CHAPTER - III

Trade Union Philosophies.

Gandhiji's Philosophy.

The TLA proclaims to have committed itself totally to the philosophy of Gandhiji and hence it is imperative to study his views on socio-economic problems including those of industrial relations.

Gandhiji had an integrated conception of life and as Kriplani put it: "The unity that runs through his concrete schemes and plans makes Gandhiji's programmes a single whole. It makes of it a complete system of philosophy with its distinct ideology." For Gandhiji, Truth was the core or end and Non-violence the means for the practical realisation of his ideas. Of Truth Gandhiji used to say: "This Truth is not only truthfulness in word but truthfulness in thought also; and not only the relative truth of our conception, but the absolute truth, the Eternal principle that is God."* At the same time he held that, "Finite human beings shall never know in its fulness Truth and Love which is infinite" and therefore "as long as I have not realised this Absolute Truth, so long must I hold by the relative truth as I conceive it."* According to Dr. Mahadev Prasad, "in Gandhian Philosophy truth is static and whole but its knowledge is dynamic and realisation partial. Through intuition Gandhiji discovered the technique of Satyagraha or

* Kriplani J.B. : "The Latest Fad", P.101
and "Harijan" May 25, 1935.
as he calls it, Soul - Force to realise Truth."*

But can the Gandhian system of thought with truth integrated in all aspects of life be called a philosophy?

In the Western mode of thought philosophy means and includes intellectual speculations or models built up in a complex but highly logical and rational manner and taking up nothing to be axiomatic, so much so that if God were to appear before the philosopher and introduce himself as God he would question his credentials. And though Gandhiji used to insist that nothing of what he said should be accepted unless it could bear the test of reason, it cannot, it seems, be said that there are no axioms in his system. Many of his concepts such as those of God, Truth, Morality, Abstinence and so on, are, I believe, axiomatic. In the western conception therefore the Gandhian system may not be given the status of philosophy. But it may be able to stand up to all the three criteria of the Indian conception of philosophy namely, (a) "It is the unseen foundation upon which the structure of civilisation rests." Dr. Radhakrishnan 'Kalki' p. 29

(2) &q^3e3 3 3 The spiritual perception of the whole view revealed to Soul Sense.

(3) and &q^3e3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 It is the result of the curiosity to know the means of getting rid of the three kinds of miseries. Apropos Dr. Mahadev Prasad writes thus: "It is in this sense that Mahatma Gandhi who was impatient to attain 'Moksha' (beatitude)

* Dr. Mahadev Prasad: "Social Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi", P. 12
in this very existence had a philosophy. With this he attempted to free humanity of the aforesaid three miseries. He not only propounded a philosophy but lived it. He was realising a spiritual perception and a whole view was being revealed to his soul sense. And if, to quote Dr. Radhakrishnan again, 'this soul sight, which is possible only when and where philosophy is lived, is the distinguishing mark of a true philosopher' is true, we can boldly hold that this great practical idealist had a philosophy of his own."* 

Though Gandhiji drew for himself the largest inspiration from Hindu scriptures his attitude to life was unusually very positive. He took the world to be real and propagated incessant action. Said he: "To be true to such a religion, one has to lose oneself in continuous and continuing service of all life. Realisation is impossible without a complete merging of oneself in and identification with this limitless ocean of life."* 

The Individual of Gandhi's Conception.  

The change for the better in the social order can come about, according to Gandhiji, by the moral and spiritual improvement in individuals of which society is comprised. Gandhiji expected infinite patience from his soldier in non-violent non-co-operation, his technique of revolution. He therefore said: "With the knowledge that the soul survives the body, he (the Satyagrahi - non-violent non-co-operator) is not impatient to see the triumph of truth in the present body. Indeed, the victory lies in the ability*

*Dr. Prasad : ibid : p.4. 
to die in the attempt to make the opponent see the truth which the 'Satyagrahi' for the time-being expresses." The satyagrahi of Gandhiji's conception is similar to his ideal man described by Prof. Aldous Huxley thus: He is "nonattached to his bodily sensations and lusts. Nonattached to his craving for power and possessions. Nonattached to the objects of these various desires. Nonattached to his anger and hatred, nonattached to his exclusive loves. Nonattached to wealth, fame, social position. Nonattached even to science, art speculation, philanthrophy. Yes, nonattached to even this. Nonattachment is negative only in name. The practice of nonattachment entails the practice of all the virtues. It entails the practice of Charity (love), for example, for there are no more fatal impediments than anger (even 'righteous indignation') and cold blooded malice to the identification of the self with immanent and transcendent more than self. It entails the practice of courage; for fear (is) a painful and obsessive identification of the self with the body. (Fear is negative sensuality, just as sloth is negative malice....."* Being a practical idealist Gandhiji knew it that it was difficult to transform oneself into the Satyagrahi of his conception and therefore pointed out: "Let us be sure of our ideal. We shall ever fail to realise it but should never cease to strive for it."* He was also conscious that "what a few may do, others will copy and the movement will grow like a coconut of the mathematical problem." ("Hind Swaraj" p.86).

* Aldous Huxley: "Ends and Means.", p.4
* "Speeches of Mahatma Gandhi", p.301
Conceptions of Social Order:

As is known, with the advent of the industrial revolution, machines came to be substituted for men, production began on a large scale and became centralised and the society was divided into two classes of the proletariat living by selling labour and the capitalist owning means of production. In course of time capitalists made peasants also dependent upon their mercy and began to exploit the have-nots and consequently there emerged violent conflicts between the capitalistic haves and the oppressed have-nots. According to Marx and Engels --- "The Communist Manifesto" pp. 43-44 --- these conflicts were a projection of the uninterrupted, now hidden now open fights in history between freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guildmaster and journeyman, which resulted in a revolutionary reconstitution or in the common ruin of contending classes.

According to Marx, the mode of production of material life determines the social, political and intellectual processes in general. Says he, "In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum of total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society.".

How was the strife between the capitalist and the

*Marx in preface to the "Critique of Political Economy".*
proletariat in society with these economic relationships predominating it to be done away with?

Gandhiji's and Marx's approaches to this question stand in sharp contrast. Communists believe that the root cause of the said strife lies in the selfishness of man, in his attachment to means of production and property and if through fierce class wars capitalists could be deprived of the means of production and the dictatorship of the proletariat be established, man's selfishness and its companions violence and hatred would be banished. Apropos "Socialism Scientific and Utopian," may appropriately be quoted verbatim. Says it: "The proletariat seizes the public power and by means of this power transforms the socialised means of production, slipping from the hands of bourgeoisie into public property. By this act, the proletariat frees the means of production from the character of capital hitherto borne by them, and gives their social character complete freedom to assert itself. ------ Man, atlast the master of his own form of social organisation, becomes at the same time, the lord over nature, master of himself, free.....".

Engels was Optimistic that the society that will reorganise production on the basis of the free and equal association of the producers will put the machinery of the State into its proper place viz. in the museum of antiquities by the side of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe. * Contrary to the beliefs of Marx and Engels, history has proved that social tensions increase and the dignity of men diminishes, vanishes to put it correctly, where the means of production

*Marx and Engels: "Selected works", p.292
are socialised and put under the tender and gentle care of the mighty state. Possibly the flaw in the analysis of Marx and Engels was that they failed to understand that it was easier to kick wealth than power and authority.

Gandhiji's solution to the problem of social conflicts referred to, had as its basis morality, religion, scrupulously truthful behaviour and love for man transcending human limitations. It has been already pointed out that Gandhiji firmly believed it that social betterment cannot come about without individuals' ascendance over his basic and instinctive limitations. He wanted individuals to develop specifically the qualities of truthfulness, abstience, the control of the palate, non-stealing, non-possession, fearlessness, removal of untouchability, bread-labour, tolerance, humanity and 'swadeshi', meaning the determination to use goods produced in one's own country by hands as far as possible and inevitably by simple machines. The powerful technique of social reorganisation that Gandhiji has bequathed to us is non-violent non-cooperation with all exploitation and evil. In the vernacular it is equated with "Satyagraha" i.e. holding fast to truth. But before analysing his technique of non-violent non-cooperation we may examine his views on industrial problems and relations.

How conscious Gandhiji was about the dignity of the employee is revealed by his quotation cited below. For he wrote: "The surprise to me is that any person can still remain in an office where he cannot follow his religion or maintain self-respect."

*Young India : 3-17-27* p. 348
Gandhiji was proved of calling himself a labourer and identifying himself with workers. He said to workers thus: "I think I told you last year ..... that I consider myself a fellow-labourer like you..... I entertain (such) great respect for the dignity of labour that I have thrown in my lot with the labourers and for many, many years now I have lived in their midst like them labouring with my hands and with my feet."* Gandhiji also characterised himself as an expert in organising strikes.*

Wages:

Gandhiji's comments upon Umpire Zaveri's award in 1929 on the demand of the Ahmedabad workmen for the annulment of wage cut of 1923, are very interesting. In the Young India of 12-12-'29, he wrote thus: "The Umpire's judgment is a preparation evidencing a careful study of facts of the case, and is a bold enunciation of the doctrine that when the worker does not get enough wages to enable him to maintain a suitable standard of living, he can ask his employer to pay him wages which would enable him to do so. The contention advanced by labour for the past many years and denied by employers that it is entitled to a living wage has been wholly accepted, as I maintain it was bound to be by the Umpire...... The only explanation I can discover from this discrepancy between the finding on the theory and the actual enforcement in terms of wages is that the umpire was afraid of his own finding or that he hesitated to condemn even by implication, the action of millowners in making the cut in 1923, and that too not by arbitration, but by an arbitrary."

*Speeches, and writings of Mahatma Gandhi, p.1045 & Young India of 10-5-28, *Harijan 20-4-40.
exercise of their power to coerce labour ... The question of a cut can occur, if at all, when wages are so good as to leave a margin after paying for living expenses and the industry concerned has to face an actual deficit." Therefore dissatisfied though he was with the verdict of Umpire Zaveri, Gandhiji wedded to arbitration, did not advise workers to throw the award by the window and strike work. On the contrary he implored them to submit cheerfully to the umpire's decision and perseveringly and peacefully work for the "balance", i.e. the gap between the actual and the wage necessary for subsistence. The concept of the living wage has become current in the terminology of labour economics fairly recently. But at least twenty years ahead of the actual acceptance of the necessity of paying to workers living wages, Gandhiji had been striving to regard the payment of living wages as essential.

In his differing award with the co-arbitrator on the MOA's proposal for a wage cut made in 1936, Gandhiji presented certain principles on wages. He did so as a result of his close and unbroken contact with the industry for a period of eighteen years in the capacity of an arbitrator. Those principles were these:

(a) "No cut should be made till mills have ceased to make any profit and are required to fall back upon their capital for continuing the industry."

