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1.1 TRADE UNIONS IN THE EARLY PERIODS:

The trade unions have sprung up during the early stage of capitalism as an organization aiming at improving the economic conditions of the workers within the framework of the capitalist system. At first they considered it as their task to fight only with the individual capitalists in defence of the immediate professional workers' interests without affecting the foundations of capitalist exploitation and without going beyond the pale of the capitalist industrial social organization. The abolition of competition among workers of a given trade, the restricted access of new workers to it and the resorting in extreme cases to strikes were the usual methods used by the old trade unions in order to obtain higher wages, shorter working hours and better working conditions.

They failed to see the direct tie-up which existed between the condition of the workers in production and the political and state organization of capitalist society. Those trade unions shut
themselves up in their narrow professional shell, assiduously avoiding all participation in political battles and in the nation's politics in general and confining themselves to questions pertaining to their trade. This of course subsequently did not prevent them from being quite frequently used directly or indirectly for the political ends of the bourgeoisie. In spite of this innocuous character of the first trade unions the bourgeoisie and its state opposed them vehemently and tried by violence, repression and legalized bans to destroy them, sensing instinctively that they might develop into dangerous class organizations, into organs of the class struggle of the proletariat for the abolition of the capitalist system.

The rabid acts of violence, repressions and bans against the trade unions failed to produce the result expected by the bourgeoisie. A product of the very development of capitalism, having emerged in the struggle between capital and labour and having become a vital necessity for the workers in their defence against capitalist exploitation, the trade unions could not possibly be eradicated. The persecutions against them only intensified the existing class contradictions in capitalist society and revealed them more clearly to the masses of workers. Without the intervention of the trade unions the strikes were more frequent, spontaneous and turbulent inflicting immeasurable damage on production threatening often even the personal safety and property of individual capitalists.
It was precisely this that finally compelled the bourgeoisie to get reconciled to the existence of trade unions, while attempting to tame them and to turn them into organizations which would regulate relations between workers and capitalists and maintain a lasting peace in industry.

This really marked the beginning of the era of collective contracts concluded between the trade unions and the capitalist organizations and by fixing by mutual consent the conditions and rates of wages and working time thereby removing for a long time the danger of strikes at the enterprises and in the branches of industry affected by these collective contracts. The well-known wage scales were established according to which wage rates were determined in accordance with the average price of prime necessities over a given period the calculation however being usually so made as to keep wages at the lowest possible level. In order to involve the workers and their trade unions more deeply in capitalist production to harness them to it and make them eager collaborators of the capitalists in expending and stabilizing it so as to increase capitalist profit to the utmost many enterprises resorted to profit-sharing schemes in the form of certain percentages and bonuses granted to the workers. Thus the capitalists secured a maximum labour efficiency on the part of the workers, safeguarded themselves against their strikes, pocketed fat profits while all that
the workers got was the illusion of participating in the profits of the enterprises and if what they secured was inadequate of attributing it not to capitalist exploitation, not to the greed of the capitalists, not to the capitalist system of production itself and the way the goods produced were distributed but to their own inadequacy in work, to their failure to put in the necessary efforts for the success of production. Adopting this industrial policy towards the workers the capitalists strove to make them believe that an improvement of their condition could be achieved not through strikes, not through a struggle against capitalist exploitation but solely through an increase of capital, through an expansion of production, through constantly growing capitalist profits.

The majority of trade unions turned from bodies for the defence of the workers' interests and for fighting capitalism into vehicles for the establishment of equilibrium and peace in capitalist production and into an instrument of the nation's capitalists whereby to keep the workers' masses in a state of subordination and bondage, to divert them from the road of the class proletarian struggle and ever to oppose them to the emancipatory workers' revolution.
After the founding of the First Socialist International and the publication of the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels the proletariat began rapidly to organize itself as a class of its own and the trade union movement increasingly adopted Marx's view to the effect that trade unions should not confine themselves to a partisan war against individual capitalists but should become schools of socialism and strive to abolish capitalism itself by playing a prime role in the civil war for its downfall. The bourgeoisie adopted a long-term and systematic policy of bribing and corrupting the trade union leaders and the numerous trade union bureaucracy in order to keep the trade union movement under its influence. In its press it flattered the trade union leaders as being intelligent and talented workers' representatives, enticed them to come to its sumptuous banquets, courted them in various ways, granted them all sorts of benefits, helped them to enter parliament and kept them firmly in its hands.

