CHAPTER VIII

C_L_U_S_I_O_N

Marx identified three forms of production in capitalism namely, cooperation, manufacture and Factory form of production, particularly in the context of the industrialization process in Britain. Each of the successive forms was a leap forward over the previous one according to Marx, in terms of the detail division of labour, greater centralized control of the capitalists over the labour process, and the progressive concentration of workers under one roof. The major distinction between the manufacturing form of production and the Factory form of production was focused on the nature of instruments of labour used during the labour process. Under manufacture, tools were predominantly used for production, and under Factory form of production tools were replaced by machines. However, cooperation continued to be part of all the three forms of production. The manufacturing form of production, wrote Marx, extended from mid 16th century to the last quarter of 18th century in England. During the next hundred years Factory form of production established its complete victory over the manufacture. Each successive form of production had a direct bearing upon the nature of the working class, which in turn had its implications in the emergence and growth of trade union movement.
Manufacturing form of production which extended over more than two centuries in England was not homogeneous in its character. For the first century, that is, up to mid 17th century, the major chunk of the produce in the traditional industries was controlled by the merchant capital which was organized into monopolistic trading companies.

The workers were scattered into their individual households. The control over the production was remote through the advancing of raw material to the domestic workers. This system of production under the early manufacturing form of production is termed either as 'putting out' or as capitalist domestic industry. Instruments of labour were mostly traditional. Under the 'putting-out' system of production domestic workers constituted a major constituent of the work force. 'Class-in-itself' constituted by the pure wage workers was yet to emerge.

During the second phase of the manufacturing form of production, mastercraftsmen turned to trade and started to outweigh the big merchant companies in the control over production. Here the production under the workshop conditions also started to emerge as an important feature of the manufacturing form of production. However, the major chunk of the workforce continued to work under domestic conditions. It provided a major obstacle in the growth of a homogeneous working class constituted by the pure and simple wage
workers. Consequently, there was no organized resistance by the workers to their naked exploitation by capital.

Under the Factory form of production since late 19th century tools were progressively replaced by the machines. Machines were run with the steam as a centralised source of motive power. Assemblage of a large number of workers under one roof became a technical necessity. The control of the workers over their labour-process was lost to the machines and workers simultaneously emerged as a 'class-in-itself'. Material conditions of production facilitated the emergence of a consciousness of collective resistance among the workers. The continuous growth of the Factory form of production in the 19th century was accompanied with the rise of a homogeneous working class, constituted by the 'simple and pure' wage workers. There was a simultaneous emergence of the trade union consciousness. The British workers posed a major challenge to the capitalist class through their collective resistance. It was the outcome of the changing material conditions of production under the Factory form of production. Industrialization in this study is synonymous to the development of capitalism on the lines formulated by Marx.

Parallel to the 'putting out' system of Britain, in India the merchant capital took the course of dadni system
under which cash was advanced to the artisans. Dadni system was not a capitalist system of production unlike the British 'putting-out' system. Under the dadni arrangement of production artisans were bound to a merchant or to an European company through the cash advances. This system was so widespread in India that by the end of the 17th century virtually every commodity for the market was procured through this system (Ray Chaudhuri, 1984: 22-23). Therefore, pre-British India cannot be characterized to be on the threshold of the Industrial Revolution because of stagnant technology, lack of use of inanimate source of power, absolute control of merchant capital over artisans without any direct intervention into the production process, and the absence of 'ideology' for such a change (Ray Chaudhuri, 1984: 33-34; Pavlov, 1979: 366). Mercantilistic plunder by the East India Company in India further blocked the growth of new productive forces from below (Dutt, 1979). In the traditional industries of India, various forms of production continued to co-exist throughout the 19th century, such as rural independent artisan production with family labour, artisan production for merchants under dadni system, and the production carried out by clusters of artisans (inclusive of hired labour) with elements of detail division of labour (Bhattacharya, 1984: 283-84).

