
The table shows that more than 3/4th of the respondents believe that
government servants largely serve the interests of the owners vis-a-vis
the workers. Among the outsiders such belief is held by less than
1/2 i.e. 46.3%; though, those who do not agree with the statement
are little less than 1/4th only. The insiders, overwhelmingly agree
with the statement. Thus, the government officials, do not enjoy
a favourable image among the insider-leaders.

Union-wise also, the picture does not change much. An insider
from TLA said that they (the government officials) depend upon the
owners; another said that the labour officers are enemies of the
workers. An outsider from the same union, said that they are usually
fair to both the parties.

A respondent of Indicate union said that the Government officials
come from the class of exploiters; another said that in a capitalist
society, one would not find anything different. An outsider from
Indicate, tried to maintain distinction between old and new officials
and said that the new generation is more pro-labour. An insider from Mandal, complained that, sometimes, the leaders of the representative union and government officials together work against the interests of the workers.

Thus, by and large, the trade union leaders subscribe to the view, that government officials are more likely to side with management than workers.

**Interests of the workers and Employers:**

The present topic is different from the previous ones in the sense that, it largely concerns the workers and employers. According to Marxian analysis, workers who have essentially the same place in the system of production and have common interest in raising their income, come in conflict with owners who would like to keep the wages down. Thus, members of the two classes may not be aware of their membership into the classes to which they belong. This relative lack of class-consciousness, according to Marx, does not allow the class conflict to be manifest but once the members become class-conscious, it leads to class-struggle. This struggle ultimately leads to elimination of the capitalist class and dictatorship of the proletariat.

The history of the capitalist society up to the present time has not proved the prophecy of Marx. On the other hand, a general improvement in living standard, coupled with governmental legislation and bargaining power of the trade unions, have lessened the intensity of conflicts, if not completely eliminate it. Unlike Marx, Gandhi, on the other hand has emphasized class-collaboration,
rather than class conflict. Consistent with his non-violent policy, he wanted employers and workers to live as members of the family. "The relationship between mill-agents and mill-hands ought to be one of father and children or as between blood brothers" (quoted by Soman; 1957:60). However, Gandhiji does not completely reject the existence of class-struggle, but is against fomenting it.

The aim of containing class conflict is noble indeed, but the way out suggested by Gandhiji, in the form of trusteeship principle, encourages paternalistic tendencies, which, as Majmudar (1970:49) puts it: "is incompatible with equality between labour and capital, which Gandhiji unhesitatingly, and categorically professed."

The insistence on arbitration and peaceful, non-violent behaviour of the workers by TLA, in case of industrial disputes and the 'forsighted policy' and the 'spirit of accommodation and fair play' displayed by the millowners of Ahmedabad, seem to be responsible for the peaceful industrial relations in the textile industry. In the face of this historical background, the respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement such as this: "The interests of the owners and those of the workers are not opposite but to a large extent similar?" The available responses are presented in Table No. 8.7. The table indicates that little less than 2/3rd of all the respondents believe that the interests of workers and owners are opposite and not similar. In terms of outsider/insider breakdown, more insiders than outsiders disagree with the communality of interests, though the difference is not very much. Thus, in spite of the Gandhian teaching that workers and owners belong to the same family, the respondents
Table No: 8.7

Percentage Distributions Of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To The Statement, "The Interests Of Owners And Those Of The Workers Are Not Opposite, But To A Large Extent, Similar," Separately For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insiders.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agrees</th>
<th>Disagrees</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>N.A.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLA</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARNI</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANH</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSIDERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error.*
Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.
do not seem to accept that view.

Looking unionwise, we find that the four unions viz. Indicate, Lalvavta, Mandal and sangh have a high percentage of respondents who do not accept the commonality of interest of workers and owners. The Sarni union has lower percentage of respondents who do not accept that interests of both parties are similar. Only TLA has more than 50% respondents who believe that way. For TLA, it is natural but it is strange that the Maha Gujarat union also has a high percentage of respondents holding such belief.