(b) "There should be no cut till wages have reached the level adequate for maintenance. It is possible to conceive a time when workmen have begun to regard the
industry as if it were their own property, and they would then be prepared to help it out of a crisis by the barest maintenance consisting of a dry crust and working day and night. That would be a voluntary arrangement."

(c) "There should be a common understanding as to what should be included in determining a living wage."

(d) "The consideration of the deterioration in individual mills cannot form a part of a case for a cut in the wages of labour in general."

(e) "It is vital to the well being of the industry that workmen should be regarded as equals with shareholders and that they have therefore, every right to possess an accurate knowledge of the transactions of the mills."

(f) "There should be a register of all available mill hands acceptable to both the parties and the custom of taking labour through any agency other than the TLA should be stopped."

Gandhiji was of the view that no scheme of automatic adjustment of wages was possible without reference to his above-mentioned maxims but at the same time he held that his decision as an arbitrator in the wage dispute of 1936, was not guided by them. When in his Umpire's award, Sir Govindrao Madgaonkar characterised these maxims as idealistic, Gandhiji rebelliously reacted thus: "Of course it was no part of his duty as Umpire to examine or refer to them at all .... But having referred to them at all, the learned Umpire
might have shown how or why they were idealistic." With these as sorts of prefatory remarks, Gandhiji justifies the said principles in the Harijan of 13-2-'37 with superb lucidity and force.

Gandhiji did not commit himself to the living wage for workers aimlessly. The following passages clearly unfold his high motive in the striving for securing it. Addressing Ahmedabad workers he said: "We cannot become rich merely by getting more wages, nor is becoming wealthy the all in all. Ansooyabehn has not dedicated her life to you merely for the purpose of securing for you better wages. Her object in doing so is, that you may get enough to make you happy, to make you truly religious, that you may observe the eternal laws of ethics, that you may give up bad habits such as drinks, gambling, etc., that you may make good use of your earnings, that you may keep your houses clean and that you may educate your children."

"It is now the time to examine the use we should make of the increasing wages and hours saved. It would be like going into the frying pan out of the fire to use the increase in wages in gam-shop, and hours saved in the gambling dens. The money received, it is clear, should be devoted to the education of our children, and the time saved to our education. In both these matters the millowners can render much assistance. They can open cheap restaurants for the working men where they can get cheap milk and wholesome refreshments. They can open reading rooms and provide harmless amusements and games for them. Provided such healthy
surroundings, the craving for drink and gambling will leave them. Thus unions also should attempt similar things. They will be better employed in devising means of improvement from within than in fighting the capitalists."

Words of Advice to Workers:

Complimenting workers Gandhiji pointed out: "And it is my universal experience that as a rule labour discharges its obligations more effectively and more conscientiously than the master who has corresponding obligations towards the labourers." He also defended labour time and again, as the passage quoted below reveals, against charges levelled against it by capital. At one time defending workers he said: "The Millowners tell me that the mill hands are lazy, they do not give full time to their work and they are inattentive. I for one cannot expect attention and application from those are called upon to work twelve hours per day." But Gandhiji was very judicious and perfectly aware of the limitations of workers. He not only did not pamper them in season and out of season but whenever it was opportune, he would advise them to improve their behaviour. We have seen than in the passage quoted above he pleaded for the reduction in hours from twelve to ten. Having done that, he hastened to advise workers thus: "But I would certainly hope that when hours are reduced to ten, the labourers will put in better and almost the same amount of work as in twelve hours... When mill hands learn

Both these passages are taken from the Young India of 28-4-20 and 5-5-20. In these articles Gandhiji elaborately advises workers to develop their moral faculty.
to identify themselves with the interest of the millowners
they will rise and with them will rise the industries of our
country."

In an article in the Young India dated 10-9-'25 it
had been pointed out that Gandhiji was sorry to learn that
workers' way of life was so improper that they were required
to borrow so heavily as they did. He told workers clearly
that they could not ask for more wages, when millowners
were in serious difficulties. And further he said: "a time
may come when loyal labourers may have to come forward with
an offer to serve without any wages, in order that mills
may not close down. But I know you are not prepared for
to that day. There is not that amount of trust between you
and the millowners. You are labouring under numerous
injustices, and unless millowners have won you over by
considerate and loving treatment, you are going to do nothing
of the kind today. But that is a consummation towards which
I want you to work."

In the same spirit in the "counsel of self-help"
to workers he wrote in the Young India of 4-8-'27 thus:
"A word about internal reform. You often quarrel among
yourselves, you are given to drink, gambling and worse and
pass on the legacy to your children. If you want to qualify
yourselves for Satyagraha you must get rid of these vices.
I don't think there need be any clash between capital and
labour.... An owner never spoils his property. When you
know that the mill is as much yours as of the millowners you
will never damage your property, you will never angrily
destroy cloth or machinery with a view to squaring your
quarrel with the millowners. Fight, if you must, on path of righteousness and God will be with you. There is no royal road, I repeat, to gaining your rights, except self-purification and suffering."

**How Should Labour and Capital Behave?**

How should labour and capital behave? Warning capital, Gandhiji wrote in the Young India of 25-7-'29: "If capital is not to fall in utter discredit, it behoves capitalists voluntarily to exercise self-restraint and make common cause with labour."

In the Young India of 28-4-'27 he had characterised the disparity prevalent between labour and capital as criminal.

In his address at the time of the opening ceremony of a creche in the Raipur Mill of Shri Kastoorbhai in Ahmedabad, Gandhiji said, *"Though I have a recollection of some bitter experiences; I have also a number of sweet recollections of my relations with millowners (of Ahmedabad). I have not yet given up hope of Ahmedabad. I still expect great things of it... Ahmedabad has much to do yet towards the amelioration of the condition of the labouring class --- and so I make bold to tell you that you have not yet done your part towards your labouring population. In some cases the labourers have not been provided with even primary amenities of life. There are exceptions, however...."

"The sentiments about the welfare of mill hands that Sheth Kastoorbhai has just now uttered before you, reflect credit on him and the city of Ahmedabad. Sheth Kastoorbhai..."  
* Young India, 15-5-'28.
was delighted with Port Sunlight, and rightly. But Port Sunlight cannot be our ideal... But I should be untrue to myself and be failing in my duty to you, if I did not place before you what I regard as the highest ideal. The relation between mill agents and mill hands ought to be one of father and children or as between blood-brothers. I have often heard the millowners of Ahmedabad refer to themselves as masters and their employees as their servants. Such loose talk should be out of fashion in a place like Ahmedabad which prides itself on its love of religion and love of Ahimsa. For that attitude is a negative of Ahimsa, in as much as our ideal demands that all our power, all our wealth and all our brains should be devoted solely to the welfare of those who through their own ignorance and our false notions of things, are styled labourers or servants. What I expect of you therefore is that you should hold all your riches as a trust to be used solely in the interest of those who sweat for you, and to whose industry and labour you owe all your position and prosperity. I want you to make your labourers co-partners of your wealth. I do not mean to suggest that unless you legally bind yourselves to do all that, there should be a labour insurrection. The only sanction that I can think of in this connection is of mutual love and regard as between father and son, not of law. If only you make it a rule to respect these mutual obligations of love, there would be an end to all labour disputes, the workers would no longer feel the need for organising themselves into unions. Under the
ideal contemplated by me, there would be nothing left for our Ansooyabens and Shankerlals to do,"

In the modern world we have developed a dislike towards paternalism almost to the point of abhorrence. Gandhiji's conception of industrial relations which is essentially paternalistic is therefore likely to come in under fire. As it were to forestall his future critic for his paternalistic conception of industrial relations Gandhiji wrote in the Righteous Struggle (pp.46,47,48) thus: "Pure Justice is that which is inspired by fellow feeling and compassion. We in India call it Eastern or ancient justice. Where there is no place for fellow-feeling or compassion, it is known as devilish or Western or modern justice. Out of feeling or regard a father gives up many things for the son, and vice versa, and in so doing both eventually gain. In giving up for another, the giver experiences a feeling of pride and considers it a sign of his strength and not of weakness. There was a time in India when servants used to serve in the same household from father to son for generations. They were respected and treated as members of the family where they served. They shared the misery of the employer, and the employer was with them in their joy and sorrow. When this was the state of affairs the social order in India was simple, and it lasted for thousands of years on that basis. Even now this feeling is not altogether absent in our country. Where such an arrangement exists there is hardly any need for a third person or an arbitrator. The disputes between master
and servant are settled by both together amicably. Nor did the increase and reduction in wages or a demand for them depend on each other's need. Servants did not ask for higher wages when there was a dearth of servants, and masters did not reduce wages when the supply was plentiful. This was mainly due to mutual regard, discipline, courtesy and affection. This was not then, as it is now, considered unpractical, since such relationship between master and servant was what generally prevailed in our country. History records that many great deeds were achieved by our people because they had made this pure justice the law of their life. This is the ancient or Eastern justice.

"A totally different way of life prevails in the West today. It is not to be supposed that all persons in the West approve of modern justice. There are many saintly persons in the West who lead a life of purity, adopting the ancient standard. But in most public activities of the West at present there is no place for feeling or mercy. It is considered just that a master pays his servant, as he finds convenient. It is not considered necessary to think of the servant's requirements. So also the worker can at will make a demand, irrespective of the employer's financial condition, and it is considered just. Each thus thinks only of himself and is not bound to think of the other. The present war in Europe is fought on the same principle. Nothing is considered improper, when the enemy is to be subdued. Such wars must have been fought even in the past, but the vast masses of the
people were not involved in them. It is desirable that we do not introduce this despicable 'justice' into India. If workers make a demand merely because they feel they have the strength to do so, regardless of the employers' condition, it will mean that they have succumbed to the modern demoniacal justice. That the employers do not consider the workers' demands means that they have accepted the principle of modern justice, may be, unconsciously and out of ignorance. Mobilising forces by employers against workers is like raising an army of elephants against ants. Considering from the point of righteousness, the employers should shrink before opposing the workers. In ancient India the workers' starvation was never consciously used as the employers' opportunity. That line of action which does not harm either party to a dispute is alone justice. We have been confidently hoping that the Jain and Vaishnava employers of this Capital city of glorious Gujarat will never consider it their victory to subdue the workers or deliberately to give them less than their due. We believe that this Western influence will die out soon. At any rate, we want the workers to observe the ancient justice and its canons as we know them, and only thus do we wish to help them to secure their rights."

Despite such a utopian conception of the pattern of industrial relations Gandhiji, the practical idealist as he was, was not unaware of their prevalent patterns. In the Young India of 11-2-'20, he wrote about it as follows: "None of these conditions is satisfied today. For this both
the parties are responsible. The masters care only for the service that they get. What becomes of the labourer does not concern them. All their endeavours are generally confined to obtaining maximum service with minimum payment. The labourer on the other hand tries to hit upon all tricks whereby he can get maximum pay with minimum work. The result is that although the labourers get an increment, there is no improvement in the work turned out. The relations between the two parties are not purified and labourers do not make proper use of the increment they get."