The dadni system of production continued to dominate over production for market until the early part of the 20th
century. The 'modern' working class emerged in India in response to the capital based Factory form of production imposed from above both by the British and Indian capitalists. This gave rise to a general ruination of the artisan production during the second half of the 19th century who joined the ranks of the workers (Joshi, 1981). This ruination continued till 20's of the present century. The emergence of the working class in the traditional industries, constituted by the wage workers, started to take shape during early 30's of the present century (Buchanan, 1934: 15-16). Since then the industrialization process in India has continued to follow two distinct lines, that is, capital based Factory form of production imposed from above and the traditional industries struggling to grow to the higher forms of production from below (Shirokov, 1980: 309).

It is true that the working class had first started taking shape in the Factory form of production as they have divorced from the means of production and were exclusively dependent upon wages. It was here that the workers were also working under 'one roof'. The emergence of the trade union organization and working class movement also simultaneously developed in the Factory form of production. However, the concern of the present study is limited to understand the emergence and growth of the working class and the trade unions in the traditional industries only.
In the Independent India, the Industrial policy of the Government did not shake the base of the 'trader-cum-moneylender's capital' in the traditional industries. It could not be transformed to the industrial capital and hence a transition from a household to centralized system of capitalist small industry was rather slow (Malyarov, 1984: 23-26). This has been substantiated by the analysis of the various forms of production prevalent in the major traditional industries of India.

The structure of production in various traditional industries of India today ranges from petty-commodity production to the decentralized Factory form of production. It is unlike the experience of the British industrialization process where the lower forms of production were replaced by the next higher forms of production. Industrial capital in Britain had established its domination as early as the 18th Century. However, in India even after the introduction of small machines into the detail labour process, merchant capital did not lose its grip over the producers. Garment and cotton hosiery industries are typical cases in point. The various forms of production in the traditional industries in India today is still heavily influenced by mercantilistic interest and has given rise to the formation of a working class which has the following characteristics:
1 Part of the instruments of labour are owned by the workers.

2 The workers are mostly scattered either into the small workshop type units or at the domestic level.

3 Wages are paid through piece-rates which accentuates competition among the workers.

4 A large number of the intermediaries are involved between the principal employer and the actual workers.

5 The workers are also divided on the lines of age, sex, and level of skill.

The above characteristics of the 'working class' under the traditional industries points out that it is still of amorphous nature, and weak in collective resistance. The emergence of a 'modern' working class in the traditional industries is still in the making.

The organized trade union movement in India even in the industries characterized by Factory form of production is still not strong owing to several factors. Slow and uneven growth of industries (Punekar, 1978: 47), over-population and abundant supply of labour to industry (Karnik, 1982: 30), migrant character of the workforce, the prevalence of pre-industrial ties with employers (Pandey, 1970: 8), and heavy
reliance on formal legal procedures (Crouch, 1966: 48-49) have been identified as some of the objective factors which have hindered the growth of trade unions as a force.

The various studies on the traditional industries of India, such as beedi industry (Avachat, 1978) sandal Industry (Basu, 1977), lace industry (Kies, 1982), and various other industries - have shown that apart from the factors enumerated above, the objective structural factors (such as, scattered nature of production, prevalence of piece-rate wage payment and ownership of instruments of labour by the workers) of the production organization of these industries have severe constraining influence in the growth of trade unions.

The pattern of production in the traditional industries of India gives a clue to understand the structure of hosiery industry at Ludhiana. In the light of the above, the specific questions for exploration in the present study have been the following:

(1) Whether the role of the trading capital in Ludhiana hosiery industry took the form of dadni system of production or the form of 'putting-out' during its transition to early forms of capitalist production?

(2) The factors associated with the transition of hosiery industry from the early capitalist forms
of production to workshop type of production.

(3) Whether the present form of hosiery production is characterized by manufacture or machinofacture?

(4) Whether the system of production presently developed is on the lines of classical 'putting-out' as in England or on the lines of 'modern putting-out' as in the cotton hosiery and garment industry in India?

