

**PARTY AND TRADE UNIONS**

**some  
problems**

**COMMUNIST PARTY  
PUBLICATION  
NEW DELHI, 1964**

*Price: 25 nP.*

## INTRODUCTION

---

*Taking into account the fact that the working class and the trade union movement have to face serious problems affecting the country and the life and living of millions of toiling people, the Secretariat of the Communist Party decided to call an all-India fraction meeting of the trade unions.*

*Each State Committee of the Party was asked to depute one or two leading party members working in the trade unions. Party members who are on the General Council of the AITUC or are its office bearers were also called for the meeting. It was also decided that all the Central Secretariat members should be present to study the issues on the spot and give guidance as a whole.*

*In all 32 members were present in the meeting, which met in Bombay on December 11, 1963 on the eve of the All-India Trade Union Conference convened by the AITUC to prepare and launch a National Campaign for reduction in prices and taxes, for higher wages, DA and bonus and for nationalisation.*

*S. A. Dange, placed before the fraction meeting a document on behalf of the Secretariat.*

*All participants in the discussion agreed with the main points of the documents and also suggested certain improvements, after which it was adopted. The Secretariat has now released the document for the guidance of party members on the trade union front.*

SECRETARIAT

## INTRODUCTION

## QUESTIONS BEFORE THE TU MOVEMENT

---

### I

*Why have we called this meeting of the leading party members working on the trade union front? Is there any special problem that has to be put before a TU fraction of this character?*

You know we had a convention of Communist Party members working in the TU movement which met in Calcutta on May 20-22, 1952. Some three hundred Party workers who were TU functionaries attended that convention from all over the country. Five reports were made to the convention which it endorsed and were published by the Polit Bureau of that period on September 27, 1952.

As you are aware, there was a completely new situation in the country and also in the Party in that period. The calling of the convention of Party TU workers was a very helpful step.

Then again in May 1953, i.e., a year later, an all-India TU fraction meeting was called in Poona to discuss mainly the problem of TU unity, particularly with reference to the INTUC and the HMS.

The TU Sub-Committee of the Central Committee summed up the discussion, on which there was unanimous agreement. This was published as a document in a Party Letter dated July 8, 1953 by the Polit Bureau.

Thereafter, in the new organisational developments, the fractions on the mass fronts were abolished. The main reason for this was that in most of the mass organisations, in their leading committees and open sessions, the Communist delegates were an overwhelming majority and the

calling of fractions as such became superfluous as well as inconvenient and even harmful in some cases.

Where an organisation had a multiplicity of parties and groups in its composition of leaderships, the policy in those bodies was discussed either at the CC level or an ad hoc fraction was called to discuss the problems. Since 1960, several such ad hoc fractions composed of party members who are trade union functionaries in various united and composite TU federations have met from time to time.

We have had trade union sub-committees of the National Council. But they were too small to replace wider consultations.

Hence the Secretariat decided to call you to this meeting so that the CEC and the National Council can get some idea of the problems before the working class in the special field of trade unionism and in the concrete application of the general line of the Party therein.

In the trade union field, the working class is directly confronted by the national bourgeoisie and the foreign monopolists in the day-to-day production sphere.

It also comes directly face to face with the state and the representatives of the national bourgeoisie in the government, in the sphere of industrial law and industrial relations, i.e., in strikes, courts, industrial tribunals and tripartite bodies, etc.

As a party of the working class, the Party in its general political line does lay down the strategic and tactical line for the working class and its relations with regard to the other classes in political and economic matters.

But we are not dealing with that general problem here. In trade unions, we only consider the concrete application of the general political line of the Party. Hence, such a meeting as this does not go into the discussion of the general line.

We concentrate mainly on the specific problems of the defence of the working class in its struggle with the developing capitalism in a country like ours, a newly-liberated and an underdeveloped country which, as such, has

to face the dangers of neo-colonialism from the imperialists but has also a friend in the powerful socialist camp.