**Organisation of Workers:**

As regards the power of labour, Gandhiji was of the opinion (the Young India of 14-1-32) that, "No matter how oppressive the capitalists may be, I am convinced that those who are connected with labour and guide the labour movement have themselves no idea of the resources that labour can command and which capital can never command. If labour would only understand and recognise that capital is perfectly helpless without labour, labour will immediately come into its own."

Gandhiji believed that "moral and social reforms amongst labourers is most difficult and taxing. It is slow work and can only be done at the hands of reformers who will live practically among their midst and by their sterling character affect the lives of mill hands for the better."*

The following extracts from the Young India of 11-2-20 from Gandhiji's writings on the organisation of workers and the role of trade unionists who are outsiders, give a good

* Young India 24-9-'25.
idea of his ideas about them. "A third party has sprung up between these two parties. It has become the labourers' friend. There is need for such a party. Only to the extent to which this party has disinterested friendship for the labourers can it befriend them.

"A time has come now when attempts will be made to use labour as a pawn in more ways than one. The occasion demands consideration at the hands of those that take part in politics. What will they choose? Their own interest or the service of labour and nation. Labour stands in sore need of friends. It cannot proceed without a lead. What sort of men give this lead will decide the condition of labour.

"Strikes, cessation of work and hartal are wonderful things no doubt, but it is not difficult to abuse them. Workmen ought to organise themselves into strong labour unions, and on no account shall they strike work without the consent of these unions. Strikes shall not be risked without previous negotiations with mill owners. If the mill owners resort to arbitration, the principle of panchayat (arbitration) should be accepted. And once panchs (arbitrators) are appointed, their decision must be accepted by both the parties alike, whether they like it or not.

"Readers, if you are interested in ameliorating the condition of labour, if you want to befriend the workman and serve him, you will see from the above that there is only one royal road before you, viz. to elevate the workmen by creating between the two parties family relationship. And to
secure this end there is no path like truth. Mere increase in wages should not satisfy you. You must also watch by what means they get it and how they spend it."

The TLA was the model trade union in Gandhiji's view. About it he said: "As to labour, I am responsible for the organisation of Ahmedabad labour. I am of the opinion that it is a model for all India to copy. Its basis is non-violence, pure and simple. It has never had a set back in its career. It has gone on from strength to strength without show. It has its hospital, its school for the children of mill hands, its classes for adults, its own printing press and khadi depot, and its own residential quarters. Almost all the hands are voters and decide the fate of elections. They came in the voters' list at the instance of the Provincial Congress Committee. The organisation has never taken part in party politics of the Congress. It influences the Municipal policy of the city. It has to its credit very successful strikes which were wholly non-violent. Millowners and labour have governed their relations largely through voluntary arbitration. If I had my way, I would regulate all the labour organisations of India after the Ahmedabad model. It has never sought to intrude itself upon the All India Trade Union Congress and has been uninfluenced by that Congress. A time, I hope will come when it will be possible for the Trade Union Congress to accept the Ahmedabad method and have Ahmedabad organisation as part of the All India Union. I am in no hurry. It will come in its own time."

Gandhiji was aware of it, that "As time progresses,
the labour world is getting more insistent in its demands which are daily increasing and it does not hesitate to resort to violence in its impatient enforcement of those demands."

He was therefore asked how employers should behave in these circumstances? As a long term solution to the harassment to owners of capital by workers Gandhiji wanted "employers willingly to regard workers as the real owners of the concerns which they fancy they have created," and "equip the employees with sound education that would draw out the intelligence dormant in them and gladly promote and welcome the power that this combination of workers gives them." But "Meanwhile what should those do who have to face the destruction wrought by strikers in their concerns?" To that his answer was this: "I would unhesitatingly advise such employers that they should at once offer the strikers full control of the concern which is as much the strikers' as theirs. They will vacate their premises not in a huff but because it is right and to show their goodwill they would offer the employees the assistance of their engineers and other skilled staff. The employers will find in the end that they will lose nothing. Indeed, their right action will disarm opposition and they will earn the blessings of their men." And if the strike of workers is unjustified on merits, Gandhiji desired that the Indian National Congress i.e. four hundred millions of India speaking through the Working Committee of the same Congress, should unequivocally denounce it.

* Harijan : 31-3-'46:
* Harijan : 18-6-'46:
Strikes.

Gandhiji wanted workers to strike only when they must. As we have seen, he wanted strikes not defensible on merits to be denounced. His conscious rebelled against making workers strike for political purposes. Very clearly he pointed out: "The labour world in India, as elsewhere, is at the mercy of those who set up as advisers and guides. The latter are not always scrupulous, and not always wise when they are scrupulous. ... And there are not wanting labour leaders who consider that strikes may be engineered for political purposes... The greatest political contribution, therefore, that labourers can make is to improve their own condition, to become better informed, to insist on their rights, and even to demand proper use by their employers of the manufacturers in which they have had such an important hand... Strikes therefore for the present should only take place for the direct betterment of the labourers' lot, and when they have acquired the spirit of patriotism, for the regulations of prices of their manufactures."

In Gandhiji's view a strike if inevitably it has to be called out after negotiations for the settlement of workers' just demand have collapsed and the demand for arbitration has been turned down or the arbitration has failed should bear the following tests.

1) The cause of the strike must be just,
2) There should be practical unanimity among strikers.
3) There should be no violence used against non-strikers.
4) Strikers should be able to maintain themselves during the strike period without falling back upon union funds and should therefore occupy themselves in some useful and productive temporary occupation.

5) A strike is no remedy when there is enough other labour to replace strikers. In that case, in the event of unjust treatment or inadequate wages or the like, resignation is the remedy.* Gandhiji was so keen on the self-maintenance by workers during the strike that at one time he said; "In all strikes that I have ever conducted I have laid down one indispensable rule that labourers must find their own support. And therein lies the secret of success and therein consists your education."* Gandhiji regarded the strike as the inherent right of workers but in his opinion it was criminal if it were continued as soon as the arbitration for the settlement of demands for which it was called out, was accepted.*

According to Gandhiji, a "pacific strike must be limited to those who are labouring under the grievance to be redressed." He was so keen on the maintenance of non-violence during the strike and could draw out such nice shades of differential aspects of it that sympathetic strikes were to him a species of violence; vide the Young India of 18-11-'26.

Replying to the question "Do you feel there is any special significance in the increasing number and magnitude

* Young India, 16-2-'21.
* Young India, 19-9-'29.
of labour strikes, especially in India of late? What do you think will be the outcome of this labour trouble in India?

In the Harijan of 22-9-'46, Gandhiji, visionary as he was, wrote: "The fundamental reason for this spreading strike fever is that life here as elsewhere, is uprooted from its basis, the basis of religion and what an English writer calls 'cash nexus' has taken its place. And that is a precarious bond. But even when the religious basis is there, there will be strikes because it is scarcely conceivable that religion will have become for all the basis of life. So there will be attempts at exploitation on the one hand and strikes on the other. But these strikes will then of a purely non-violent character." Gandhi's analysis of the causation of strikes is elemental and difficult to question. But one is not required to stretch one's nerves to understand that history has not borne out his prophesy made as above.

The Theory of Trusteeship.

The callousness of the rich used to pain Gandhi. However he was sparing in his references to them in that respect. But occasions did arise when he would flare up against the rich and the capitalist. Here are the instances of it.

"Whenever I hear of a great palace rising in any great city .... I become jealous at once and I say, Oh! this money has come from agriculturists."* "The greatest obstacle in the path of non-violence is the presence in our midst of the indigenous interests, that have sprung up from British rule..."

* Quoted from Nirmalkumar Bose's Studies in Gandhism p.84.
All these do not always realise that they are living on the blood of masses, and when they do so, they become as callous as the British principals whose tools and agents they are."

Writing on the concept of Trusteeship (in the Harijan of 1-2-'42) Gandhiji pointed out: "The monied classes have got to learn how to fight either with arms or with the weapon of non-violence. For those who wish to follow the latter way the most effective 'Mantram' is (Enjoy the wealth by renouncing it) Expanded it means, earn your crores by all means. But understand your wealth is not yours, it belongs to the people. Take what you require for your legitimate needs and use the remaining for society."

Gandhiji conceded to it that the non-acquisition and the non-possession are much better than the trusteeship of the accumulation through means not always unquestionable and as he knew that acquisition is a very powerful instinct in human beings. But taking the world as it is, he preferred to promulgate the trusteeship rather than non-acquisition.* Similarly Gandhiji was all for equal distribution but as a practical man he agreed that a talented man should earn more "if otherwise his talents are likely to be stifled." (vide the Young India, 26-11-'31).

Gandhiji did not favour the implementation of the theory of Trusteeship through violence because he believed that the society will be poorer if it were to lose the gifts of the man who knows how to accumulate wealth.° He

*Young India, 6-2-'30.
°Harijan, 3-7-'37.
therefore fancied a preference for non-violent, non-cooperation in making the rich trustees of their wealth for society. To the question whether the State was justified in taking over the inheritance of an inheritor with the minimum violence, if he refused to become its trustees, Ghandiji's answer was in the negative. He wrote: "I believe it will be justified if it uses the minimum of violence. But the fear is always there that the State may use too much violence against those who differ from it... What I would personally prefer would be not a centralisation of power in the hands of the State but an extension of the sense of trusteeship, as in my opinion violence of private ownership is less injurious than violence of the State... It is my firm conviction that if the State suppressed capitalism by violence, it will be caught in the coils of violence itself and fail to develop non-violence at any time. The State represents violence in a concentrated and organised form. The individual has a soul but as the State is a soulless machine, it can never be weaned from the violence to which it owes its very existence. Hence I prefer the doctrine of trusteeship."

A strong criticism of the theory of Trusteeship of Ghandiji reads as follows:

"The division of society into the property owning and propertyless classes which is the characteristic of capitalism is sought to be retained in Gandhism is that the capitalist, property owning class will consider itself trustee on behalf of the proletariat. The change is purely in the subjective sphere, the objective conditions of

*Quoted by N.K.Bose; ibid; pp.107-108.*
production will continue by remaining as they were in capitalism. Production will continue by unplanned private competition among the individual trustees. These conditions of production have a compelling logic of their own which lead to the same contradictions as are witnessed under capitalism today. The class appropriation of surplus value which trust production will continue in a pious guise will mean larger and larger accumulations of capital on the one hand and pauperisation of the masses on the other... These evils cannot be banished by wishing a change in the hearts and minds of the owners of property."