(5) To what extent the workers in the hosiery industry are concentrated under one roof and whether they have emerged as pure wage workers?

(6) Whether the social origins of the workforce (in terms of migrant or local, age, sex, level of skill, etc.) account for the variations in wage rates and working class solidarity?

(7) The factors associated with the emergence of strong or weak trade union movement in Ludhiana hosiery industry.

The study follows both historical and empirical methods. The historical method is adopted to understand the industrialization process in Punjab in general and Ludhiana hosiery industry in particular for which published sources have been mainly utilized. The empirical study is restricted to understand the forms of production organizations, working class formation and trade union movement.
in the Ludhiana hosiery industry presently, i.e., during the period of empirical investigation in 1983-84. The empirical study is confined to Ludhiana export hosiery industry. The sampling procedure is on the lines of probability sampling which has been discussed in detail in Chapter II. For the collection of empirical data structured schedule was the main instrument of data collection supplemented through case studies, observation, and non-directive interviews.

The place of Ludhiana Hosiery Industry has first been analysed in the context of the industrialization process in Punjab in general. Historically Punjab could not emerge on a sound industrial footing. It could be partly attributed to the natural reasons and partly to the deliberate policies of the Government. Lack of natural resources, its distant geographical location from the sea-coast, and the deliberate policy of the Britishers to maintain Punjab as an agricultural state also contributed to the backwardness of the industrial economy of the State. The major industries of Punjab, till early part of the current century were constituted by the traditional industries such as weaving, leather industry, woodworks etc. These industries were mainly rural based. The process of the emergence of industries into the urban centres began mainly during the present century. During the early part of the present century workshop type production
either of the form of simple cooperation or of the manufacture form was found in the weaving and leather industries at Ludhiana and Amritsar. However, the production at the domestic level also continued simultaneously. The major base of the industries was still rural. Therefore, the transformation in the production relations, as compared to the overall size of the industries in the State, was rather slow. Most of the workers were artisans in origin. They were heavily indebted to the traders or money lenders. During the same period, that is, before World War I, at all India level dadni system of production was most widespread along with the existence of independent artisan production. Therefore, the pace of the transformation in the production relations in the traditional industries of Punjab, before World War I, was similar to other parts of the country. The emergence of the working class in the form of pure wage workers was at its infancy.

The effect of the two World Wars on the Punjab industries was selective. Those industries which catered to the war material got boost such as, hosiery, cycle and sewing machine, and hosiery machine 'manufacturing' industry. However, the other traditional industries felt a jolt due to the dislocation of the market. The new industries which were coming up were of the small workshop type or at the most small Factory type. In the engineering industry artisans were enlarging their workshops in order to take the industry to the higher forms of production. In hosiery, however,
merchant capital was dominant. The conditions of the workers continued to be precarious during this period.

Before partition, powerlooms had already started to replace handloom in the various urban centres of Punjab, especially, the Ludhiana and Amritsar. Therefore, small Factory form production had started to emerge in the weaving industry. In the textile (weaving) industry 'putting-out' system of production surfaced during 30's and 40's which was co-terminus with the changes at all India level. The industries in Punjab were struggling to come up from below - from handicrafts to small workshops and further to small Factory form of production. However, the penetration of capitalist production relations in the traditional industries of Punjab was rather slow vis-a-vis some other industrial centres of India. Heavy rural bias in the traditional industries continued to exist.

Partition of the country in 1947, and for that matter of Punjab, dislocated its economy, especially in the border districts. By Mid 50's, the industrial economy in Punjab was rather weak. The rural areas had its edge over the urban areas. In the rural areas the character of production was mainly of petty-commodity production. In the urban centres, production and employment per unit was rather small. Nearly two third of the 'workers' were engaged into the 'petty-commodity' production. The industries were organized
either into the small workshop type manufacturies or small Factories. The major industries were textiles, leather and leather products and of food-products. Capital based non-traditional industries were almost non-existent.