It must be admitted that in this way the bourgeoisie quite often succeeded in attaining its goal and in keeping many of the trade unions under its direct or indirect control of which circumstance it made the widest possible use in particular during the World War.
1.2 TRADE UNIONS DURING THE WAR PERIODS:

Standing on the positions of their nation's capitalists, the majority of British trade unions, the oldest and strongest trade union organizations, saw in the war the only means whereby industry in Great Britain would be able to preserve its dominant position on the world market now threatened by rising and aggressive German capitalism and to maintain its sway over India and the other rich colonies which supplied it with raw materials and vast markets for its products. The British trade unions placed themselves at the complete service of the imperialist and bellicose policy of their own bourgeoisie. They attempted to stop all strikes, prolonged the expiring terms of all collective contracts and strove to ensure the widest possible development of the war industry. They gave a great number of volunteers from among their midst and opened special offices for the recruitment of volunteers for the British Army and when compulsory military service was introduced in Great Britain where it had never existed in the past, they not only did not oppose it but even enthusiastically applauded this initiative of Lloyd George's as a fine means of forever crushing Prussian militarism.

The German trade unions on their part headed by the notorious social-traitor Legien and by the numerous staff of the
corrupt workers' bureaucracy announced that the war of German imperialism against England was at the same time a war for the existence of the working class in Germany, that if the latter were defeated in this war, even the few colonies which she possessed compared with Great Britain would be taken away from her that German industry would be deprived of the raw materials which it needed, its roads to the international markets would be blocked and it would be brought to complete disaster and, together with it, the working class would be reduced to utter misery and unprecedented pauperism and Germany - as Lenin liked to put it - instead of exporting goods, would be exporting live men, its manpower. The General Trade Union Committee addressed an ardent appeal to the workers in industry and in the Army urging them to give their all-round support to the sacred defensive war of Kaiser Wilhelm and the German imperialists and demanding of the trade unions to make the workers refrain from all strikes especially in the field of mining and the war industries. That is how civil peace between the working class and the imperialist bourgeoisie was solemnly proclaimed. At the very moment when the German capitalists and their joint-stock companies were pocketing billions of profits, when the gold rain of the war was pouring into their safes, the German proletarians were shedding their blood on the battlefields or working day and night in industry for the defence of the fatherland, while their trade unions invested their millions in cash (collected over decades in workers'
pennies for fighting capitalist exploitation) in state loans to finance the perfidious war.

Accompanying the singing of the rabid hymn of the German imperialists and militarists Deutschland, Deutschland fiber alles', the big trade union leaders published a special book containing articles by the secretaries of the various unions who with figures relating to their production branches endeavoured to prove the necessity of Germany's holding out to the end in the war and of her emerging as complete victor proudly declaring that this would inevitably he achieved because the war on the part of Germany was a war which the working class was waging for its existence and its future happiness. They enthusiastically painted the bright prospects of a military victory for the German workers who would be able freely to travel around the whole world, receiving high wages and enjoying the greatest prosperity.

At the same time Gompers's AFL was carrying on a very intensive propaganda for America's intervention in the war and when this intervention became a fact mobilized all its forces in the service of the American millionaires and corporations. Even the French trade unions which under the influence of anarcho-syndicalism were considered extreme and irreconcilable enemies of capitalism in their bulk committed themselves for similar reasons to
the service of French financial capital in the war furled their banners
and wholeheartedly embraced the policy of civil peace.

Without dwelling on the betrayal of the trade
unions in the other belligerent nations except for those in Russia,
Italy, Bulgaria, Serbia and Rumania which remained completely
loyal to the working class and to international proletarian solidarity,
we can boldly assert today that if the capitalists in the two warring
blocks were able to kindle the holocaust of the world war and drive
their peoples into it if they succeeded in manifesting such titanic
forces during its four-year duration this was due primarily to the fact
that they managed in good time to win over the trade unions which
had a membership of many millions to their imperialist cause and
place them at the service of their military policy of conquest.