Some of the TLA respondents who have made some extra comments, said that in the broader perspective, the interests are similar but, if one looks from the narrow viewpoint, they will be dissimilar. Another respondent said that industry does not belong to owners only, workers also are owners. Some said, that the interests are not similar and it is wrong to think otherwise.

An Indicate respondent likened the interests of two parties with horse and the grass and said that just as the horse eats up grass, the owners also devour that which belongs to workers. Another said that ideally, the interests should be similar but in reality they are not.

A respondent from Lalvavta said that the owners do not even give the legitimate rights of the workers. In such a situation what to talk of common interests.

 Outsiders in trade unions:

It has been mentioned in chapter two, that in Indian trade unions, outsiders play a pivotal role. In spite of the many dysfunctions of their role, because they have been accepted by the workers as their leaders. And in the face of many limitations
of the workers, they fill the gap with ease. Because of their presence, the workers do not have to take leading part in their unions, and they can easily escape the risk of being victimized. Moreover, the outsiders, with their higher training, provide a better presentation of workers' demand and can also provide an ideological base which trade unions in western countries lack, because their leaders are worker-leaders, who are not that highly educated.

The National Commission on Labour has put the problem of outsiders from the worker's point of view thus. It says: "A worker is not too worried whether his leader is an 'outsider' or an 'insider' or what the definition of term should be. To him, a person who has the worker's cause at heart is as much an 'insider' as the operative who works on a neighbouring machine. The question is again who can deliver the goods." (1969:35)

Gandhiji also was not opposed to outsider-leadership in trade unions. On the contrary he saw the need for such leadership (cf. Majmudar, 1970:50). But he emphasized that such leaders should not take to politics and should stick to truth, give proper guidance and work for the amelioration of the workers.

In the context of the controversy about the outsiders in trade unions, the respondents were asked to give their opinion on the following statement "It is not in the interest of workers to have outsiders in-charge trade union:" The information is presented in Table No. 8.8.

The table shows that little less than 2/3rd of the respondents do not agree with the statement. In other words, they are in favour of having outsiders in charge of trade union. Nearly 1/3rd are not in favour of outsiders being in charge of the unions.

More outsiders than insiders are in favour of outsiders, though the difference is not very much. If we see the union-wise breakdown
### Table No. 8.8

Percentage Distributions Of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To the Statement, "It is Not In The Interest Of Workers To Have Outsiders In Charge Of Their Unions," Separately For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insidors.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNI</th>
<th>SANGH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error.*

Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.

Note: (115) (54) (25) (30) (41) (210) (251)
we find that in Mandal union, eleven out of twelve respondents are in favour of outsiders. This may be because one of the former leaders of the union who was its President had successfully won many cases of the members of the union. Moreover, the present Secretary also enjoys the trust of the members because of his selfless service. The Lalavta union also has high percentage of respondents (80%) who favour outsider leaders. This is because the union believes that political leadership is necessary in the union and political leaders are usually outsiders. Another Communist union, the Maha Gujarat Union has no outsider, in the sense that the present Secretary was previously a mill worker. Maybe, because of this situation, only five out of eleven are in favour of outsiders. TLA, Indicate and Sarni unions have majority of respondents in favour of outsiders, though none has an overwhelming majority.

The various comments offered by the respondents indicate their awareness of this problem. The TLA respondents have pinpointed the limitations of rank and file leaders and the merits of the outsiders. For instance it was said that workers are not smart; they are divided into various castes and communal groups and they lack education. On the other hand, outsiders are educated, have experience and maintain impartiality. Some said that an outsider should be a full-timer, he should have full knowledge of industry and should not be an active politician.