The above discussion over the industries in Punjab upto mid 50's indicates that the industrial capital in Punjab was rather shy and its growth was very slow. However, Amritsar and Ludhiana cities were emerging as the big centres of traditional industries. The working class constituted by the wage workers, was emerging as a distinct force in these two industrial centres. This is also evinced from the fact that trade union struggles among the workers were witnessed from early 50's to mid 50's.

From 60's onwards the rural base of the traditional industries has continuously been eroded. These industries have progressively been concentrated into the urban centres of Punjab. The rural artisans, who were ruined in competition to the urban based industries, joined the ranks of the agricultural labourers. A small proportion of them also entered into the petty trading or services (Gill, 1980). However, Ramgarhias (an artisan caste) are the exception who have been pursuing the classical line of industrial development. They first enlarged their small workshops and then further grew to the level of small Factory form of
production in the 'engineering' and 'wood works' industries. Some of them have been able to control the big Factories.

The industries in Punjab today are mostly of the nature of small-scale constituted by the small workshop or small Factory type units. During 1979-80 nearly 80 per cent of the workers were concentrated in the 'small-scale' sector contributing to 61 per cent of the total industrial production of the State. The major industries in Punjab, with respect to the level of employment and production are textile and engineering. However, the overall development of the industrial sector in Punjab is rather weak which is indicated from its low contribution to the net state Domestic Product (during 1979-80 the percentage was 11.02).

The growth of hosiery industry at Ludhiana shows close resemblance to the hosiery industry in other countries and in India. In Britain, prior to frame knitting, the hosiery production was carried out by the domestic workers on the basis of 'putting-out' system. It was an early phase of the manufacturing form of production. However, with the introduction of frame-knitting during the mid 17th century, the practice of renting out frames to the domestic workers was also taken up by the urban based 'merchant-manufacturers'. This practice continued in England till the last quarter of the 19th Century from where hosiery started to enter into the Factory form of production in a big way. It
was interesting to find that the prevalence of 'putting out', along with the practice of renting out knitting frames to the domestic workers, also existed in Japan and China during their early phase of the growth of this industry.

In India, however, hosiery industry followed the example of Britain with respect to the various forms of production. It was a departure from dadni system of production which was the practice in other traditional industries of India. In spite of the large-scale introduction of machines into various detail processes the hosiery workers could not concentrate into big Factories under one roof. Each of the detail process has emerged as an independent 'sub-industry' constituted by the small Factory type units. Employment of domestic workers on large-scale continues. The instruments of labour are owned either by the 'petty-capitalists', who are the owner of small units, or by the workers themselves. The raw material is advanced by the 'merchant-manufacturers'. This system of production amounts to the scattered production with centralised control. This has also been termed as 'modern putting-out'.

The experience of the growth of hosiery industry at Ludhiana, closely resembles that of Britain. Before the introduction of frame knitting (towards the end of the 19th century) there was a practice of distributing yarn to the domestic women workers by the 'middlemen'. After paying fixed 'wages', the middlemen collected hosiery goods from the
women workers which they sold in the city. It was a stage of hand-needle knitting. This form of production was analogous to the mid 16th or early part of the 17th century Britain which has been characterised as the early phase of manufacturing form of production. The form of production was akin to the British putting out system and not to the dadni system as was the case in the traditional industries in India between the 18th and the early part of the 20th century. It was hypothesized that the role of trading capital in Ludhiana hosiery industry would have taken the form of dadni system of production rather than the form of putting-out. The hypothesis thus was not sustained which is reminiscent to the typical features of the hosiery industry in general irrespective of the country.