In the citation quoted above there is obviously a confused mixing up of ideas. What is meant however is that the trusteeship system, will suffer from the same 'contradictions' as capitalism does and secondly and in the wrong sequence, it is doubted whether the trusteeship system as conceived of by Gandhiji is likely to come into existence through the process of the change of hearts of owners of capital and workers. But at once as owners of wealth and means of production come to be convinced that their belongings are owned by society and they have to administer them on its behalf in perfect trust they will so administer them. And given for instance the Central Planning Body requesting and if necessary directing each of them how much should be produced to suit the national interest the best, it is difficult to understand how the aggregate production would not be equilibrated to the

* Quoted in Dr. Mahadev Prasad: ibid : p.195
demand for it. Very obviously in a system like this it is
axiomatic that there should be near perfect if not perfect
good faith and harmony of understanding between the Central
Planning Body and owners of capital and wealth. And they
would be created by the conception of the dominance of
national interest and the sense of trusteeship. Further in
the society in which owners of wealth agree voluntarily or
through non-violent non-cooperation to be trustees of their
belongings, more properly bailments, public opinion is found
to be so effective as to make it obligatory for the Planning
Body and owners of wealth and means of production to
understand each others problems and adjust themselves
to one another in honesty and good faith. Now as to the
practicability and the feasibility of the establishment of
the trusteeship system it can be said that in an industrial
society in which Gandhian ideas are understood in their
integration, in which attempts are made to stick to them
in attitudes and behaviours as much as is possible and in
which the effective trade union of Gandhiji's conception is
allowed to function with even the minimum of promotional
spirit, a conviction on the part of labour and capital that
they should be trustees of each other and of the society,
can and should emerge in ten to fifteen years time; not a
long period by any criterion looking at it from the point
of social good. This conviction by itself would go a long
way in the establishment of the trusteeship system. Without
faith in what Gandhiji said and achieved and without the
preparedness to abide in behaviour and attitude by Gandhiji's
ideas, to conclude that the trusteeship system is a moonshine may be a reflection of one's intellectual dishonesty or basic mental maladjustment.

Non-violent Non-Cooperation:

In his The Communist Manifesto, Marx made it clear that the social revolution for removing social tensions and conflicts and establishing the social order based on justice was not possible without the use of force and violence. He said: "The communists disdain to conceal, their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution."* Marx nevertheless was at times doubtful about the inevitability of the revolution. But to Lenin force was the midwife of every old society pregnant with the new one.* In a more eloquent way Nietzsche sang the song of violence thus: "Who can attain to anything great if he does not feel in himself the force and will to inflict great pain? The ability to suffer is a small matter. In that line weak women and slaves often attain masterliness. But not to perish from internal distress and doubt when one inflicts great suffering and hears the cry of it - that is great, that belongs to greatness.

"Living... that is continually to eliminate from ourselves what is about to die. Living, that is to be cruel and inexorable towards all that becomes weak and old in ourselves, and not only in ourselves. Living that means* Marx : Communist Manifesto. pp. 98-99
* Quoted by Dr. Prasad : ibid : p.120
therefore to be without pity towards dying, the wretched and old. To be continually a murderer? And yet old Moses said; 'Thou shalt not kill!' Be robbers and spoilers, ye knowing ones, he exclaims, as long as you cannot be rulers and possessors. War is an index of health, a time when feelings of prodigality, sacrifice, hope, confidence, extraordinary audacity and enthusiasm burst forth abundantly. War barbarises and so makes men more natural — it is a sleep of the winter period of culture; man emerges from it with greater strength for good and evil."* George Sorel said: "Every conflict which gives rise to violence becomes a vanguard fight... each time they (strikers) come to blows the strikers hope that it is the beginning of the great Napoleonic battle (that which will definitely crush the vanquished); in this way the practice of strike engenders the notion of a catastrophic revolution."

The genesis of reliance on violence even if it is for the supposed benevolent purpose of creating "force necessary to put down the imperialist opposition which is violent"* lies in the philosophies of materialism propounded in the nineteenth century. In this respect C.E.M. Joad points out thus: "Copernicus abolished the primacy of man's planet in the universe, Darwin abolished the primacy of man within his planet and materialistic psychology abolished the primacy of mind within the man. To the general disparagement of the importance of life initiated by biology and psychology, geology and astronomy were only too ready to contribute....

*From F.W.Nietzsche's Joyful Wisdom quoted by Dr.Prasad.
*Quoted by Dr.Prasad.
See V.A.Kulkarni:Satyagraha—A dead weapon; in N.K.Bose:Studies
Thus in the vast immensities of astronomical space and geological time life seemed like a tiny glow, a feeble and uncertain flicker. Destined one day, when the heat of the sun had cooled to such an extent that earth was no longer able to support life, to be ignominiously snuffed out in the one corner of the universe which had known it.

"Life, then if materialists are right, is to be regarded not a fundamentally significant thing in the universe in terms of which we are to interpret the rest, but as an incidental product thrown up in the haphazard course of evolution, a fortuitous development of matter by means of which matter has become conscious of itself. It is an outside passenger, travelling across a fundamentally hostile environment, a passenger moreover who will one day finish his journey with as little stir as once in the person of an amoeba he began it."

As against these views of Marx and others quoted above, Gandhiji maintained that, "Social justice even to the least and lowest is impossible of attainment by force."

"The two opposing forces are wholly different in kind, the one moral and spiritual, the other physical and material. The one is infinitely superior to the other which by its very nature has an end."

Further, the spiritual force, according to Gandhiji, lies dormant in many but it is capable of being awakened by judicious training. According to Gandhiji, the technique of resisting the evil and awakening

\*C.W. Joad: Guide to Modern Thought, pp. 46-47
B. Harijan of 10-2-1946.
C. Harijan of 10-2-1946.
the man in man, was non-violent non-cooperation. When a satyagrahi decides to non-cooperate with the evil, exploitation or injustice, he is fearless, calm and steady. Because of a different belief, training or experience, he has much self control. He does not respond to the attacker's violence with counter-violence. He states his belief as to the truth of the matter in dispute. He asks for an examination - an objective one - of both the sides of the dispute and is ready to abide by the truth. He offers resistance but only in moral terms. He is ready to prove his sincerity by his own suffering rather than by inflicting suffering on the assailant or the opponent. He accepts blow after blow, showing no signs of fear or resentment. He keeps steadily good humoured. He is kindly in look of eye, tone of voice and posture of body and arms. To violence he offers such non-violent resistance."

Knowing that notwithstanding all suffering and degradation which comes up along with it, war promotes qualities of responsibility, co-ordinated endeavour, comradeship, courage and enthusiasm the psychologist William James tried to find out a moral equivalent of war. But people did not pay heed to his ideas. It may be noted that the satyagraha is not a substitute for war. It is war itself shorn of its many ugly features and is guided by a purpose nobler than that associated with destruction. Clausewitz's principles of war, namely "retaining the

* R.B. Gregg : Power of Non-Violence p.41
initiative, using the defensive as the decisive form of action, concentration of force at the decisive point, the determination of that point, the superiority of the moral factor to purely material resources, the proper relation between attack and defence and the will to victory are all, according to Mr. Gregg, "The Power of Non-violence", pp. 113-114, retained in the Satyagraha.

It is difficult to understand how Gandhiji who was scrupulously careful on the observance of even relatively minor aspects of the Satyagraha, because he conceived of it as being an organic whole whose every aspect had an importance of its own, could pronounce thus: "My business is to refrain from doing any violence myself and to induce by persuasion and service as many of God's creatures as I can, to join me in the belief and practice. But I would be untrue to my faith if I refused to assist in a just cause any men or measures that entirely did not coincide with the principle of non-violence." In an expression of himself like this, possibly the politician in the Mahatma was outwitting the saint in him.

The Satyagraha being not an end but a means for the prevalence of truth and justice, Gandhiji used to consider it as a progressive educational method. Precisely that is why the non-violent army, according to him, should not be open only to those who enforce its principles in their lives but to all who accept them, that is they are prepared to abide by them in non-violent non-cooperation faithfully and
sincerely. Gandhiji had pointed out: "If I had started with men who accepted non-violence as a creed, I might have ended with myself." According to Neopolean discipline formed seventy five percent of elements that go to make the success in the battle. Similarly the army of non-violent non-cooperation imperfectly subscribing to its principles might achieve the limited objective for which the Satyagraha might be waged. But it is essential to bear in mind that the Satyagraha is a sublimated form of war and not war itself. Unlike in marxism the objective of the Satyagraha is the change of will and not habit. The Satyagraha carried out by an army which does not wilfully, sincerely and wholly subscribe to the theory of it may be converted into the self righteous holding fast to the half truth or the untruth which are non-existent in the long run and might do more harm than good. Moreover times without number Mahatmaji had pointed out that the Satyagraha is a qualitative and not quantitative affair. Commenting for instance on the Rajkot Satyagraha, Gandhi had said: "I think the initial mistake was made when all Kathiawaris were permitted to join Rajkot Satyagraha. Thereby we put our reliance on numbers whereas a Satyagraha relies solely upon God who is the help of the helpless." Therefore the army of satyagrahis should as far as possible consist of people who accept its theory with openness, intelligence, a good deal of sincerity and humility.

A cardinal principle of the Satyagraha is that it

should not be launched or carried out with the external assistance and the satyagrahis should stand absolutely on their own or find out an alternative avocation for themselves during the period of the Satyagraha. That is why, when during the strike of 1918, Ahmedabad weavers were offered an assistance of Rs.50,000, Gandhiji had politely but firmly rejected it and asked the needy weavers to make their living temporarily, by helping in the construction of the 'Sabarmati Ashram'. At one stage Gandhiji had said: "Labourers look to pecuniary support from their unions for maintenance. No labour can prolong a strike indefinitely so long as labour depends on the resources of its unions and no strike can absolutely succeed which cannot be indefinitely prolonged. In all strikes that I have ever conducted, I have laid down one indispensable rule that labourers must find their own support. And therein lies the secret of success and therein consists your education. You should be able to perceive that if you are able to serve one master and command a particular wage, your labour must be worthy and fit to receive that wage anywhere else. Strikers therefore cannot expect to be idlers and succeed.(A) He also said: "What is the meaning of satyagraha if workers join the struggle thinking that you will give them money for it or support them with your money? The real secret of satyagraha lies in bearing cheerfully the difficulties.

---

it may entail. The more a satyagrahi suffers the more he is tested." (B)

It is likely that Gandhiji wanted a satyagrahi to suffer to the utmost because basically he believed it that the more he suffers the more does he gain for his cause. In respect of Gandhi's view that a Satyagrahi should suffer the most to gain for the cause for which he fights, Mr. Gregg has an interesting explanation to offer. It is read thus:

"Probably the nervous system is more responsive to stimuli associated with pain than to any other type of stimulus. Hence the sight of suffering causes an involuntary sympathetic response in the nervous system of the beholder especially the automatic nervous system." (C)

Gandhiji believed that a Satyagrahi must fight for a clean cause with clean hands and there can be no Satyagraha for an unjust cause or in defence of ill-gotten gains and immoral acts. (D) Further Gandhiji was firmly convinced that the demand of the satyagrahi should be pitched the lowest. In this respect Mr. N. K. Bose points out thus: "Bring your demand to its lowest proportions without sacrificing truth and justice. In other words, distinguish carefully between what is essential and what is not in the demand. Submit your demand constantly to public examination and criticism. All that is found not absolutely essential should not be made a cause of satyagraha." * But Gandhiji wanted that once the satyagrahi is convinced on an objective

---

B. M. H. Desai "Righteous struggle" p. 20
C. R. B. Gregg: ibid: p. 53
D. Young India: 27-4-'21 and 'Harijan' 5-9-'36.
examination of facts of the case and the capacity of the
other party to satisfy his demand, that his demand is the
minimum, he should not reconcile himself to an achievement
of anything lesser than what he had demanded.