The outsiders were more forthright. One of them said, that if mill-owners employ experts, why not workers? Another said, that it is not necessary to have all leaders from rank and file. 'Time is yet not ripe' said a third one. A prominent outsider pooh-poohed the controversy of outsider-insider and said that the bogey of insider-outsider is raised by enemies of workers. The
idea, that outsiders should not be associated with trade unions is academically futile and practically damaging. He further added that all full-timers are insiders.

Many of the Indicate respondents felt that the leaders should be of both types. Majority of them should be insiders, because that is democratically desirable. For outsiders, it was said that they should be men of principles, must have working class ideology and they should preferably be lawyers by training. An outsider said, that outsider leaders provide a protective base which prevents an insider from being victimized. He termed outsider's role as 'necessary evil.'

The respondents from the two communist unions admitted the need of outsiders, because they (outsiders) are politically more conscious, and are required to train workers. But it was mentioned that all outsiders are not on the same par. Only those who accept the class-interest of the workers, are their real leaders.

The Mandal respondents were largely in favour of outsiders, but some of them said that workers should be trained for the job, and till that time outsiders may continue. One of them said, that in the face of legal complexities, an outsider is a 'must.' An outsider of the same union said, that those who are politically active should not be in the trade union.

The respondents of the Sarni Union were almost evenly divided on the topic, with two more respondents on the side of outsiders. Some of them wanted outsider to be educated.
preferably in law, and sympathetic to the cause of workers. One Sangh respondent also emphasized the need of a lawyer as a leader.

The above discussion points out that workers know their own limitations and also have some idea about the qualities they want to see in their leaders—whether insider or outsiders.

Since outsiders are mostly political leaders, we have asked leaders' opinion about unions' political involvement.

**Political involvement of trade unions:**

In a democratic society, trade unions as interest-groups of workers, work as pressure groups, and by sending their representatives to legislative bodies, and by promising support to the political parties, they get favourable legislation enacted for them. In this sense, political involvement of trade unions is their legitimate activity.

But in India, trade union and politics are so closely related that some have called it 'political unionism' rather than trade unionism. (Cf. Millán, 1963)

As Karnik notes, "Politics is the birth-mark of the Indian trade union movement" (1966:30). The peculiar characteristics of Indian industrial worker noted earlier necessitated the role of outsiders who were middleclass professionals. Because of their higher education they were not concerned solely with the short-term goals of wage-demands and working conditions. They felt that the real improvement would come only if the prevailing system changed. In the beginning it was colonial
rule which they wanted to change. After independence, it is the goal of socialism which has gripped their attention. All long-term goals require political action and in that sense trade union leaders become more concerned about political goals which, to their mind, help fulfill economic goals.

The political involvement of trade unions can be of three types: (1) where trade union gives rise to political party, as is the case in England, with respect to Labour Party; (2) where both trade unions and political parties are strong and independent and they seek alliance and support, as and when necessary. This is largely the case in U.S.A. and (3) where political parties give rise to or support trade unions, because of the latter's weaknesses. This is largely the case in India.

The situation in India is such that the national organizations—federations or confederations—are stronger than the constituent units and the trade union leaders at the national level are usually the political party leaders. This makes trade unions handmaid of politics. The workers' primary interests become subservient, and the political leaders use the trade unions to consolidate their political gains. The involvement of political parties also give rise to multiple unions and union rivalries.

There are exceptions to this, which only goes to prove the rule.

The political involvement of trade unions, as described above has its functions also. For instance, the workers get the benefits of many competent leaders. Often the problems of
the trade unions get solved when the demands are supported by the political parties.

Gandhiji had not approved of politicians to be in charge of trade unions. For a long time, TLA had also remained aloof from any national organization in order not to divert its attention from workers' economic and social demands. After independence TLA became member of INTUC, and up to the split in the undivided congress, it remained a major planner of labour policy of the congress government. After the split, it has started its own National Labour Party, though its support to Congress (o) has continued in spite of it.

In the context of the significance of the above topic, the respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statement about political involvement of trade union. The statement was "It is in the interest of trade unions to be with some political party because thereby their problems are solved easily". The responses are presented in table No. 8.9.