The introduction of frame knitting decreased the importance of hand-needle knitting. Frame-knitting got major stimulus during World War I. Small workshop type hosiery units appeared in response to the increased demand. From early 20's hosiery 'machine-manufacture' was initiated by the Ramgarhias locally at Ludhiana. Soon it emerged as an independent industry. Availability of the knitting frames locally at Ludhiana encouraged the practice of renting-out frames by the hosiery manufacturers. Consequently a structure emerged in which there were a large number of small workshop type units, supported by the family level units. Side by side there also sprang up a few large sized manufactures.
validates the hypothesis that in the hosiery industry of Ludhiana the expansion of the market and the 'manufacturing' of the hosiery 'machinery' at the local level would be associated with the predominance of workshop type of production. Until the mid 50's in hosiery industry at Ludhiana most of the family based units were working as fabricators and small proportion was also producing independently - which can be characterized as the petty-commodity production. Bigger units were also putting-out work to small workshop type or family sized units. Most of the instruments of labour were manually operated. It leads to the conclusion that manufacturing was the predominant form of production during this period.

Till mid 50's hosiery catered to the civil and defence markets. For the last two and a half decades a new vista of 'export hosiery' has also opened up for the hosiery industry of Ludhiana. The export has left the earlier two types of hosiery far behind. The spectacular growth of the export hosiery can be evinced from the fact that beginning with a few lakhs of rupees during early 60's it had already touched the figure of Rs 100 crore during 1984-85. However, the basic structure of production has not altered much during all this period. The abundant supply of cheap labour and the purchase of hosiery by Russia in weight are the two important factors for this. Though machines have been introduced into some of the detailed processes, yet the major work of knitting is carried out manually.
The pattern of growth of the hosiery industry over the period provides ample evidence that growth of a working class of pure wage workers, employed with the big manufacturers is rather a slow process. In fact, sizable section of the workers own petty-instruments of labour. They were scattered at the level of small workshops as also at the domestic level.

Manufacture was characterized by Marx by the prevalence of detail division of labour, use of tools as the instruments of labour, and progressive concentration of workers under one roof. The empirical data on the nature of instruments of labour engaged by the exporters as also the fabricators indicates that they are predominantly tools. In certain detail processes, such as linking, winding, button holing/ stitching etc., machines have been introduced by the exporters. This does not alter the basic character of the forms of production which is predominantly manufacture in the export hosiery industry. This has also been substantiated by the account of the workers who were working over machines. Of the total workers employed directly by the exporters 12.38 per cent were working over machines and this percentage for fabricators was only 1.80. This clearly demonstrates that the predominant character of the form of production in hosiery industry is of manufacture. This has close resemblance to most of the other traditional industries of India which are also of the form of manufacture. This also shows the backwardness of the productive forces in the hosiery industry vis-a-vis Britain. In Britain, the machino-
manufacturing form of production was transformed to machino-
facture (Factory form of production) in a big way a century
back. However, the abundant supply of cheap labour power
in Ludhiana allows their appropriation through the extraction
of absolute surplus value and does not compel the exporters
to go for costly machinery.

During the manufacturing form of production in
Britain, 'putting-out' work to the small workshops or domestic
workers was an important feature. This has been amply demons-
also found similar arrangements of production in Russia. The
empirical study of the hosiery industry at Ludhiana also leads
to similar conclusion. Nearly 45 per cent of the total
production was 'put-out' to the fabricators. The fabrication
was calculatively encouraged by the exporters since mid 70's
with the intention to weaken the collective resistance of
the workers. It is also an economic gain to the exporters
from their simple economic calculations. Those workers who
were chum with the exporters and also had some experience in
the control of workers within their export units, such as
contractors for a particular job, were encouraged to desert
the export units and establish their own independent workshops.
The exporters advanced raw material (yarn) to the fabricators
and gave all specifications of designs, inclusive of fixed
labour charges. The fabricators employ workers under them and
act as 'out-side departments' of the bigger export units. The
fabricators are generally the men of small means and are at
loss in their asymmetrical power relations with the exporters. Consequently, the fabricators sometimes uses nefarious means to maintain their profit margin. Such a culture of suspicion was also noticed towards the 'outside' workers in Britain.