The old opportunism and auto-syndicalism in the
trade union movement, the policy of confining their activity to
reforms within the capitalist system, the professional narrow-
mindedness, short-sightedness and corruption of the trade union
bureaucracy, the education of the workers' masses in the trade
unions in a spirit of petty, momentary gains along the road of
mutual understanding with the capitalists - all this developed and
was brilliantly manifested during the war in the form of a labour
imperialism which rent asunder the international solidarity of the
proletariat and turned the workers in the different countries into deadly enemies who killed each other for the cause of their common enemy - world capital.

This, however proves the complete bankruptcy of the dominant opportunist policy in the trade union movement in most countries laying bare before the world proletariat and its workers' organizations with absolute clarity the only salutary road - the road of intransigent class struggle.

1.3 RESULTS OF THE TRADE UNIONS STRUGGLE:

With the trade methods of struggle the unions in the different countries did indeed achieve quite a few results. The despotic arbitrariness of the boss towards the workers at the enterprises was restricted. The workers won the right to intervene through their trade unions in the settlement of relations between labour and capital. A rise in the average wage level was also obtained as compared with the worker's former exceedingly miserable conditions as well as shorter working hours which in the past the capitalists could freely prolong to the physically utmost possible limits. Moreover the sums spent by the trade unions during periods of unemployment not only alleviate the heavy lot of the unemployed but also help to avoid intense competition between
unemployed and employed thus preventing a lowering of wages and the former unrestricted deterioration of general working conditions.

The benefits derived from the struggle of the trade unions usually went to the skilled and semi-skilled workers who were those precisely in a position to establish strong trade unions while the mass of unskilled general workers enjoyed these benefits but little.

How insignificant in general are the results obtained by trade unions over many years of effort and struggle could be clearly seen from the fact that even in the most highly developed capitalist countries such as Great Britain, Germany and America, the wage rates prior to the war always ranged about the minimum necessary for the workers' elementary sustenance while the working day in most branches of industry was ten and only here and there eight hours. The gains of the trade union struggle are moreover, not only insufficient from the viewpoint of the material, cultural and spiritual needs of the working class were also precarious.

The capitalists had at their disposal various means of counteracting the efforts of the trade unions aiming at improving labour conditions as well as at divesting them of the fruits of their
struggle. The general policy of the state as well as of the conditions in which capitalist production was developing facilitated their task in this respect.

Thus they took advantage above all of the possibilities offered them by technical progress, introducing and extending the use of women and children in production. These owing to their smaller power of resistance and lower susceptibility to organization usually competed with the adult workers and tend to depress working conditions. For the same purpose the capitalists used the workers from the backward regions and countries whose culture was lower as well as the helpless arid ruined urban and rural petty bourgeois who owing to their restricted means were ready to work on terms inferior to those which the trade unions had won. Compelled to reduce the working day the capitalists now managed to draw from the workers even during the shorter working hours as much of their vital force as before through piece work and the different special systems of utilizing every movement of the worker's body while he was at work.

Finally, what the trade unions managed to gain through their professional struggle in the way of higher wages was by and large taken away from them the next moment as a consequence of the general capitalist policy and in particular, the
introduction and increase of indirect taxes, of import duties and a number of similar means which tend to raise the cost of living.

All these special conditions of trade union struggle had long ago suggested to the more advanced and farsighted elements among the working class that this struggle should not be waged in an isolated way that it should be coordinated with the general political struggle of the proletariat that a strike in production should be combined with the ballot and the struggle in parliament as well as with all forms of mass workers' action that in a word the trade union struggle become a component of the entire class struggle of the proletariat.

Indeed wherever this had been applied in practice the trade union struggle had been more successful and surer. It must be admitted that even when the struggle of the trade unions was thus combined, it's limits and chances of success did not change substantially. Even then, its results though substantially greater and surer still remained insufficient and precarious. They did not create for the working class in capitalist society the possibility of living well and like cultured men nor did they even substantially decrease the material and social misery in which it lived. All improvements obtained through strikes on the one hand and through labour protection laws on the other as long as political power was in the
hands of the bourgeoisie could not exceed the limits of a given amount of capitalist profit as otherwise the very existence of capitalist industry would be impossible.

From the history of the struggle of the trade unions it could be seen that its only essential and lasting result consisted in that the workers succeeding in resisting the utter exhaustion of their vital forces and in safeguarding themselves against utter physical and moral degeneration to which capitalism was irresistibly pushing them. The trade unions, however, were not in a position to impose sufficient and lasting improvement which would enable the workers' masses to lead a more cultural and happier life for a long period.