The table shows that the respondents are almost equally divided on the statement, except that those who are in favour of alliance with political parties are slightly more than those who are against it. Among the outsiders, however, the difference is wider a little and is tilted in the direction of party alliance. Since outsiders are more actively engaged in political parties, this result is but natural.

The union-wise information is indicative of the philosophy of the respective trade union. While all the respondents from
Table No. 8.9

Percentage Distributions of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To The Statement, "It is In The Interest Of Trade Unions To Be With Any Political Party Because Thereby, Their Problems Are Solved Easily," Separately For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insiders.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNI</th>
<th>SANH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undecided</strong></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.A.</strong></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(210)</td>
<td>(251)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error. Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.*
Maha Gujarat union are in favour of being with a political party; a large majority of Lalvavta and Indicate respondents also have the same opinion.

Among those who think otherwise, Mandal and Sangh are at the top. All except one of Mandal respondents and three out of four of the Sangh respondents disagree with the statement. Among the TLA respondents, little less than 2/3rd, and among the Sarni respondents, exactly 50% also believe that there should be no link with political party. Since Mandal is an independent union and Sarni union also does not have any political philosophy, it is but natural that more respondents of these two unions are not in favour of party alliance. With TLA respondents, it is the influence of Gandhian teaching and maybe, a lesson from the present political situation, in which the union disaffiliated itself from INTUC.

Some of the TLA respondents who made some extra comments said that a trade union should remain independent. Others who preferred to be with political party, said that it should be just any political party, but that which accepts the goals of TLA, or that which is wedded to Gandhian philosophy. Some said that alliance with political party should not lead to too much of party interference or exploitation by the party. There were two outsider respondents who preferred occasional support but no permanent alliance.

The Indicate union has close link with the Congress (R). The comments of some of the respondents are also in line with this reality. One insider respondent, for instance, mentioned that it is inevitable for a trade union to be with a political party, because without it worker leaders would be sold to owners. Another said
that it helps workers to stand against the owners. Two of the insiders said that trade unions should be with government. Apparently, they meant party in power.

The outsiders among the Indicate union emphasized the need of political ideology for trade union to increase the political activism of workers. One outsider and quite a few insiders also preferred independent trade union.

The two Communist unions have a distinct preference for political party. Their arguments are: An independent union is like stagnant water in a well or is like a private shop which can be opened and closed at one's own sweet will. A true union has a distinct political ideology which tries to serve the class-interest of the workers. An outsider from Lalgavta went so far as to assert that there is no difference between trade unions and political party.

The respondents of Mandal union were all against party alliance. However, there was one respondent who admitted that an independent union has no impact. Another said that workers are used as a means to serve the interest of the party leaders. A respondent from Sarni union pointed out that a small union like theirs, does not gain much through party alliance. Instead, he suggested better relations with the management.

The political party alliance is a reality for about five unions and therefore quite a large number of our respondents are familiar with the situation. It speaks of the controversial nature of political alliance with trade unions that the opinion of the respondents are so evenly divided.
Trade Union and Class-consciousness

The rise of industrial society has given birth to a class of wage-earners who are engaged in the productive processes of the industries and earn their livelihood by selling their labour. Since these wage-earners work in common work-situation, they develop a sense of belonging to the same class.

The process of arousing class-consciousness among the industrial workers depends upon the intensity and rigidity of pre-industrial social structure. In village community, caste joint family and religion are the major traditional groups, to which the workers are related. Even when they come to cities, the bonds of caste and joint family remain more or less intact. In this situation the workers remain divided on the basis of caste, language, region, and religion.

The emergence of trade union presupposes a degree of class consciousness. In India, in the absence of such consciousness, it was the middle-class outsiders who organized workers in the initial stages. Once trade unions develop, it is part of their function to make workers aware that they belong to working class. This becomes possible only when workers gradually come out of the narrow group loyalties which they have inherited from the past.