The 'putting-out' phenomenon does not stop at the level of fabricators. As already mentioned, the fabricators are men of small means, they cannot afford to buy costly imported machines, such as, linking-machines, button-holing/stitching machines, etc. For such detail processes, therefore, the fabricators either depend upon the independent small Factory type units from where they get the 'process' performed for fixed charges, or they put this work out to the domestic women workers. The overall structure of production organization in the export hosiery indicates that it resembles the classical 'putting out' with a difference. The fabricators are themselves employers of wage workers and they manage small independent workshop type units. The workers employed are in urban settings and are not tied to the small plots of land scattered over the country-side. Both these features are a departure from the classical 'putting-out'. However, the advancing of the raw material to the outside fabricators is characteristic of the putting out. Therefore, the present system of production under the manufacture form can more appropriately be qualified as 'modern putting-out' instead of classical 'putting-out'. This also corroborates the
hypothesis that the hosiery industry in Ludhiana today would be characterised as 'modern putting-out'.

The tendency of the exporters to 'put-out' work to the fabricators shows their inclinations for withdrawing from the actual labour process. They are more interested in securing larger export orders, the size of which determine their level of profits. The very fact that the exporters own only part of the means of production shows their mercantilist tendencies with regard to the actual production process. At the same time the exporters control more than half the production directly and employ workers into their export units. It indicates their functioning as industrial capitalists. Therefore, the exporters partly extract their profits from their role as industrial capitalists and partly as merchant capitalists. They thus could be characterized as 'merchant - manufacturers'. This term has also been used by Dobb (1978) during his analysis of the character of manufacturers of the 17th and 18th century England.

This form of production gives rise to the formation of a working class which is geographically scattered over a large area. The part of the workers who are employed by the exporters within their export units, of course, work under one roof. However, they are segregated internally on other accounts. For instance, 9 per cent of the total workers were female workers who were employed on traditional jobs.
They were generally old age women working under strong socio-economic constraints. They did constitute only the peripheral part of the overall workforce. Further, 43.66 per cent of the total workers were employed through intermediaries or contractors and statutorily were not considered employees of the exporters. Amongst the remaining 56.34 per cent of the workers who were directly employed, only a small portion was treated as employees of exporters. All those workers who were piece-rated were also considered contractor-workers. Of the total workers only 14.39 per cent were time-rated workers who were also directly employed, yet not all of them were on the regular muster-roll. This indicates that though the workers in the export units seemingly work under one roof yet more than 90 per cent of them are not recognized as 'workers' by the exporters on one or the other pretext. Ownership of instruments of labour by the workers is another important factor which creates internal divisions among the workers. In knitting and tailoring processes, which jointly constituted more than 60 per cent of the total workers, instruments of labour are owned by the workers. Therefore, even in the export units the cohesive working class could not emerge. Workers employed by the fabricators are not only physically more scattered but are also in a weaker position as compared to the workers from export units. No worker from fabricating units is considered employee of the fabricators. Besides the fabricators try to
compete with the exporters' machines by engaging more women labour as also the domestic workers. The 'putting-out' system of production, use of intermediaries within the export units as also the domestic workers, payment of wages by piece-rates, casual nature of the workforce, and ownership of the major chunk of the instruments of labour by the workers give rise to an amorphous kind of workforce. They do not constitute a cohesive class. This validates the hypothesis that the emergence of the working class as a 'class-in-itself' constituted by the pure and simple wage workers would be in a weak form in the hosiery industry in Ludhiana. Casual character of employment is one of the great constraining factor. It encourages frequent shift of workers from one unit to another. Hence, the unstable character of the hosiery workers is an outcome of the deliberate policy of the exporters which is embedded into the very structure of the hosiery industry.

Apart from the existing structure of the production organization of the hosiery industry other socio-economic characteristics of the workers have also contributed to weaken the cohesive character and solidarity of the workers. Important among these factors are social origin of the workers, e.g., their migrant and local nature, social composition with respect to age, sex, level of skill etc.