But many a time in his struggle and experiments with
truth Gandhiji had reconciled himself to an achievement
of something less than what he had earlier promulgated to be
the irreducible minimum. For example during the righteous
struggle for weavers of Ahmedabad mills in 1918, Gandhiji
implored them, even made them pledge themselves to accepting
nothing less than 35 per cent increase in wages. But in
order to terminate the long and drawn-out struggle with mill-
owners he had himself advised weavers to agree to accept
a 20 per cent increase in wages for one day and a 27% per cent
increase in wages pending the publication of the award of the
arbitrator. Why Gandhiji compromised even on the minimum
demand has been enigmatic to not a few persons including
the writer of this. The explanation of the puzzling
phenomenon in Gandhiji's life is to be possibly sought in it
that Gandhiji believed that one should fight only when one
must and essentially he was a man of compromise. It is
also necessary to bear in mind that Gandhiji was a great
optimist and might be thinking that what one forgoes out
of the minimum would be only temporary. And life being a
continuous process of struggling one would achieve the
balance of the minimum demand in another round of struggle.
It is also necessary to note that Gandhiji was always
prepared to compromise on the minimum demand if the decision of the arbitrator warranted him to do so.

Gandhiji wanted the satyagrahi to be ever ready to negotiate with the party he is called upon to stand up against. "It would not do," he said, "for a satyagrahi to argue that the approach should be mutual. That assumes the existence of the spirit of satyagraha in authorities (the other side), whereas satyagraha is offered in respect of those who make no claim to be satyagrahis. Hence the first and the last work of a satyagrahi is ever to seek an opportunity for an honourable approach." Further Gandhiji wanted a satyagrahi never to lose hope so long as there is the slightest ground left for it and used to quote the instance of his achievement with General Smutts in South Africa.

In war surprise is the most powerful element of victory. In his Satyagrahas often Gandhiji used to introduce the element of surprise by fasting and if necessary promulgating that it would be unto death. And he used to carry the day. Though Gandhiji used to claim that his fasting was an entirely private affair in order "to come face to face with God by crucifying flesh" it used to sway the public opinion in his favour tremendously. Gandhiji was careful to see that his fasts would not coerce the other party. Apropos it is pointed by Mr. Mahadevbhai Desai in the "Righteous struggle", Pp.62-63: "His vow is not intended to

* Harijan : 10-6-'39
* Harijan : 27-2-'40
influence employers. If the fact is conceived in that spirit it will adversely affect our struggle and honour. We want justice from employers, not pity. If Gandhiji exploited his relation with the employers or the community in this manner, it would be a misuse of his position and he would lose his prestige. "During the satyagraha of 1913, Gandhiji was aware of the coercive effect of his fasts on employers and therefore prepared himself to compromise even on his minimum demand.*

Gandhiji would go on fast during the Satyagraha in order interalia to strengthen the morale of satyagrahis. The "Righteous struggle" apologies for Gandhiji's fasting during the satyagraha of 1918 thus also: "Gandhiji thought that if he fasted, it would show how much he himself valued his pledge. Moreover workers were talking of starvation. 'Starve but keep your vow' was Gandhiji's message to them. He at least must put his message into practice. Besides workers would not work (in the alternative) employment provided to them and wanted financial help. This was a terrible thing. Only in one way could Gandhiji effectively demonstrate to workers that suffering involved in work should not be avoided. He himself should suffer."*

An able general always keeps up the initiative and does not allow it to pass off into the hands of the enemy. In the Satyagraha, the war of love, though the opponent is not the enemy, neither party is defeated and

---

* Righteous Struggle, p. 32.
* Righteous Struggle, p. 63.
* Harijan : 27-7-'39.
ultimately both of them are supposed to win, yet like the general the satyagrahi must know "whether to advance or retreat, offer civil resistance or organise non-violent strength, constructive work or purely selfless humanitarian service... according to exigencies of situation." If the satyagraha gives way to violence and has to be abruptly wound up as it had to be due to riots in Bombay in 1921 and in Chauri Chaura in 1922, there should be no heart burning to the leader of it. Gandhiji believed that if the satyagraha had to be wound up due to upsurge of violence it was not its failure. It only implied that satyagrahis had not properly understood its spirit and were not yet trained up. In this respect Gandhiji points out that satyagrahis must have "the faith that it is all for the best. My own experience hitherto has been that each suspension has found the people better equipped for the fight and control over forces of violence. I dismiss from my mind the fear that it may lead to desertion and disbelief."

Gandhiji wanted that the satyagraha must be carried out in all openness and no secrecy and must be launched after satisfying oneself that the satyagrahis are prepared to suffer to the maximum extent and identify themselves with their cause like sugar in milk*. That is why Gandhiji's dictum that he only who has mastered the art of obedience to law should launch the movement of disobedience.*

*Harijan: 1-4-'39
*Harijan 14-5-'38 and 4-11-'39.
*Young India 5-11-'39.
The idea underlying the Satyagraha is to awaken the sense of justice in the wrong-doer and to convert him. The Satyagraha does not aim at coercing him into conceding to the demand. Should the wrong-doer entertain an awful apprehension of the satyagrahi or his technique? To that Gandhiji replied, characteristically thus: "I can understand 'ahimsa' (non-violence) inspiring a kind of fear, the sort of fear a mother feels when her child gets offended and goes to sleep hungry without taking any food. But genuine satyagraha should never excite contempt in the opponent even when it fails to command regard or respect." That of course does not mean that the Satyagraha should aim at keeping the other party's temper unruffled or humouring him. Far from it, since the Satyagraha is the process of extricating the evil out of minds, its repercussions are bound to disturb him for sometime. But the fundamental test of whether the Satyagraha has been a war of love or not is that after it gets over it should not leave the slightest trace of bitterness in the minds of parties who might have once combatted with each other without the fullest strength, vigour and tensions.

How the Satyagraha can convert the wrong-doer is a question most likely to arise. Below is rendered its explanation as offered by Mr. Gregg.

The wrong-doer would attack the satyagrahi assuming him to be a coward. But if he finds him fearless, the contempt for him would give way to wonder and curiosity. In support of his view, Mr. Gregg quotes the psychologist Shand who
maintains that, "wonder tends to exclude repugnance, disgust and contempt in relation to its objects." Further if the satyagrahi remains steady because he has a creative purpose, the attacker would lose his moral balance due to the confusion caused by the miscalculation of the satyagrahi's personality and power. Further, due to anger, the attacker's energy would be depleted. And steadfast appeals of the non-violent resister would arouse his kindly and decent motives putting them into conflict with his fighting, aggressive instincts. With the audience and beholders as a sort of a mirror, he would realise the contrast between his own conduct and that of the victim. His hesitance would increase. Moreover the satyagrahi's refusal to use violence and impure means would indicate to him his respect for his (the assailant's) personality and moral integrity. On the authority of McDougal and Transley, Mr. Gregg concludes that this self-respecting sentiment expressed by the resister for the wrong-doer would become the foundation of the rise of the higher morality in the latter. According to Mr. Gregg, normally the wrong-doer is likely to be filled with a sort of cruelty, (a complex of fear, anger and pride) greed, (the distorted desire for security and completion) and pride, (the mistaken sense of divisiveness) and bigotry (i.e. the obstinate religious pride). And the tendency of the satyagrahi is to remove from him fear, anger and any foreboding or sense of separateness and to replace them by a sense of security, unity, sympathy and goodwill. Through, therefore his conduct of love, the satyagrahi uproots from the minds of the other party fear, anger, hatred, indignation, pride, vanity, scorn,
contempt, disdain, disgust, anxiety, worry and apprehension. No counter-attack from and the withstand of the attack by the satyagrahi, strongly stimulate the wrong-doer's imagination in the subconscious and set it in conflict with his own conscious will. And from this, on the authority of Baudouin, Mr. Gregg concludes that "when will and imagination are at war, imagination invariably gains the day." According to Mr. Gregg, a further related process affecting the attacker, is his unconscious imitation of the attacked. For when an attacker watches his victim's actions and comes to respect his courage, he unconsciously begins to imitate him. According to Mr. Gregg, another largely unconscious process at work is the creative power of trust and expectation evinced by the resister; he tries to give concrete and repeated evidence of his trust in the decency and the reasonableness of the wrong-doer and of his expectation that this fine spirit, perhaps latent at start will grow stronger duly. All these will convert the wrong-doer into a non-violent kindly person. Then comes into operation what is known in psychology as the stage of integration. It consists of working out a wholly new solution which satisfies all or most of the fundamental desires and needs of parties at variance and utilises the energies of both of them without balking or suppressing them.

Having dealt at such length with the potency of non-violent non-co-operation, possibly nothing fundamental remains to be said about it. If nevertheless a question is asked, 'how can workers obtain justice without violence?'
and it was addressed to Gandhiji in the Victoria Hall in Geneva – the writer would like the questioner to refer to its classic answer by Gandhiji in the Young India of 14-1-32.

Therein Gandhiji said: "In my humble opinion labour can always vindicate itself if labour is sufficiently united and self-sacrificing. No matter how oppressive the capitalists may be, I am convinced that those who are connected with labour and guide the labour movement have themselves no idea of the resources that labour can command and which capital can never command. If labour would only understand and recognise that capital is perfectly helpless without labour, labour will immediately come into its own.

"We have unfortunately come under the hypnotic suggestion and the hypnotic influence of capital. So that we have come to believe that capital is all on this earth. But a moment's thought would show that labour has at its disposal capital which capitalists will never possess.... There is in English a very potent word, and you have it in French also, all languages of the world have it – it is 'NO' and the secret that we have hit upon is that when capital wants labour to say 'yes' labour roars out 'NO' if it means 'NO'. And immediately labour comes to recognise that it has got the choice before it of saying 'Yes', why it wants to say 'yes' and 'No', when it wants to say 'No', labour is free of capital and capital has to woo labour. And it would not matter in the slightest degree that capital has guns and even poison gas at its disposal. Capital would still be perfectly
helpless if labour would assert its dignity by making good its 'NO'. Then labour does not need to retaliate but labour stands defiant receiving the bullets and poison gas and still insists upon its 'NO'. The whole reason why labour so often fails is that instead of sterilizing capital as I have suggested, labour wants to seize that capital and become capitalist itself in the worst sense of the term."