1.4 CONDITIONS OF TRADE UNIONS STRUGGLE AFTER WORLD WAR:

The world war created conditions which further impede the struggle of the trade unions and substantially lower even the chances of obtaining practical results which it had prior to the war. The conditions could be summarised as below:

- It nullified most of the previous gains in the working conditions of all the belligerent and even of neutral nations.
• Everywhere wages far from corresponded to the colossal rise in the cost of living.

• There was a precipice between the nominal and the real wage, i.e. its actual purchasing power.

• There was an unprecedented rise in the price of the necessities of life and a shortage of them, an acute housing crisis and unprecedented misery for the working masses in the defeated as well as in the victorious countries.

• The war radically upset all economic life.

• For four years almost 45 million people instead of producing goods were engaged in a terrible holocaust of destruction.

• More than 20 million producers of goods left their lives on the battlefields or were disabled i.e. deprived of their former capacity for work.

• Flourishing regions in the world were devastated.
• All reserves of raw materials and foods were swallowed up by the greedy war monster.

• Vast spaces of land remained uncultivated.

• Three-quarters of the farm animals were killed.

• The workers who returned from the battlefields were physically exhausted and morally upset trade has been completely disorganized.

• The former relations between the different economic and industrial regions for the exchange of raw materials and finished goods have been discontinued.

• The means of communication i.e. railroad, shipping and other communications have been worn out etc.

• As a result of this disorganization of economic life, many branches of industry were standstill and others have altogether ceased to function.

• Mass unemployment had assumed unprecedented proportions in all countries of the world.
In the period of liquidation of the World War which in effect was merely a passing over of the war into another stage of all imperialist war against the rising international proletarian revolution, capitalism proved incapable of securing peace among nations, of restoring production and securing the elementary survival of the masses. Crushed by the weight of its insoluble internal contradictions, its only concern became to save itself from the revolution. It led to further the chaos in production and economic life and infinitely increasing the sufferings of its own people. On the other hand, the World War irretrievably ushered in the epoch of the international proletarian revolution. Amidst anarchy in economic life, disorganization in production accompanied by mass unemployment and misery bourgeoisie tried in vain to retain its shaken supremacy.

There were no longer any prospects for a return to prewar conditions. The war itself accelerated and revealed the complete bankruptcy of the capitalist system of production and trade, of social organization and state government. The situation then prevailed confronted working mankind with the dilemma either to pass over to new forms of production and social organization or to perish under the regime of imperialist barbarity. The restoration of economic life could be possible only along socialist lines, i.e. without the capitalists and against them. Under the new conditions
after the war, the efforts of the trade unions to improve the conditions of the workers even back to the pre-war level became quite hopeless and helpless.

The trade unions were unable to think of obtaining the improvements needed by the workers when the overall economic life was so upset, when there was a mass unemployment and when the strong and extremely obdurate financial capitalists looked at every movement for higher wages and shorter working hours as a revolutionary action aiming directly at the overthrow of capitalist rule. No labour laws of a nature to expand and consolidate the gains of the trade union struggle could be enacted which was under billions of war debts. These peculiar conditions in the trade union struggle at the imperialist stage of capitalism which confronted the proletariat and in particular its trade unions with the immediate task of doing away with the capitalist system and the ensuing exploitation of labour.

1.5 THE STRUGGLE FOR POLITICAL POWER:

Amidst the situation discussed above, the historical moment the struggle for political power by the proletariat came to the fore and all other efforts and tasks of the workers' organizations including the trade unions needed to be coordinated
with this struggle and be completely subordinated to it. The replacement of one social and production system by another is possible only by means of political power. The abolition of capitalist exploitation which was the immediate task of the trade unions could be achieved only if the proletariat wrests power from the hands of the ruling bourgeoisie. But if the strike is considered the strongest weapon of the trade unions for gaining improvements in production, when came a question of seizing political power and proceeding to a radical reconstruction of production and society, the strike even in the form of a mass political strike would not settle the issue but the proletarian revolution itself. To rally the masses, to educate and prepare them for this struggle, was then the foremost task of the trade unions if they wished to remain true to the interests of the proletariat and to their own role of class proletarian organization.