The sample study of the hosiery workers indicates that among the adult male workers 41 per cent were migrant workers from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Himachal Pradesh and
other states of India. As compared to the local workers, migrants were employed into such processes which involved low skill and high incidence of health hazards. Migrants were also more employed through intermediaries/contractors. They hailed from joint families who were settled in the rural areas and their level of literacy, as compared to local workers, was also low. Most of the migrant workers had live links with their respective villages in the rural areas. On the other hand, local workers were mostly urban based, having high literacy level, and were absorbed into the more skilled jobs. Difference in the cultural background was reinforced into the work situations as also in the segregated residential pattern. Local workers also feel that due to the abundant supply of cheap labour-power by the huge stream of migrant workers, their wages have been depressed by the employers. Thus local-migrant distinctions among the workers severely hamper their solidarity. Though both the local and the migrant workers hailed from different caste backgrounds, yet it had no effect on dividing the workers into separate compartments. In the work premises they work together irrespective of caste considerations. Similarly, in the labour colonies the workers of different caste backgrounds were living together without practicing caste discrimination. Caste consciousness was hardly alive. On the other hand, the consciousness of local and migrant distinctions was clearly discerned in the work situation, interaction pattern, wage differentials and residential segregations.
It is the characteristic of the manufacture form of production that it involves detail division of labour in order to have a judicious use of the different labourers with respect to the level of skill, age, sex, literacy and social origin of the workers. Therefore, workers from different categories were paid accordingly. A hierarchical structure among the working class was clearly discerned. It was found that the local workers occupied top position on the 'wage-scale' followed by the migrant workers, child labourers and women workers. Piece-rate wage payment and the partial ownership of instruments of labour by the workers were two important factors which blur the class consciousness among workers. The prevalence of both these factors was itself associated with the low level of development of the instruments of labour. The workers could own knitting flat frames or sewing machines because their market price is within the reach of the workers. The piece-rate wage payment is profitable for the employers because the workers compete among themselves for more production in order to earn more wages. As already pointed out, these factors are further linked to the foot-loose character of the hosiery workers which acts as a major stumbling block in the development of the collective resistance of the workers. The findings are in the expected direction that the heterogeneous character of the hosiery workforce at Ludhiana would result in weaker working class solidarity and low level of class consciousness. It is due to these constraints of the formation of the working class in hosiery industry that the workers suffer the most.
The sample study shows that nearly 95 per cent of the workers were excluded from any kind of the statutory benefits.

The structural constraints of the working class-formation in hosiery industry have proved to be a major obstacle in the emergence of the strong trade union movement. The dispersed nature of the workers under 'putting-out' system of production and their casual character of employment resulting into the high inter-unit mobility are also major constraints in organizing the workers into strong trade unions. The prevalence of piece-rate wage payment triggers competition among workers, internal hierarchy among the workers on the basis of part ownership of the instruments of labour and of the differences in their composition with respect to age, sex, level of skill and social origin of the workers and the prevalence of intermediaries acts as constraints in the emergence of the true working class consciousness. It results into a weak growth of the trade union movement. This also corroborates the hypothesis in this regard. This was also found in other traditional industries of India at large. The affiliations of the trade unions to the different political parties, undemocratic functioning, and high level of dependency of the leaders on the bureaucratic legal structures have also contributed to weak trade union movement. The political affiliations have divided the working class into different slots, sometimes resulting into the trade union rivalries. The heavy dependence
upon the legal structures have degenerated the trade unions into the business-shops. Hence, if the trade unions pay more attention towards the conscientization of the workers on class lines and rely more on the class struggle rather than the official legal structure, it is possible to build a strong trade union movement in the hosiery industry in spite of structural constraints. The strength of the present study is that it has tried to knit together the inter-relationship between the structure of production with the corresponding working class formation and its implications for the trade union movement. The existing studies are more one sided as they exhaustively explores one particular dimension. That is we have plethora of studies on trade union movement in India but it does not provide us a systematic understanding of why the trade union movement are strong or weak in industries with varying levels of production structure and development. There is relative paucity of theoretical perspective to understand the aforementioned relationships. The studies in this direction are replete with such theoretical categories, as the distinction between the formal - informal sectors, organized - unorganized sectors, and such other frequently used categories as large, medium, small -scale and domestic industries. These categories do not have the potentialities of not only throwing insight into the three areas as specified in the previous para but also lack the strength of giving an overall understanding of the linkage of various levels of production organization and the structure of working class with the national
and international market. One of the emerging trends in the Indian industries, particularly in the traditional ones, is the decentralization of production structure with the centralised control over the surplus value generated by the workers in as much as that even the domestic labourers are also tied to the international market in the network of the structure of exploitation. The theoretical framework evolved in the studies of the labour process (Friedman, 1977; Mies, 1982; Murray, 1983; Gorz, 1978 and Littler, 1982), have initiated fruitful areas of enquiry and thrown considerable insight into the understanding of such inter-relationship. The field of industrial sociology in India is completely fertile from this point of view as there is great paucity of studies with this perspective. The present study tries to partially fill the gap and would contribute to the theoretical insight into this field.