*We have to consider our TU problems within this general framework, no doubt. But this framework itself keeps on changing and developing, throwing up new features, without undergoing any very basic change for some time at least. We think we are now and have been for some time in a situation which requires a proper review with reference to the working class and its trade union struggles in the industrial sphere, which inevitably cast their reflection in the political sphere.*

We are sorry we have not got enough time to undertake the discussion of a long document or a comprehensive review of the whole national situation as it affects the workers and the trade unions. But we may pose a few questions and look for their answers in brief. A more comprehensive session and discussion may be thought of later.

The first important question would be:

1. During the last twelve years, i.e., of the two and a half Plans, as we may call them, has there been any basic or important change in the *industrial structure* of the country? What is the direction and *class-nature* of this change?

The second question would be:

2. If there has been such a change, how has it affected the working class? In what respects has the change shown itself? Size, number, composition, trade, language, caste, etc.

The third question would be:

3. What is the growth and strength of the TU organisation, what have been its principal features, achievements and failures in the recent period?

The fourth question would be:

4. What ideologies are being pushed on to and adopted by the working class? And what is the position of the Party in the TUs?

The fifth question would be:

5. The immediate problems before TUs in the struggle for wages, DA, bonus, nationalisation and TU rights.

We think we may limit ourselves to these five questions which by themselves cover a very wide field and are of fundamental importance.

The answers to these questions, if they are to be very exhaustive will require a longer reporting and debate. But just now, at this stage, we should try to bring out broad conclusions and use them in the development of the struggles and trade union organisation of the working class. We may, therefore, indicate here those broad conclusions for your consideration.

## II

There is no doubt the industrial structure of the country has undergone big changes. These changes have been remarkable and of deep significance during the Second Plan period and the two years of the present Third Plan, which now is facing a crisis and is being reappraised.

The main direction of this change is that the semi-colonial economy of British India, based on backward feudal agriculture and semi-processing raw materials for the monopolists of the imperialist countries has taken steps to break through its shackles in the last eight years.

When the Second and Third Plan decided to establish heavy industry, new iron and steel plants, the machine tool units, foundry forges, oil exploration, heavy electricals, transformers, diesel engines, mining machinery manufacture, heavy machine-building plants, high-pressure boilers, fertilisers, chemicals, ball bearings, heavy plant and structural, automobiles, pharmaceuticals, etc., it was a decision to change the very basis of the old Indian economy.

*The eight years' development of all the projects, complete and incomplete, has been changing the face of India's economy in a positive and progressive way. It has created new forces of production, new means, which were totally absent in the old British India. The very names of the projects, some of which are already completed or under way, were unheard of before and could only*

*be read in the literature of the imperialist or advanced socialist countries.*

There is no doubt, there are many vital weaknesses in this changing structure. Some of the plants depend on foreign supplies for their renewals and spare parts and on foreign technicians for their know-how. That is still the basic structural defect, as was seen in the breakdown in Rourkela and DVC. But once the heavy tools, structural plate, alloy steel and foundry forge base is completed, the economy will be what they call "self-generating". That will release it from the inhibiting hand of foreign technique and foreign dependence to a very large extent.

*These new instruments of production right on our own soil and wielded by our own working class and intelligentsia can be transformed into instruments of people's prosperity from their present state of being instruments of capitalist prosperity, given a real democratic regime.*

One may also point out that the value of industrial production in the total national product has also gone up considerably, though the dominance of the agricultural sector continues.

Another aspect of this change in the physical structure of the economy is the distribution of these new industries in the various states. The planting of vast new industries in areas where only agriculture formerly prevailed has had a radicalising effect on the countryside as well as the various classes. The vast industrial complexes of Bihar, Bengal, Bangalore, Coimbatore, Hyderabad, Bhopal, Bhilai and a host of places in UP and Madhya Pradesh will bear witness to the change which must be studied by us carefully.

The introduction of the factory, the bourgeois relations of production right in the midst of vast agrarian areas create a tremendous impact on the peasantry, the rural petty bourgeoisie and particularly on the agricultural labourer and the landless.

When we of the trade unions go on to organise the cons-

truction sites, as in Barauni or Gauhati or elsewhere, we must take notice of this aspect of the matter in framing our approach.