The Philosophy of the AITUC.

The Mill Kamdar Union of Ahmedabad affiliated to the AITUC controlled by communists, would in general, it is presumed, abide by Lenin's views on the role of trade unionism in capitalistic countries. On the admission of Mr. Dange, "total development" in India, "is towards capitalism": whether it is or not is out of question. In what follows are therefore presented Lenin's views on trade unions."

Lenin held that the only solution to workers' problem lay in their joining "together for the struggle with the factory owners for higher wages and better living conditions."* Explaining the advantages of strikes Lenin wrote thus:

"Every strike concentrates all the attention and all the efforts of the workers first on the one and then on another evil from which the working class is suffering. Every strike gives rise to a discussion of these evils and helps the workers to appraise them, to understand where the oppression of the capitalists comes in ..... and to learn how to fight against

---

* S. A. Dange: "For defence of motherland T.U. Unity and Socialism" p. 5
* T. T. Hammond: Lenin on Trade Unions and Revolution 1897-1917
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this oppression. Every strike gives more experience to the whole of the working class. If the strike is successful, it reveals the strength that lies in the unity of workers and stimulates others to take advantage of the success of their fellow workers.

Lenin did not want strikes to be organised against a single employer or a group of employers but against the whole of the employing class. He wrote: "As capitalism grows and strikes become more frequent, strikes become inadequate. The employers take common measures against strikes ... It is no longer a single employer that confronts the workers in a particular factory, but the whole capitalist class, and the Government which helps it... The unity of workers in a single factory or even in a single branch of industry, is no longer adequate to resist the whole capitalist class; it becomes absolutely necessary to exert the joint efforts of the whole of the working class."

Lenin wanted Social Democrats to "take part in all the spontaneous manifestations of the struggle of the working class, in all the conflicts between the workers and the capitalists over the working day, wages, conditions of labour, etc." "Our task", he said, "is to merge our activities with the practical everyday questions of working class life, to help the workers to understand these questions, to draw the attention of workers to the most abuses, to help them to formulate their demands to the employers more precisely and
practically, to develop among the workers a sense of solidarity, to help them to understand the common interests and the common cause of all the Russian workers as a single class representing the international army of the proletariat."

The above promulgation by Lenin of the role of Social Democrats as regards trade unionism is incomplete and not comprehensive. By itself it smells more reformism than revolutionism. The latter and in no way the former was Lenin's cherished goal. Much of Lenin's philosophy of labour movement was revealed and clarified in the issues which he took up with 'economists' and they may now be examined into relevant details.

Economists v Lenin:

The 'Economists' were not experts in the science of economics; they were rather a group of Russian Social Democrats who believed that greater stress should be placed on the economic side of the labour movement. They argued that there was little hope of overthrowing the Tsarist government, but that significant results could be obtained in the economic struggle against capitalists. A rise in wages today, they said, is worth more than dreams of a socialist society to be realised at some time in the indefinite future. Instead of the party trying to impose its abstract ideas on the labour movement, they said, it would be better to get in closer touch with masses of the workers and learn practical lessons from their spontaneous activities.

"Economism, in short, placed less emphasis on the

* T.T. Hammond: ibid; p. 16
political struggle and more on the economic struggle, less on the party and more on the trade unions, less on ideological questions and more on practical everyday problems, less on the importance of leadership by the Party and more on the spontaneous movement of the workers. The opposite point of view was preached by Lenin and the rest of the Politicals.

In 1902, Lenin published his famous pamphlet "What is to be Done?". It is a detailed answer to economists containing the fullest exposition of his views on trade unionism. Lenin himself later admitted that in his debate with the 'economists' he had exaggerated. The economists, he said, had bent the stick in one direction and in order to straighten the stick he had bent it in the other.

Broadly the position which Lenin took up in joining issues with 'economists' could be classified four-fold as

1. The importance and effectiveness of the economic struggle
2. Participation of workers in the political struggle
3. The economic struggle as a means of developing political consciousness, and
4. "Subservience to spontaneity" vs. "Conscious leadership."

(I) The importance and effectiveness of the economic struggle:

According to Lenin, economists held that a "kopeck added to a rubel is worth more than socialism and politics; workers must fight, knowing that they are fighting not for future generations but for themselves and their children; the trade union struggle is a struggle for the welfare of the workers and their children, and not a struggle for some kind of socialism that will be realised only in the remote future;"
the workers for workers ......, strike funds are more valuable for the movement than 100 other organisations."

Lenin's answer to the above mentioned views of economists was this: "Trade unionism and strikes, at best, can enable the workers to obtain slightly better terms of sale for their commodity - labour power. Trade unionism and strikes become impotent when, owing to a depression, there is no demand for this 'commodity'. They are unable to remove the conditions which convert labour power into a commodity... To remove these conditions it is necessary to conduct a revolutionary struggle against the whole existing social and political system."

2 Participation of Workers in the Political Struggle:

According to Lenin, economists argued that regardless of what the wishes of Social - Democratic leaders might be, it was impossible to impose on the mass labour movement.... the task of overthrowing absolutism and the only political task the workers could carry out was to struggle for immediate political demands. According to economists, said Lenin, the political movement should therefore be left to the intelligentsia and the liberals. According to Lenin, economists further maintained that if the economic struggle were developed sufficiently, the political struggle would automatically be taken care of, because Marxism had taught that "politics always obediently follows economics."

To these arguments Lenin's reply was this: "The workers cannot wage the struggle for their emancipation without striving to influence affairs of the State.... the
administration of the State, (and) the passing of laws... The
workers' struggle against the capitalists must inevitably bring
them into conflict with the government... Therefore, the most
urgent thing the workers must do, the first thing the
working class must aim at in bringing its influence to bear
upon the government is to achieve political liberty."

To Social-Democrats Lenin's advice was that they,
"must not confine themselves entirely to the economic
struggle, they must not even allow the organisation of
economic exposures to become the predominant part of their
activities." According to Lenin they must "also" strive for
the abolition of the social system which compels the
propertyless class to sell itself to the rich."

The view of the Journal Robochee Dielo that Social
Democrats must give the economic struggle a political
character was dismissed by Lenin as reformism, and meant to
convert labour movement into an instrument of bourgeois
democracy." Later in his life Marx was dubious about the
necessity of the proletariat revolution. But Lenin
consistently favoured the revolution. He was not against
working for reforms for workers; but he was bitterly opposed
to reformism. He himself distinguished between a reformist
change and a revolutionary change thus: "A Reformist change
is one that leaves the foundations of the power of the
ruling class intact and is merely a concession by the ruling
class that leaves its power unimpaired. A revolutionary
change undermines the foundations of power." It may be just
mentioned that in giving political action an ascendancy over economic action Lenin might have even deviated from Marx. The economic struggle as a means of developing political consciousness:

Lenin did not agree with the view that the economic struggle was the most widely applicable method of creating political consciousness. According to them, "of all the innumerable cases in which workers suffer... from tyranny, violence and lack of rights, undoubtedly only a relatively few represent cases of police tyranny in the economic struggle as such." And he clearly warned Social Democrats that, "We shall not be fulfilling our task of developing the political consciousness of the workers if we do not undertake the organisation of the political exposure of autocracy in all its aspects." vide Mr. Hammond's book, page 26.

Subservience to Spontaneity vs. Conscious Leadership:

A protagonist of economism charged Lenin of "giving too little consideration to the material elements and the material environment of the movement whose interaction creates a certain type of labour movement and defines its path, from which the ideologists in spite of all their efforts, are incapable of diverting it, even if they are inspired by the best theories and programmes."

According to Lenin 'economists', "fail[ed] to understand that an ideologist is worthy of that name only when he marches ahead of the spontaneous movement, points out the road, and when he is able ahead of all others to solve all the
theoretical, political, tactical and organisational questions which the 'material elements' of the movement spontaneously encounter....consciousness participates in this interaction and creation."

To those who had argued that the mass labour movement could not be pushed from outside, Lenin replied that there had been far too little of such pushing on the part of conscious leaders who had bowed far too slavishly before the economic struggle of the workers. Lenin was therefore of the view that spontaneity of workers needs to be controlled by conscious leadership. He considered masses to be strong but obedient tools who could not work out their independent ideology. Lenin seems to be of the view that real understanding of Marxism was beyond the capacity of masses and therefore their leadership would have to be provided by the intelligentsia, bourgeois in origin.

According to Lenin, "The workers' organisation for carrying on the economic struggle should be trade union organisations.....But it would not be at all to our interests to demand that only Social - Democrats be eligible for the membership in trade unions. The only effect of this would be to restrict our influence over the masses. Let every worker who understands the necessity for organisation in order to carry on the struggle against the employer and the government join trade unions." Lenin thus favoured trade unions with a mass membership. But he wanted them to be directed and controlled, as far as possible by a secret, small, compact core consisting of reliable, experienced and hardened members.
of the Social-Democratic party. He clearly pointed out: "If we begin with the solid foundation of a strong organisation of revolutionists, we can guarantee the stability of the movement as a whole, and carry out the aims of both Social Democracy and trade unionism. If however we begin with a wide workers' organisation, supposed to be most accessible to the masses, when as a matter of fact it will be most accessible to the gendarmes... we shall achieve the aims neither of Social Democracy nor of trade unionism."

A wide organisation of workers would find it rather difficult to keep its methods secret. But Lenin was of the view that the compact organisation of the Social Democratic Party would make up for the looseness of the trade union organisation.

During the Revolution of 1905, Lenin temporarily changed his views on the relationship between the party and workers' organisation. He pointed out: "It might be thought dangerous for a large number of non-Social Democrats to join the party suddenly. (It might be thought that) if this occurred the party would become dissolved among the masses, it would cease to be a class conscious vanguard of the class..."

"......Comrades, let us not exaggerate this danger....

At the present time, when the heroic proletariat has proved by deed its readiness and ability to fight unitedly and consistently for clearly understood aims, to fight in a purely Social-Democratic spirit, at such a moment to doubt whether workers who are members of our party and those who
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will join it tomorrow ... (They) will be Social-Democrats in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. The working class is instinctively, spontaneously Social Democratic..." But very soon Lenin changed his position and reverted to his old view already mentioned earlier, so much so that when after the revolution of 1917 in Russia, workers took over the control of factories, Lenin smelt syndicalism in it. He attempted to convince the proletariat that the desirable kind of workers' control could best be effected through a central organ i.e. a Soviet government.* Later on, apropos he clearly pointed out thus: "We do not suggest anything resembling the ludicrous passing of the railroads into the hands of the railwaymen, of the leather factories into the hands of leather workers. What we do advocate is workers' control, which is gradually to develop into complete proletarian regulation of the production and distribution of goods into a 'nation-wide-organisation' of the exchange of grain for manufactured production etc. what we demand is the passing of all state power into the hands of the Soviets of workers', soldiers', and peasants' Deputies."* A.I.T.U.C. on Trade Unions:

Having thus dealt with the fundamentals of Lenin's view on trade unionism the question naturally arises as to the position of the A.I.T.U.C. in relation to it. According to the A.I.T.U.C., "The organised T.U. movement is faced with the urgent problem of the ideological building up of the working class."* Notwithstanding that the development in

---
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India: is a "bourgeois development", the AITUC claims to have taken up the position of some co-operation with the system which according to it is 'capitalistic', and "with which" they "are in contradiction." Explaining the why for of it, it is pointed out: "So we had a peculiar position which is not the same as in a purely classical capitalist or imperialist country. In an imperialist country, all these problems do not arise for the trade unions. There cannot be any question of co-operation with the bourgeoisie there because it has ceased to be national bourgeoisie; it has become imperialist, an exploiter and enslaver of colonies.