1.6 THE ORIGIN:

The trade union movement is a result of the modern industrial revolution. Trade unions have grown in response to the peculiar needs and problems, which the wage earners have had to face in the course of industrialization under the capitalist economic system. The factors that necessitated the origin of trade unions
1.6.1 Separation between capital and labour:

The capitalist mode of industrialization has involved a separation between the ownership of capital and labour, both of which are essential for the production of goods and services. The modern factory system created a class of laborers and a class of owners of capital. A class of people came to the labour market to sell their Labour power: the only source of their livelihood, and became the sellers of labor. The other class with large capital at their disposal came to the market to buy labour power and put it to productive use. As buyers they were interested in paying the lowest possible price and as suppliers of labour, the laborers were interested in securing the highest possible price. Thus the two classes with divergent and conflicting interest came together to give rise to a conflicting relationship.

1.6.2 Lack of bargaining power on the part of workers:

Whatever might have been the position and the status of the industrial workers in the eyes of law, in reality, the individual workman, deprived of any independent means of livelihood and being the seller of the most perishable commodities, was no match for this employer either in the bargaining skill or in the knowledge of the trade the market conditions or in economic
resources and waiting power. It was the employer who unilaterally determined the wage rates, the hours of work and other conditions of employment without any semblance of bargaining. The workers had either to accept the job on the terms and conditions offered by the employers or give it up, remain unemployed and starve.

1.6.3 Individual dispensability v/s collective indispensability:

The individual workman was dispensable to the employer but workman, collectively, were indispensable to him. The employer could easily and always get rid of the services of a few workmen and replaced them by others, but he could not dispense with the services of all his workmen and readily replace them.

1.6.4 Emergence of trade unionism:

It was under these conditions that the workers' organisation started in a rudimentary form. Workers working under a common employer, faced with common problems and common tasks, developed common sentiments. They developed group interpretations and reactions to the external environment, social and economic situations and tried to organise themselves into an associations which could meet the employers on the basis of quality.
Trade unions in all the countries have passed through three stages:

- Outright suppression
- Limited acceptance and tolerance
- General acceptance and recognition

However, the trade unions in the world today are not at the same stage of development everywhere. In some countries, especially in those under colonial rule and dictatorships, trade unions are working hard to cross the first stage; in the underdeveloped countries recently freed from colonial yoke, they are in the second stage; and in the fully-fledged industrially advanced capitalist democracies, they are in the third stage.

1.7 OBJECTIVES OF TRADE UNIONS:

According to Samuel Gompers,

"Trade Unions were born of the necessity of workers to protect and defend themselves from encroachment, injustice and wrong. To protect the workers in their inalienable right to higher and better life; to protect them, not only as equals before the law, but also in their rights to the product of their labour; to protect their lives, their
limbs, their health, their homes, their firesides, their liberties as men, as worker, as citizen; to overcome and conquer prejudice and antagonism; to secure them the right to life, and the opportunity to maintain that life; the right to be full sharers in the abundance which is the result of their brain and brawn, and civilization of which they are the founders and the mainstay."

The primary function of trade unions is to protect the workers against the excess committed by the employers and to meet other needs of the worker-economic and political.

The aim, philosophies, theories and social and economic programme of the trade union movement are all related to one supreme goal i.e. the protection and promotion of the interest of the working class. All other objectives flow from this supreme goal.

This generic goal of protecting and promoting workers interests consist of such specific objectives as:

- Shorter working day
- Improved economic status
- Betterment of working and living condition
- Income security e.g. pension, provident fund
- Compensation for work-injuries and unemployment
- Obtaining job security such as protection against layoff retrenchment and victimization, etc
- Better health, safety and welfare standards
- Respect for the personality of the workers
- Human treatment from supervisors and others
- A greater voice in industrial administration and management
- By the establishment of industrial democracy and
- Improving political status.

The early unions everywhere emphasized the wage issue much more than any others. Later on, the hours of work and still later, the income security aspects came to occupy a higher priority for which unions and when is a function of time and place.