The plethora of studies on industrial sociology in India is abound with empirical studies with focus on the present. They do not provide insight into the growth of industries and working class as a process. The combination of historical methods and empirical methods provides better insight into the dynamic nature of the relationship. This is one of the serious limitations of the studies on industrial sociology in India. The present study tries to effectively combine the strength of two methods to understand the nature of hosiery industry in the past and its linkage to the present
as also the simultaneous evolution of the working class. It is expected that the present study would also partially fulfil this methodological gap in the studies on industrial sociology in India.

The study has bearing for policy implications as well. The analysis in chapters V and VI have clearly revealed that the majority workers are excluded from the statutory definition of the worker. Consequently, they are deprived of most of the benefits accruing from labour legislations such as Factories Act, 1948, Minimum Wages Act, 1948, Employees State Insurance Act, 1948, Employees Provident Fund Act, 1952, and Maternity Benefit Act, etc. This has been apparently possible due to the complicity between the labour department and the exporters.

The study has also certain limitations which are both methodological and theoretical in nature. The theoretical limitations stem from the paucity of similar studies on the traditional industries in India. Hence, generalizations could be taken as tentative and in the direction of providing hypothesis which could be tested in other situations to test its soundness. Part of the limitations and theoretical generalizations are implicit in the lack of studies of this nature and also relative lack of historical and secondary material to provide the basis for more rigorous generalizations. The other limitations arise from the lack of comparative focus. For example, the nature of relationship between industrialisation, working class formation and trade union movement in one
of the traditional industries like hosiery could be effectively compared with other traditional industries in Punjab like the textile, carpet industry and wood-works industry etc. The paucity of time and resources did not make it feasible to attempt a comparative study of the other traditional industries. The nature of the present study made it imperative to focus more on the qualitative rather than the quantitative dimension. It is from this point of view that the structured interviews was made to play a sub-dued role and greater emphasis was placed to such techniques of data collection as observations (both, participant and non-participant), case studies and and non-directive interviews.

Consequently there was limited usefulness of the application of the statistical techniques of analysis. The lack of authenticity of the information supplied by the labour department and the industrialists themselves made it necessary to pull-out information below the belt. The nature of exploitation perpetrated on women labour, the domestic workers, child labour and the migrant workers necessitated deeper probing which could not be elicited from the structured interviews. The role of intermediaries, contractors and fabricators which were also the effective safety valve mechanism utilized by the capitalists to prevent the outlet of the real information also necessitated the use of qualitative technique of data collection. As the study also explored the longitudinal dimension with emphasis on the process, the structured interviews would be ineffective to go into these aspects.