"Therefore, these relations which obtain in a newly liberated country, developing itself independently, are different..... Even the growth of its national bourgeoisie is an anti-imperialist factor. Therefore, with such a national bourgeoisie, the trade unions established special relations - relations which should exist in a non-aligned, newly independent developing country."*

Is this enunciation of its policy by the A.I.T.U.C. a deviation from its objective quoted at the beginning of this paragraph, an objective which appears to be in consonance with the Leninist line?

It appears that what would apparently look like a deviation, more so theoretically, is only a tactical move guided by environmental and practical considerations. More than ever the A.I.T.U.C. realises that the "political leadership of the masses in the national liberation movement"

*S.A.Dange: On the Indian Trade Union Movement, p.26
*S.A.Dange: For Defence of Motherland T.U.unity & Socialism, p.5
*S.A.Dange: Ibid, p.6
was not seized by the pioneers and the (communist) party, due
to inadequate understanding of the programme and the tactics
in relation to the national struggle, the role of the
bourgeoisie and its parties and the democratic front; during
the Second World War when workers demanded leadership from
us in their defence, we either lagged behind or gave wrong
slogans or in some cases even deserted the struggles" out of
the underestimated strength of the USSR and the resistance
movements and overestimated in panic the strength of
imperialism;" during the war and post war strike wave the
"party still suffered from the remnants of the previous
reformist outlook, and did not swiftly react to the new
situation to put the Party and the T.Us in fighting trim; the
sectarian adventure after the Calcutta Congress of the
Communist party, coupled with the violent suppression by the
Congress Government led to the disruption of our trade unions
and the set back to the working class."*

Secondly the A-I.T.U.C. also knows that, "Because of
the lack of mass contact, we are not able to measure the exact
influence of the I.N.T.U.C. and the Right Wing Socialists
and many a time have to depend on the spontaneous action of
the masses..."*

Thirdly the A.I.T.U.C. realises that the "bourgeoisie"
labour movement has spread wide in India and is so powerful
that the revolutionary and tactless deviations from the mood
of masses may not be conducive to its growth; it may even spell

*See S.A.Dange: On the Indian Trade Union Movement Report V.
*Dange: ibid: p.52
"The first difficulty is," says Mr. Dange, "that our rivals are more worried about our existence than about national defence. They say it is a god-sent opportunity to finish us off. If we accept industrial truce provoke us; if we dont, condemn us."

Lastly the A.I.T.U.C. also understands that the internal factions are as much a threat to its existence and development as the external danger coming from the "bourgeoisie" labour unions. It says: "In such a situation when masses act spontaneously or other leaderships launch struggles and masses respond, the sectarianms come out of their hiding and use the caution of T.U. leaders to attack them as reformists, deserters etc. They use this not in order to see how to devise new means to correct overcaution, the legacy of their adventurism, but to use it for factional ends. This is one malady.

"Another malady is that when the genuine worker, seeing the crisis, wants to advance slogans of struggle and action in reply to the attacks of the bourgeoisie and the government, the remnants of reformists oppose him as sectarian, taking advantage of the fact that sectarianms in the past have used struggle slogans most irresponsibly."

With these environmental, physiological and tactical considerations holding its nerves fast how does the A.I.T.U.C. want to act?

It thinks that strike struggles have to be led and fought but strike leadership alone is not enough to unite

* S.A. Dange for defence of motherland T.U. unity as socialism p.10.
* S.A. Dange: On the Indian Trade Union Movement pp.52, 53
and organise the working class. According to it, the bourgeoisie attack takes various forms in which a strike alone is not sufficient and it has to be met according to means employed by the bourgeoisie.

The A.I.T.U.C. wants its rank and file to be with workers in struggles, bearing in mind that the Government's economic plan or American aid is not going to lessen the crisis for food, consumers' goods, industrialisation and markets; the food crisis is a permanent one until the land is handed over to the peasant and landlordism abolished; the American loans may delay the impacts of famine here and there but will ultimately intensify the crisis.

Like the bourgeoisie trade unions the A-I.T.U.C. wants its workers to know the general trends of development, trends of development in each industry, techniques of trade, laws concerning labour; and to participate in the conciliation and arbitration proceedings and workers' welfare and cultural work. But it also wants them never to forget Stalin's "wise words", which are these: "What does placing the economy of a country on a war footing mean? It means giving industry a one-sided war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population; restricting to the utmost the production and especially, the sale of articles of general consumption - and consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis."

*All this on the basis of the Report IV of S.A. Dange on the Indian Trade Union Movement.
*Quoted in Dange's book on p. 44.
The Philosophy of A.M.M.M.

The Ahmedabad Mill Mazdoor Mandal (A.M.M.M.) yet another union of workers in Ahmedabad is possibly the only trade union in Ahmedabad which is not affiliated to any political party. However Mr. C. T. Daru, a reputed lawyer of Ahmedabad and the General Secretary of the A.M.M.M. is a Royist of very long standing. Presuming that the A.M.M.M. is being conducted on the line of thinking cherished by its General Secretary, on the basis of Mr. Daru's articles on (i) Industrial Democracy and (ii) Labour Legislation in what follows is set out some of the aspects of the philosophy of the A.M.M.M. on industrial relations.

On Industrial Democracy:

"Let us, therefore, first try to see why we want industrial Democracy. It is now universally accepted that modern industrial organisation has a very great dehumanising effect on the worker. Any individual worker in a modern plant does not know what he is doing. Cases are not unknown where it has been found that workers do not even know what products are manufactured in their factory. They do the allotted job unaware of the final product. They are so many cogs in the wheel. They do not see any purpose in production. Their own purposes are not integrated in the total purpose of the industry. Have we not seen workers manufacturing armament— weapons of destruction, weapons, that are likely to be used for their own destruction or suppression? How could this be possible if they had a purpose in production, if they had
any voice in the decisions regarding production? Consequently the worker is not interested in his product but in his wages only. He ceases to be a human being and becomes a part of the machine on which he is working. He is only a "living tool" as Aristotle defined a slave. We are gradually moving towards a society of robots, efficient robots may be, but none the less slaves. A human being of flesh and blood, with purposes, desires, interests and aspirations of his own will soon become a thing of the past and an automaton will take his place.

"Can we accept this state of affairs? Can we keep quiet at this degeneration of a human being? Is there no way out? Should we resign ourselves to this position of thinking that it is inevitable in the machine age? If man by his ingenuity has made the machine can he not devise a social set up where he will not be lost entirely?

"Bold thinking is certainly required. We have been accustomed to think of socialism or communism (i.e. state ownership of the means of production) as the only alternative to the present system of private big business. Many of those who are disgusted with the present system see in state ownership a panacea for all the ills of today. But how will state ownership solve this problem? The essence of capitalism will not be changed by transforming it into state capitalism. On the contrary the evils will be aggravated. It cannot be disputed that in modern age ownership is not identical with management or control. The whole nation may own a project but ownership is only a legal concept. In practice a bureaucrat appointed by the top level authority of the state would
replace the present capitalism. That does not carry us any farther.

"It would only result in concentration of power in a few hands at the top and more helplessness on the part of the individual. People would be servants of the state, unable to control its decisions. They may have a theoretical right to change the Government by voting it out of power. But that right, as experience has shown, is too slender to enable them to acquire a standing control over the day-to-day affairs.

"We should therefore think of a new way, a third way, If we keep our main aim in view, this should not be difficult. We want that producers should not be sacrificed to production. That they must be enabled to decide what to produce and how to produce, and also how to divide the fruits of their labour. This means that persons engaged in production must themselves manage the productive units. How best to achieve this is certainly a big problem. But still it is a matter of detail.

"In the past we have toyed with this idea in a limited form. We have thought of production committees, joint consultative machinery, works committees and so on. But the basic approach has been wrong. These institutions have been conceived not by keeping the above-stated aim but for the mere purpose of increasing production or maintaining industrial peace. When the management found that workers were not so obedient as in the past, when it saw that the whip could not bring about more work, it thought of finding new ways. Consult the workers representatives on how to get more production. That will give some satisfaction to the workers and our aim of
more production will be achieved. If the worker could not be bossed, he had to be manipulated. Emphasis shifted from punishment to reward, text-books on human relations began to be made compulsory reading for managers and supervisors. Americans ridicule this, somewhat rightly, by calling it 'Cow Sociology'. Raise the contented cows in order to get a higher yield of milk.

"Many have complained that workers do not take adequate interest in such machinery. This fact is used against the idea of workers' participation in management. But that is not proper. Consultation is not enough. Why should the workers take interest in any machinery which does not give them a share in decision making? Who would like to be consulted if he knows that the result of consultation will not be effective? In Ahmedabad an experiment was made in one mill. It was publicised in the whole country as an experiment in workers' participation in management. It ended in a dismal failure. but what really was that experiment? Vital matters connected with the industry, namely supply of raw materials, stores, programme of production etc. were outside the purview of this experiment. The workers' representatives could only decide how best to carry out the decisions of the management, the decisions which they had not taken or in which they had no voice. The committee was a glorified suggestion box.

"What is needed is a real share in the management, share in the power to take decisions in all vital matters. Workers' should, through their elected representatives, have a right to participate in the entire management of the unit.
Of course when I say this I am not unconscious of the immense difficulties involved in this solution. When we think of this kind of solution we are up against a big wall. Several questions at once arise: Are the workers today sufficiently informed, equipped and qualified to take over such a grave responsibility? Secondly will the trade-unions take kindly to this solution? Will they not fear a great curtailment in their power? Will the employers agree? And fourthly what will happen to the consumers' interests? Who will take care of these interests? And finally, will the workers be able to take decisions which require expert knowledge?

"These questions can be and must be answered. In the first place we must have faith in the inherent rational and moral sense of all human beings. Given sufficient information and adequate data, every man is capable of drawing rational conclusions. My experience of workers does not lead me to think that common men are unable to think or to take responsibilities. If up till now, workers have only talked of rights and not responsibilities it is only because they have never been invited to share the responsibilities in a genuine way. After all in many places the workers have shared the management of their unions. And union management is also not quite a simple affair, as many are inclined to think.