To what extent trade union leaders in Ahmedabad are aware of this problem, and whether they feel that trade unions should work in this direction, to know this the respondents were asked to give their opinion on the following statement: "One of the major functions of a trade union is to remove caste and communal differences from the workers and arouse in them class-consciousness." The respondents' responses in terms of agreement/disagreement are shown in Table No. 8.10.
Table No. 8.10

Percentage distributions of the respondents showing their agreement/disagreement to the statement, "One of the major functions of a trade union is to remove caste and communal differences from the workers and to arouse in them class-consciousness," separately for each union and for outsiders/insiders.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNI</th>
<th>SAH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100.0 100.0 100.0 [11] [12] 100.0 [4] 100.0 100.0 100.0

(115) (54) (25) (30) (41) (210) (251)

*The total is not equal to 100 percent on account of the rounding error. Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.
The table indicates that an overwhelming majority of respondents (88.8%) agree with the statement. Taking outsiders and insiders separately, we find that 90.5% of insiders agree with the statement, whereas among the outsiders the percentage is little lower than that for the insiders.

Union-wise, there is no significant difference. This is because, all trade unions talk in terms of equality of workers irrespective of their caste and creed. And to a large extent, trade union officials do not and cannot show any discrimination on caste-line. Still, however, caste differences and communal differences do exist and they operate at the time of election. They are also operative, recruiting new workers and in promotion to higher posts. If an analysis of workers' grievances be made, discrimination based on caste and community will be evident.

The TLA has remained a conservative trade union working on Gandhian line. Here, various caste associations of Vaghris, Thakors, and scheduled castes are encouraged with a view to improving their way of life. The emphasis, as some of the respondents pointed out is to bring about gradual change among their own community. But the whole approach tends to strengthen narrow loyalties of the workers at the cost of solidarity of working class.

Some of the outsiders who made extra comments, said that their union does not believe in breaking down the social structure. An insider from TLA said, that his union cannot ask him to marry his daughter to anyone outside his caste. An Indicate respondent said that in his union there are no differences. The respondents of the two communist unions said that their unions have not accepted or practised any such discrimination. The semi respondents said that
their religion does not believe in differences based on castes.

Trade union and industrial commitment.

The Predominance of caste and kinship loyalties among the members of industrial work-force, has its influence upon the industrial commitment of workers. We will, therefore, examine the opinions of respondents on this topic.

Writing about industrial commitment Myers says, "we can say than a "Committed" industrial labour force has developed when workers no longer look on their industrial employment as temporary, when they understand and accept the requirement of working as part of a group in a factory or other industrial enterprise, and when they find in the industrial environment a more adequate fulfillment of personal satisfaction than they enjoyed in the village or rural society" (1958:36) In other words, it is the acceptance of factory discipline and the conditions of urban life which constitute industrial commitment.

Essentially, the problem of industrial commitment is socio-psychological. It refers to the behavioural adjustment of the workers in an industrial environment. The process requires besides workers' own attempt, assistance by management, trade union and government.

The managerial policy about recruitment, the handling of labour-management problems and the supervisory techniques of taking work from the workers—all this is closely related to industrial commitment. As Mayers notes (1958:90-41-42), the industrialists with some exceptions, have done precious little to structure and discipline workers. On the contrary, in their short-term gains,
some have encouraged labour turnover and absenteeism, so that they don't have to make workers permanent and give them facilities due to such workers?

Trade unions, as organization of workers purported to protect their interests, also play an important role in making workers industrially committed. But the unions lack continuous and conscious membership. The politically active outsiders form many small unions which divide workers and weaken their power. The financial base of the unions with some exception is also weak. Thus, the trade unions have not been in a position to play the role mentioned earlier.