Wherever the factory or the dam or electrical installation has sprung up, there the new working class has inevitably come up.

What are the relations of production that are developing in these new conditions of national independence and the industrial growth following from it? The relations of production in the industrial sphere are relations of capitalist production, i.e., of capitalist exploitation.

There are two sectors of the developing capitalist economy in the industrial field—the state sector and the private sector. The private sector is frankly and openly a capitalist sector, working for private profit of the capitalist class, drawn from the exploitation of the labour power of the working class. The economically dominant class in the country is the capitalist class. Hence, it controls the state power also. Therefore, the state sector becomes a state capitalist sector. Though the industries are owned by the state, they form part of and serve the capitalist structure as a whole. They should not be confused as socialist state sector.

*But that does not mean that the state capitalist sector is the same as private capitalist sector. Being in the hands of the state of a developing backward economy, recently released politically from the clutches of imperialism, this state sector helps quicker development, it has the capacity to remain more independent of foreign private capital and imperialist pressure.*

*It also has the possibility of being subjected to democratic criticism, if not actual control from the elected Parliament. In a developing economy of an under-developed country which has very little capital accumulation, the state sector, in the context of the existence of the socialist camp, can play an increasingly progressive role.*

But the bourgeois state is administered by the bureaucracy. Hence, the state sector industries suffer from several

evils common to the private sector—in the matter of relations with the workers, the trade unions, wage policy, corruption, etc.

The state sector industries are establishing those lines which are strategically valuable for building up the backbone of an independent economy of a newly-liberated, under-developed country, viz., steel, machine tools, heavy foundry forge, oil, etc. The imperialists do not like the newly-liberated countries to be industrialised. But the socialist countries like them to be industrialised. Hence the help rendered by the socialist camp to the strategic state sector industries in India is not relished by the imperialist camp.

But in order that the socialist help may not influence the masses towards socialism and also put the bourgeoisie in an alliance or friendship with the socialist camp, the imperialist countries are forced to participate in the industrial schemes of India and give it loans and supplies. But the methodology of imperialist camp does not strengthen our economy much in the vital sectors and is always a source of conflict, crisis and danger of reactionary influences.

We have to remember that without the defeat of fascism and the weakening of the imperialist system as a whole, there would not have arisen, so swiftly that vast belt of liberated countries, which we have seen after the second world war. And there would also not have been that independent development of economy which many of these countries including ours are building. While pointing out our own struggles and efforts, this lesson also has got to be conveyed to the working class in all our TU work, on the basis of concrete facts.

The private sector capitalism was developing even under the British rule. But it was a stunted growth. With the acquisition of independence and state power, the national bourgeoisie diverted to its pockets a large part of the wealth that was being drained away by the imperialists. And when state power gave them the power to build new industries, the private capitalist sector began amassing vast

fortunes out of the surplus value produced by the working class and also from the expropriation of the peasantry.

The concentration and centralisation of capital in the new development is accompanied by concentration of money and capital in the hands of a few big bourgeois houses. The growth of industry and the national bourgeoisie is accompanied by sharp differentiation in the ranks of the bourgeoisie. It has grown in numbers. It has developed monopolists of quite a pronounced character, though few in number. It has a big bourgeois stratum, and also small and medium. They all have their inner contradictions.

They are all our exploiters, so far as we as workers are concerned. But each one uses his power, economic, political, ideological, against us in his own way. Hence, we too use differentiated tactics in our struggles with them.

As a capitalist class, the Indian bourgeoisie, by past tradition and its inherent character, is tied up with and dependent on the advanced capitalism of the imperialist countries. As a bourgeoisie of an under-developed country, it has little of its own capital accumulation. Hence it has to depend on the import of capital goods, technique and know-how from the imperialist countries or advanced socialist countries.