"Since the day of Plato it has been recognised that education is the foundation of Democracy. In the absence of education (in its widest sense) Democracy can never function successfully. It only degenerates its demagoggy. Prejudices, superstitions and ignorance of the people can be easily
exploited by clever demagogues who would usurp power with their support and then exercise that power arbitrarily all the while speaking in the name of and on behalf of the people. We have seen the truth of this in the field of politics. But that has not led us to argue that there should be no democracy in politics? Why then this argument in the field of industry? Of course, we would not like democracy to be used by demagogues. The real way is not to oppose the concept of Democracy in the field of industry but to create conditions in which it will be successful. And as I said above education is the main condition that requires to be fulfilled. We must therefore chalk out a plan for educating the workers, not merely in three Rs. but in taking responsibility and in taking decisions. That is a huge task. The trade-unions, technicians, employers and the Government can all co-operate in this great adventure. Uptil now very little attention has been given to this aspect of the problem. Basic facts regarding raw materials, finances, markets, etc. should be made known to the workers in simple language. Principles of management should also be presented. Elementary knowledge of politics, economics should also be imparted. Fundamentals of Democracy should be explained to them. Moreover the technical processes of all departments should be made known to them. Today a worker only knows some thing about the process in which he is himself employed. He is blissfully ignorant of the working of other departments. Some knowledge of the advances in technique should also be given. These are only broad suggestions. A regular curriculum can be drawn up and qualified technicians and others may undertake to
write small books in simple language. The trade unions can then take up the task of popularising this literature and they can open classes or centres, where workers will be trained. I am sure that this will evoke great response and enthusiasm among workers. All these years they have been fed merely on slogans. It is a sorry tale but quite true that neither the trade-unions nor the employers have done anything to spread enlightenments amongst workers. Each has rested content with blaming the other. Its result has been that workers have been accustomed to represent their grievances and difficulties but have never cared to think how they could be solved. They have grumbled, fought, struck but not thought of solution. Their function has been conceived to be that of working, demanding wages and grumbling about their difficulties have been invited to share the joy and thrill of tackling problems and finding their solutions. In spite of all this tall talk of improvement in workers' life the fact remains that they are in the same position of mere working tools as they were before. May be they are paid a little better but that does not make their life more joyful, meaningful, adventurous and full of creative possibilities. Man is nothing if he is not a creator. We have thought of their wages, conditions of work, sickness insurance, social security etc. but we have never thought of catering to their creative needs. This has created irresponsibility, cantankerousness, and dehumanisation. Introduction of Industrial democracy on the basis of education with enable them to live as real men and women, conscious of their dignity and of responsibility towards their fellow men.
Labour Legislation.

The Industrial Disputes Legislation in this country has devised a machinery of Industrial Tribunals who adjudicate industrial disputes between employers and employees at the instance of the appropriate government. The awards or orders of these Tribunals have a binding force. These disputes cover a wide range and they involve questions like wages, bonus, rationalisation, retrenchment, conditions of work etc. The legislature has not laid down any principles to guide the Tribunals in the adjudication of the disputes. In the beginning therefore, the Tribunals were found groping in the dark in search of suitable principles to ensure social justice. They were, so to say, trying to steer a ship without a rudder or compass. In course of time with the gaining of experience, certain principles have come to be evolved by the Tribunals which have been confirmed with modifications by the Supreme Court of India. These principles are however evolved more or less according to the social and economic ideas which have appealed to the Judges and do not necessarily reflect the body of progressive social opinion in the country. Moreover, the variety and complexity of industrial problems make it extremely difficult to apply these principles to the facts of each case. A reading of many award of the Tribunals leaves one with the impression that while principles are enunciated, the Tribunals in actual practice resort to the expedient of splitting the difference. It is high time that someone undertook the task of arranging and systematising these principles in sort of Industrial Code. It should then be subjected to
public examination and discussion. Suitably modified in the light of such discussion to reflect the largest measure of agreement, it could be adopted by the legislature as a body of guiding principles to be followed by the Tribunals as far as possible and not to be departed from without recording reasons thereof. This will combine certainty with flexibility and make it somewhat easy for the parties to arrive at reasonable settlement across the table in the light of such principles.

"The method of resolving the conflict of interests by compulsory adjudication has come to be severely criticised by some Indian and many foreign observers. This method would be unthinkable in countries like England or U.S.A. except in time of grave emergency. The reason is that what goes on by the name of compulsory adjudication is in reality a prohibition of strikes and lock-outs which the Government makes a reference of the dispute for adjudication to a Tribunal. Neither the workers nor the employers in these countries would agree to give up their right of strike or lock-out nor would they agree in principle that an award imposed by a third party to settle their domestic dispute should have a binding force. The critics point out that compulsory adjudication has weakened the trade union movement and brought about a litigious spirit among the workers. Free collective bargaining has been replaced by litigation.

"Careful observation has however shown that much of this criticism is without force. The trade union movement in India was never strong and stable so that it would be idle
to talk of its having been weakened by compulsory adjudication. Most of the reference for compulsory adjudication have been made by the Government at the request of the Unions. The right of strike which is held to be theoretically very valuable by the Unions has not been found so very valuable in practice in India. Moreover strikes have rarely been penalised by the Government in actual practice. The strikes whenever and wherever they have taken place have resulted in most cases in weakening the unions instead of strengthening them. They have resulted in creating a sense of frustration among workers. Moreover many strikes were resorted to either for the purpose of compelling the Government to refer the dispute for compulsory adjudication or where that was not the case, the unions have within a few days of the commencement of strikes implored the Government to intervene and extricate them out of a difficult situation.

"By and large the Industrial Disputes Legislation has helped to bring about a reduction in industrial tensions and has achieved a measure of success in improving the standard of living particularly of low-paid men. Concepts of social justice have been recognised and administered through this legislation. It has moreover brought about an element of security of service to industrial workers and has to some extent succeeded in making the backward employees recognise the status and dignity of workers as human beings.

"The other kind of labour legislation has provided for certain minimum standards to be observed by the owners
of factories to ensure health and safety of workers. Reduction in working hours, prohibition of child labour, provision for adequate sanitation, creches where 50 or more women workers are employed, dining sheds, canteen and safety guards, vacations with pay etc., are some of the subject matters dealt with in factories legislation. The enforcement of these provisions, however, is not up to the mark. Moreover, there are no provisions for temperature to be maintained at a low level during the hot season. Such a provision is a crying need in Indian conditions. This kind of legislation has also been useful in achieving certain minimum standards in the field of good working conditions.

"Then there is legislation which introduces a measure of social security. But this covers only sickness and accidents and has not been universally applied even to factories in all regions. Moreover it leaves old age and unemployment benefits out of its scope.

"This is, however, not to suggest that peace and harmony can be legislated. It is a truism to say that man cannot be happy and peacefully because a decree of the Legislature ordains peace and harmony. This Benhamite illusion was shared by many social reformers in other fields and in the initial stages it also overwhelmed some in the industrial field. But it has now been realised that legislation by itself cannot go far.

"The existence of healthy and stable trade unions is indispensable for any success in the field of industrial relations. But health and stability are impossible to
achieve in the prevailing atmosphere of backwardness, superstition, casteism etc. prevailing among workers. Lack of enlightenment and education is the main factor impeding any progress in this field as in any other. It is very much regrettable that the leadership of the trade union movement has betrayed a woeful lack of realisation of this factor. There is hardly any union which has any programme of educating and enlightening its membership. Even in the limited sphere of industrial matters many workers have a very poor understanding of the situation, because the broad facts of economic, social and political set-up under which they live are not sufficiently known or appreciated by them. This becomes a serious impediment in appreciating the realities of the situation and collective bargaining in its true spirit becomes difficult. Many leaders rising from the rank of workers behave as if they are guided by the belief that wages grow in the trade union offices or court rooms of tribunals or places of strike meetings. Inspired by this belief they indulge in giving unrealisable promises of economic betterment to rank and file workers/attract membership in the unions. This kind of appeal can rarely bring to the fore men who are enlightened. This process goes on repeating itself. When the realities of situation make it impossible for performance to keep pace with promise, frustration, bickering and mutual incrimination result.

"The Government of India has realised the need of education in this field and has setup a Board of Workers'
Education. This Board has started training worker-teachers for this work. But its programme is narrow in scope. It merely aims at imparting training in the technique of collective bargaining, organisation of trade unions, productivity and such other matters. But such technical training cannot achieve the desired results in the absence of a background of sound general education in the values of democracy and co-operative living and imparting of elementary knowledge of the findings of social and physical science. This is not a very tall order as it appears at first sight to be.

"The other cause which impedes the growth of stable trade unions is the influence of domination of political parties. The political parties have come to look upon unions as their 'fronts' of branches. They attempt to use the unions as pawns in their game of power. They are more concerned with political demonstrations and vote-catching than any genuine improvement in the mental and physical life of workers. In fact, such interest would be contrary to the fundamental law of their being. Every political party believes that a real improvement in the life of the people cannot be brought about unless and until it comes to power itself or having come to power retains it indefinitely. This subordinates all other activities to the fundamental need of achieving or retaining power at any cost. Every potential source of discontent or conflict is, therefore, exploited to the full and agitation and demonstration
with the help of demagogic appeals like the place of serious activity intended to resolve the conflicts. It, therefore, acquires a vested interest in the ignorance and backwardness of workers. This is one of the reasons why serious educational activity has not been undertaken by many unions in spite of the fact that many middle class educated men have been working in the trade unions as 'outsides'. If they had not entered the trade union movement as agents of one or another political party some progress would surely have been achieved in this direction until now.

"It should be, however, remembered that such large scale domination by political parties is itself due to the lack of education among workers. This vicious circle could only be broken by devoted and educated men (both from within the rank of workers and without) applying themselves to this task.

It may be retorted that a trade union is not a place where workers are likely to go for being educated, and that if a union accepted education of workers as one of its primary aims it would soon have to liquidate itself.

This view is based on the assumption that their the workers are not keep to seek any improvement in their mental life or that if they have such a desire they are able to look to the other agencies for the same. The invalidity of the first part of the assumption is obvious to any one having contact with the workers. The other is also wrong because there are not adequate facilities at present for adult workers to get adequate education.
"If education is accepted as a precondition for the healthy growth of the unions then in the context of the Indian situation the unions will have to accept at least a part of the responsibility for providing facilities for the same. The unions can certainly seek the co-operation of educationists and teachers who may not be unwilling to devote some time to this activity. And if they cannot shoulder responsibility by themselves, they can at least take initiative in the establishment of workers' education centres with the help and co-operation of public spirited men in the community. The paucity of funds at the disposal of unions in India is well-known but a part of the general revenues, meagre as they are, can be earmarked for this purpose. It is more a question of recognizing the need of this kind of activity and of assigning it a higher place in the list of priorities. And it may well be remembered that this kind of activity is much less expensive than many other activities in which unions are engaged."