On the contrary, the multiplicity of unions has resulted into an unhealthy competition among the trade union leaders, and in order to remain in position, many trade union leaders have tended to make exaggerated demands and resorted to direct action. To curb this tendency, government had to put some restraint on such techniques through the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

The frequent resort to strikes and other direct actions like gherao, bandh, and dharna by unionized workers, had created an impression in the minds of public, as well as industrialists, that unions, far from inculcating discipline among their members, breed indiscipline. In this context, our respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a statement such as this: "Because of trade unions, workers' commitment to work has diminished." The responses of our respondents are presented in Table No. 8.11.

The statement was more in the nature of self-assessment for the respondents and it is possible that the object may not be realized, for it is not an easy thing to be objective in self-evaluation.
Table No. 8.11

Percentage Distributions Of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To The Statement, "Because Of Trade Unions, Workers' Commitment To Work Has Diminished," Separately For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insiders."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNI</th>
<th>SANH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>73.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(115) (54) (25) (30) (41) (210) (251)

*The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error.

Figures in the brackets indicate frequency.
The table shows that little less than 3/4th of the respondents do not agree with the statement. In other words, they do not think that union has diminished workers' commitment to work. More insiders than outsiders hold this view, because, for instance, it is self-evaluation, whereas for outsiders, it is evaluation of the members whom they lead.

Unionwise, there is not much variation, except that the two unions, Latvta and Barni have a sizable percentage of respondents, who agree with the statement that workers' commitment diminishes because of trade union. It is not possible to give any explanation for this variation. There was a tendency among respondents to pass the buck, in that they used to blame other unions for encouraging workers not to work. The TLA respondents were of the opinion that, rather than decreasing, workers' commitment has increased due to their union. An outsider said, that in spite of inviting abuses from the workers, their union has always asked workers to be regular, punctual and not to loiter or avoid work.

There were some who had agreed that commitment has decreased but said that diminution in commitment among workers is a part of the national phenomenon. Another said that weak management or lack of managerial abilities is the cause of it. A third one said that workers feel dissatisfied because of anti-worker policy of the management. A fourth one said that among the workers' representative, there is some tendency to shirk work, but the average worker is faithful to his work. There were some, who held that depending upon the type of union, its political orientation and philosophy, it may encourage or discourage workers to be committed.

The Indicate respondents also believed that commitment has not diminished. Those who agreed that it has diminished, tried to
find fault with others. Nearly half a dozen respondents pointed accusing finger toward TLA. Two others held management responsible for it. One of them said that management deliberately creates situation where workers cannot work. The Capitalist system was also held responsible by one respondent for lack of work commitment.

The comments were not much different by respondents of the remaining unions also. A respondent of Mandal Union said that in nationalized mills, workers' commitment has decreased. The respondents of the two communist unions held TLA for decrease in commitment. This was the view of some Sarni respondents also.

**Paternalism and Need for Union**

In a traditional society in which social change is very slow, the higher groups and lower groups tend to have relationship as it obtains between an elder and his dependent. Such a relationship is called paternalistic type and the elder takes decisions about the needs and interests of his dependent, without consulting the dependent, assuming that he knows what is in the interest of his dependent. In the same manner, the higher groups deal with the lower groups where the position of both the groups are more or less fixed and the lower groups are socially, politically and educationally not developed.

In India, this was, and is the case in rural communities. Instead of the kings and the landlords of the earlier period, the new groups, viz. employers and government, are substituted in industrial centers in India. As a result of lack of awareness, and a large mass of industrial workers in India have accepted employers/
government as their parents (mabap) and they want the latter to guide them, assist them, and protect them. The paternalistic relationship may assume a benevolent form or exploitative form. Sometimes the former is manifest and the latter is latent.

The role of trade unions is to make workers aware of their interests and needs. The employers have therefore not taken kindly to the growth of trade unions. Instead, many have started welfare programmes for the workers—without caring to know whether workers ask for them—to win them away from trade union loyalties. In spite of such programmes, as Myers (1958:96) notes, trade unions have not been averted.