1.8 MARXIST INFLUENCE:

Karl Marx was the one who gave the principles of socialism to this world which influenced the labour movement. He gave a scientific foundation for the working class with his theory of wages, profit and capital. He was born in Germany in 1818 and studied History and
philosophy in his early stages. After Fredrick William III, his course of life changed and became head of a newspaper that criticized the existing political set up. At that time the paper owners of Germany were very submissive and they accepted censorship without any resistance. Marx could not adjust with the political climate in Germany and moved to Paris. He published the German French Annuals I in which the started a series of his socialist writing. He had an in-depth study of the History of the Great French Revolution and he wrote articles attacking the then Prussian Government. He became for France and expelled from France. He shifted to Brussels and published in French in 1847 the poverty of Philosophy and discourse on Free Trade. He also used this opportunity to establish a German workers society. Marx and his friends joined the Communist League in Secret. It was used for Communist Propaganda. Everything had to be done in secret because of the then prevailing situation. This communist league is supposed to be the first organization of workers of International character. In this organization, Englishmen, Belgians, Hungarians, Poles and Swiss were members. The league organized International Labour meetings especially in London. The league was transformed into a radical organization in 1847. In the Congress, held in 1847 resolved
the publication of fundamental Principles of the party in a Manifesto to be prepared by Marx and Engles.

The document thus prepared by Marx and Engles became the Manifesto of the Communist Party. Marx throughout his life worked for the working class movement. His activities were not limited to a particular country or area. Though he was born in Germany, he lived in France, Switzerland and England. In the beginning he had to organize workers in secret but later on the workers became bold enough to organize themselves. 1848 was a period of revolution and working class struggle took place.

But by the end of the year the revolution had turned into a counter revolution. The workers were brutally crushed in Paris by the Army and National Guard. Marx was expelled from France and had to move to London. During the 1850s he continued his writing on class struggle. Marx then turned his studies to the economic foundation of Modern Capitalism. But this study on economy could not be completed. We can sum up theories as under:

- All societies are stratified into distinct groups and classes. Power and authorities
are linked closely with the economic organizations of society. Capitalism simplifies class relations creating a conflict between the owners of capital (bourgeoisie) and working class. The relation is one of exploitation.

- Society is a product of Class struggle and social change is more revolutionary than evolutionary. Societies pass through definite changes of development. With each stage contain contradictions and conflicts that eventuate in social transformations. But society and history are not be solely external to man, for it is through man's own activity, as a member of the social class, that the social and historical world is created.

- Society is a totality, a structure of interrelated levels. The economic base or infrastructure is closely bound up with the Super structure, the institutions produce knowledge and relations of production.
Social processes are never homogenous and uniform, but contradictory dialectical. All phenomena are inter-related generating contradictions both within and between themselves.

Society and history are characterized by certain laws, but it is man who ultimately makes the world through his praxis.

Class society is held together as much ideology as by force. Alienation tends to obscure for man the real foundation of society as one of exploitation and inequality.

The working class throughout the world was attracted towards Marxism mainly because of his revolutionary theory on wages. The working class including Indian working class was getting very low wages and was a dissatisfied a lot. Man sells his labour power and capitalist purchase it for a paltry sum. But this wage had nothing to do with cost of production or the price of commodity that ultimately came to the market. The capitalist never thought whether the wages given to the worker is sufficient to maintain himself and his
family. The wages is a name given to the labour power that is being purchased by the capitalist. The money that is being paid to the labourer has to be considered in relationship with the purchasing power it has got in relation with market price of the commodities he used for his lively hood. Goods cannot be produced without the effort of man. His labour power can only produce goods. The price of the goods should be in accordance with the wage that is paid to the worker. But in the Capitalist system the wages already paid from the fund available with the capitalist and the price of the commodity has nothing to do with the payment of labour. That is to say the capitalists fix the prices of the commodity and to earn huge profit as he is in control of the entire production system. The worker who got a major share in production of the goods has a right to receive wages in accordance with the prices of the commodity he has produced. But the capitalist consider labour also as a commodity like the raw materials etc. for which he has already paid. So the entire profit on sale of good is taken as the property of the capitalist. The labourer sells his labour power to another person in order to secure necessary means of subsistence. Thus his life activity is the means for him to survive. It is his only source of life. By selling his labour power he is not entitled to get the products he has produced. For example, the worker who produces silk is not entitled for
even a single piece of silk cloth. What he gets is wages as a means of subsistence. It is not his life activity begins only when he came to his house and began to think himself. The difference between a slave and a labourer that the slave is sold and purchased freely in the market but the labourer, sells only his labour power. The free labourer on the other hand sells himself and indeed, sells himself piecemeal. The labourer does not belong to the owner of a factory. But his power belongs to the owner for a specific period of time for which he is being paid.