*As a capitalist class, it is more attracted by and feels economically safe with the capitalists of the other countries. But as a weak bourgeoisie, it is afraid of being swallowed by the neo-colonialists. Hence it seeks the help of the socialist countries also. It tries to play between the two and build its own independent class-interests.*

Formerly, the British imperialists robbed the national bourgeoisie of most of the gains it made from exploitation of the working class. Now after independence, imperialists try to take away a big share of the surplus extracted by the national bourgeoisie, in the form of high prices for capital goods, spare parts, royalties and know-how, technicians' and experts' charges. The national bourgeoisie naturally resents these inroads into its surplus. But it agrees to it in the hope that once it achieves independent

capacity of expanded reproduction on its own technical base, it can get rid of the tribute to the imperialists whom it has taken into private and public partnership.

Knowing this, the imperialists do not give the full know-how nor capital goods for heavy and machine-building industry on any big scale. Hence you find every new factory here going up to 95 per cent production of an article but never to its full components.

As a class, the bourgeoisie is attracted to foreign capital but in its own self-interest as a class, it resents the inroads on its profits. It wants "foreign participation" and yet speaks of anti-imperialism. It wants American help and yet criticises its terms and conditions. This is the weakness of the capitalist development and the national bourgeoisie in India. But it is able to go forward, because in times of crisis and deadlock, it uses the help of the socialist countries who do not dictate such terms and who genuinely want India's development on the basis of heavy industry.

Then the question is raised: Knowing that India is developing industry on capitalist basis, knowing that Indian capitalism is also taking help from the capitalist-imperialist countries and knowing that capitalism exploits the working class, should a socialist country give goods and credits to a capitalist country, trade with it and thereby strengthen capitalism which, after all, is an enemy of the working class? *Should a socialist country help capitalism to grow?*

The question is a genuine one. In order to answer it, we must see the process of liberation in the new epoch of socialism in its proper class relations.

The attainment of freedom by the former colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia and Africa means their political liberation from imperialism. Over fifty countries got politically liberated after the second world war. Why was this possible? Because in the presence of the victory of the Soviet Union and the birth of the socialist camp, the imperialist system got weakened. A part of it was shattered. Hence their subject countries began to revolt and fall off from their clutches.

Though politically free, the newly-liberated countries are economically backward. They have to develop their economies. From where should they get help?

If they turn towards imperialism, they became economically subject to them, though politically free. That is neo-colonialism. If they turn to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, they have no fear of neo-colonialism. But those of them who are under bourgeois influence or rule fear that it may encourage socialism in their own country.

But if the socialist camp refuses to help on the ground that these newly free countries are capitalist countries, they will inevitably fall back into imperialist hands. If the socialist camp dictates the conditions for such help that they must all become socialist, they will resent such dictation and imposed revolution. If they do not take anybody's help, they cannot develop. And they cannot remain static or stagnant either. Hence they will inevitably fall into the trap of imperialism and neo-colonialism, unless their internal democratic forces are experienced and strong enough to prevent it.

*But from the point of view of world revolution and socialism their development even capitalistically is helpful because it weakens imperialism. Socialist help keeps them nonaligned or neutral and prevents them from being swallowed by aggressive imperialism.*

Thus the capitalism of the developing countries has two aspects. As capitalism, it is anti-working class. To fight that is our task. But as developing capitalism, it is objectively anti-imperialist. When socialist countries help India, they do not help it as capitalism in order to beat the working class.

They help in order to strengthen anti-imperialism, weaken imperialism and enable the working class to push the development on to the socialist or the non-capitalist path, depending on its strength. There would be no nonalignment, and a wide peace camp and strengthening of the liberation front without this anti-imperialist policy of so-

cialist help to the trade and industry of the newly-liberated countries.

It is therefore necessary for the trade union leadership to study each new plant from the point of view of its place in production, its financial structure and its technological standard. We must equip our workers too with this knowledge, in order to strengthen their class-outlook, their anti-imperialist national approach and also their proletarian socialist class approach.

Have the trade unions also a two-fold approach to the industrial development, its capitalist basis, both in private and state sector and to the national bourgeoisie which dominates them? They have.

We support the line of industrial development of the country, though we know that it is capitalist development.