However as a result of the weaknesses of most of trade unions and worker's own proclivity for paternalistic treatment, workers expect employers and government to provide all types of facilities to them.

In the context of the assumed proclivity of the workers for paternalistic treatment, the respondents were asked whether or not, they agreed with the following statement. "If employers take care of the interests of the workers, trade unions are not necessary?" The responses of our respondents on the statement are presented in table No.8.12.

The statement is very crucial in the sense that it questions the adequacy of trade union from the point of view of respondents. The table shows that large number of respondents (88.8%) do not believe that trade unions are not necessary. In terms of insider-outsider breakdown, more insiders feel the adequacy of trade unions. Outsiders are considered to be more aware because of their higher
Table No. 8.12
Percentage Distributions Of The Respondents Showing Their Agreement/Disagreement To The Statement, "If Employers Take Care Of The Interests Of The Workers, Trade Unions Are Not Required," Separately For Each Union And For Outsiders/Insiders."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>TLA</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>MANDAL</th>
<th>SARNI</th>
<th>SANGH</th>
<th>OUTSIDERS/INSIDERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(The total is not equal to 100 per cent on account of the rounding error.)*

Figures in the brackets indicate frequency."
education but a few of those who sit in the executive committees of various trade unions do not feel the need of trade unions, if employers look after the interests of the workers. This is indeed strange at the first sight. But the outsiders who have given this opinion are only three in number and they occupy minor positions in their unions.

If we see the union-wise breakdown, we find that two unions, viz., Indicate and Sarni, have more respondents, who feel that unions are not required, if employers take care of their interests. Such a view speaks of the lack of awareness of the respondents of both these unions. The Sarni union is primarily a community association and can be called a quasi-union and it is natural that it has few such respondents. The Indicate union is recently organized and the officers of the union find it difficult to recruit union-conscious workers to the executive committee, in the absence of adequate association of leaders with the members. It is to the credit of the two communist unions that they have no respondent who is not properly aware of the need of the trade union.

In the comments which some of the TLA respondents made, it was mentioned that the scope of trade union is wider than the facilities provided by the employers at the place of work. There were others who said that even the assumption that employers would provide all facilities, is by itself, untenable. They said that employers cannot be trusted. Some visualized the situation without union, saying that in the absence of their union, employers would get work from them, pay only that much wage which would be sufficient to buy handful of grams. An outsider with Gandhian leanings, said that if employers assume the role
of a trustee, then unions are not required.

The respondents of Indicate union also made comments which were more or less the same, as discussed above, except one. One of them said that unions are required so long as we have a capitalist society. Respondent of Mandal union emphasized the educational role of union and said that for that purpose, union will be required everywhere. A respondent of Lalavta union said that employers may not be required but unions will be required in all societies.

The above analysis of respondents' opinions indicate that, out of twelve different topics on which their opinions were sought, there does not seem any radical departure from what one would expect from them.

For instance, if we take the topics closely related to union and its intrinsic matters like the need of the union, the type of leadership, the link with political party, the work commitment due to trade union, and class-consciousness as the function of the union, we find that except on political involvement, respondents have heavily favoured either the existing pattern or have favoured that which normally is expected of them. The political link has become a controversial topic because the experiences of the workers are of both types i.e. they have suffered as well as gained out of such contacts.

In case of topic which relate trade union with government e.g. nationalisation, and perception of government officials' role by the respondents, there is not much departure from what one would ordinarily expect. Nationalisation in textile is a new thing and respondents have not crystalized their belief about it. Government
officials also have no favourable image even in the minds of laymen. So, literally, the trade union leaders may also share the same image.

The third group of topics - arbitration, rationalization, strike and wage-productivity, involve trade unions, employers and government. Here arbitration is favoured by a sizable majority, strike is supported by little more than simple majority, while rationalisation is seen as harmful to workers and wage. Increase and increase in productivity are also favoured by a sizable majority. The commonality of interest concerns trade union and employers and here also the responses are not different from the normal.