The thinking of Karl Marx that the capitalist treats human being as a commodity and not willing to share even smallest part of profit for the labourers has created a new awareness among the working class. His call to the workers to unite and struggle against exploitation was well received by the working class. Those who came forward to help the working class were philanthropists and they only wanted to mitigate the suffering of the working class rather than to make them understand their legal right of getting reasonable wages and share of profit as they are also a partner in the process of production.
1.9 MAHATMA GANDHIJI'S VIEWS:

Mahatma Gandhi's views on the role of a trade union were contrary to those of Marx believed in class struggle. Gandhiji admitted the existence of two classes, but, with his faith in the goodness of man, he ruled out the need for class struggle. Many of Gandhiji's views have arisen out of the fundamental principles of his idealism, such as faith in the goodness of the individual, purity of means, economic equality, trusteeship, removing the evils of industrialism. He believed that the trade union should be internally, used for the reformation of workers as good citizens, as also for their defense against assaults from outside. Trade unions can be moral institutions for the improvement of behavior, and belief in the dignity of labour.

1.10 TRADE UNIONISM IN SOME ADVANCED COUNTRIES:
(U.K., U.S.A. and U.S.S. R.)

Great Britain was the first country in the world to industrialize the labour movement in the UK is the oldest in the world and has the virtues and drawbacks of a pioneering movement. Industrial democracy developed side by side with political democracy, and trade unions kept before them the twin goals of
democracy, and socialism. Besides, a study of the British labour movement is very relevant to India because of the long political association between the two countries. The British labour movement served as a model for Indian trade unions. Most of our pre-independence laws, systems and procedure in the labour field have a clear British impact on them.

Even after independence, the British impact has not completely disappeared. For example, the National Commission of Labour (1966-69) in India had some important ideas from the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employer' Associations (1956-68).

For different reasons, a study of American labour Movement is relevant. The American worker is among the richest in world and his material prosperity is mainly due to the organized strength of the workers. In recent times, we have been keeping American trade unionism as our model as evidenced in such measures as the prohibition of unfair labour practices, recognition of trade unions, union security and activities.

The Russian trade movement places before us a third model. Because of the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, the roles of government management and trade
unions intermingle. The legal situation relating to the right to organize, the structure and organization of trade unions, the relationship of trade unions with the government and the party, and the function performed by trade unions. The trade unions have played a vital role in the social and economic development of the USSR. There are a number of other foreign countries whose labour movements may offer many constructive guidelines for our trade unions.

Joint consultation in France, Co-determination in Germany, cooperatives in Israel, and full employment in Sweden and workers' control in Yugoslavia may offer some useful and practical hints to trade union developments.

The main purpose of the study of labour movements in these three countries is to highlight the characteristic features of trade unions there with a view to finding out how far they can be adopted in our country. The origin and growth of trade unions are determined by a constellation of factors and it may not be possible to isolate a single factor from the rest in terms of the resultant dynamics. The factors are mostly endogenous in their origin although exogenous forces might bear some impact on some occasions.
In order to understand trade unionism in a certain country or culture it is necessary to probe and investigate into its economic situation, the dominant technology, the occupational structure, the political system and the legal situation. It may be suggested that depending on one or the other of these factors the pattern of trade unionism and its structure are likely to be different across the cultures. This part means an attempt to examine the comparative profiles of the trade unionism as they have developed in Great Britain, the United States of America and in Soviet Russia. The objective is to provide a cross-cultural perspective in the light of which trade union situation in India may be appreciated and understood. The present focus is limited to highlight only a few selected aspects of trade unionism such as their emergence structure, legal framework and predominant characteristics.

1.10.1 Russian Revolution:

The communist revolution of 1917 was one of the turning points not only in the history of Russia but also in the history of the world. The communist government established by the workers of the Soviet Union is the first such government ever came to power on the principle of socialism. The Russian Revolution has got an international character and greatly influenced all political,
social and economical fields in the world over. It brought powerful challenges to the manifold aspects of Western values, the principles of trade, the theories of government, the prime work of institution, the rules of international conduct and technique of diplomacy. The communist revolution of Russia was the result of the autocratic rule of Czar and their utter disregard for the poor mass. The pitiable condition of the workers and the poor people gave proper atmosphere for a revolution. The Marxist theory greatly influenced the leaders, workers and common people. The communist ideology of Karl Marx played a great role in ousting the autocratic regime of Czars. The discontentment among the people of Russia was mainly due to exploitation and gross violation of human rights. The economic condition of poor people was miserable and when they raised voice for improving their condition, they were crushed by the mighty rulers with the help of the army. The Czar of Russia simply slept over the demand of the common man and the workers. They were waiting for an opportunity to oust the tyranny of the Czars. The people had many serious grievances but no one was ready to hear them. The Government also did not introduce any reform for the improvement of the condition of workers. Russia was a vast country but the people were very poor. They were using the old pattern of agriculture which did not give much to the workers for their livelihood. Serfdom was a curse to Russia.
The landlords could sell and purchase serf like a commodity. The cruel master some time flogged them and ever interfered in their family affairs. This system abolished in 1867 but the villagers could not move out of their village without the permission of police. Heavy land revenue imposed on them, made the village people living in abject poverty and hunger. The factory workers also were living in miserable condition in Russia. The peasants and workers were living in a very miserable condition. They were kept in the bottom of the society and their condition was no less than the slaves. The poor workers of Russia were crushing under the autocratic rule of Czar. In Europe, the Marxist ideology was taking root. It was natural that such neglected workers were attracted to the ideology of Marxism. In 1898 Marxist socialists established the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. The inhuman condition of Russian people and defeat in the First World War had a demoralizing effect on the rulers. Economic difficulties, food shortage, the incompetence of the government to solve the problems led to the Revolution of 1917. The workers took part directly in the Revolution. There were strikes, act of arson and loot everywhere. The poor directly marched to Petrograd shouting that they were hungry and wanted bread. In February, 1917 the workers went on strike. The military was given order to disperse demonstrators but they did not resort to firing on workers. In fact the soldiers also joined the workers against rulers. There was no other
alternative but to hand over the ruling to the representatives of people and the workers. This was the first show of strength by workers who captured political power on the principles of Communism. Industrialized society never witnessed such solidarity among the working class. Even the lower grade officials in the army also supported the movement. The Russian Revolution invariably showed that the laise faire theory was loosing ground. If workers were not looked after properly they would rise against the government and the entire capital system and the governments based on this principle would be in trouble.

1.10.2 Trade Unionism in Asia:

Trade unions have a very good record indeed in this respect, particularly in the industrialized countries during the last century. First the creation of welfare states, of welfare mechanisms and safety nets, and more recently the process of reshaping of the public social agenda have provided ample evidence of the wider societal roles which trade unions have played in a sizeable number of industrialized countries over a long time span.

In Asia, after the Chinese and Pacific regions, three major highly differentiated trajectories are distinguishable. In East Asia, over the past few decades, there has been a substantial
tightening of labour markets as a result of remarkable economic restructuring and a most impressive industrialization process. The labour movement in a distinct way has managed to adopt new strategies that are conditioned by the particular conditions in each country. For instance, in South Korea the trade union movement managed to battle for basic labour rights and improvement of working conditions, while lately its assertive role in the processes of re-structuring has become widely known. The Japanese involvement has been far more modest as the labour movement became encapsulated in the specific characteristics of the Japanese corporate structures. It is striking that in Singapore new roles have been defined in terms of the trade union movement being associated with the implementation of welfare schemes.

The picture in South-East Asia is very different, particularly since the labour market situation in this second layer of industrialization has become so adverse to any strengthening of labour organization. Incidental outstanding labour leadership, such as is currently the case in Indonesia, or the efforts to organize and safeguard the position of members as implemented in the Philippines, Malaysia and Thailand, do not provide an encouraging ground to define strategic roles which the labour movement can play in development.
The South Asian scene offers a complex panorama, less so in Bangladesh and Nepal, but particularly in India, and to an extent in Pakistan. In spite of the most adverse labour market conditions, the political scene has allowed a degree of maneuverability that permits some interesting experiments: for instance, the unique Pakistan Institute for Labour Education and Research (PILER) in Karachi, or the initiatives taken by certain Indian labour leaders to establish a Centre for Worker Management (CWM) in Delhi to search for meaningful solutions to the long overdue process of privatisation of the huge public sector.
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