Firstly, because, our industrial development weakens the hold of imperialism on a world scale, strengthens independence and creates the technical prerequisites for steps towards a democratic non-capitalist path or a socialist path, depending on the strength of the working class relative to the bourgeoisie.

*We are not out to build capitalism. And our support to the development is not as if some other alternative were available but we reject it purposely and prefer capitalism. We have been thrown into that historical stage of development by the objective laws of the history of our country. Thus we support not capitalism but the anti-imperialist, liberationist role of the newly developing industry as compared to our previous status of a colonial country, living in the orbit of imperialist development and colonial backwardness.*

At the same time, we as a working class must not fail to remember that we are the exploited class, in whose labour capitalism is building itself. Hence we have a class contradiction with the bourgeoisie, which continuously tries to enlarge its gains by extensive and intensive exploitation of labour. Hence, while supporting national development of economy, we have to defend our class interests, both in



the state and private sectors from the onslaughts of capital.

While discussing the rise of the new industry and the composition of capital, one has to pay attention to the role of foreign capital and its relative strength vis-a-vis Indian capital. Who has grown stronger in the last fourteen years of independence?

The obvious answer based on facts and figures of gross block, or paid-up capital as well as the lines of strategic importance in the developing economy, is that while the influence of foreign capital is quite serious and its volume has grown, yet comparable rates of growth of Indian capital show it to have grown many times more both in volume and strategic importance. The entrenchment of foreign capital that still continues in oil, tea, jute and some lines of heavy engineering is a national menace, acts as a factor hampering our independent growth and serves as channels of draining national wealth. Politically, they are bases of right reaction.

All this development when considered in relation to the needs of the people is extremely insufficient. Due to the inhibiting or retarding factors of the profit-motive which alone drives capitalist production and the absence of any democratic control based on working-class participation and rights in planning, execution and check-up, even the rate of development suffers from inherent capitalist crisis of production and distribution.

*Along with growth in production, there is scarcity, arising from high prices imposed by monopolist robbery of the people. Along with growth in the working class, there is unemployment. Instead of the economy surging forward continuously for the benefit of the masses of the people, it goes limping or grinds to a halt under the sabotaging onslaughts of private profit and a bureaucratic state machine.*

### III

The developing capitalism in India has brought into existence a bigger and newer working class. The working

class has become bigger in size than before. But in some old established industries it has shrunk in size, i.e., numbers, though production in those industries has increased as, for example, in jute where it has shrunk absolutely. In textile, it has shrunk relative to production. That means, in these old established industries, the rate of exploitation has gone up due to rationalisation. But in most other industries, the working class has grown in numbers. On the eve of independence, the factory employment recorded the figure of 2.3 million. In 1961, it was about 4 million. This excludes mining, transport, commerce etc.

The working class has not only grown in numbers. It has changed in other vital respects also.

The old multi-lingual, multi-caste, multi-religious composition continues as before. In fact, the entry of fresh elements from the peasant and petty bourgeois strata has enhanced the influence of the caste, language or region (not so much religion) in the behaviour pattern of the new workers who have not been welded together by common class struggles and the new class-ideology.

*The most striking new quality of the new working class is that the proportion of the technical cadres, or workers engaged in new engineering production processes has risen quite high. The new class composition in some of the big industrial centres is no more dominated by the classical textile industry.*

The growth of the engineering and chemical, pharmaceutical and other ancillary industries has brought up a new worker to the forefront in the composition of the class.

A very big sector of construction workers on the new projects has come up. With no permanency or continuity of job, roaming from project to project, he is quite a new element in the situation.

A very large part of the new engineering and other workers have educational qualifications, a characteristic which has come up after independence and the spread of education. As a result, books and newspapers have acquired new

strengthen as media of propaganda and they now enter as an element in the new family budgets!

Education in school followed by employment in engineering and such other industries has added the town petty bourgeois young worker drawn from middle-class families to the old classical ruined peasant-turned worker. This new, in a way, petty-bourgeois worker is slow to come to the movement but once drawn in, he can provide good cadre and intelligent grasp of the issues. But he is also subject to violent changes of temperament and behaviour, from timidity to anarchist violence.

Another noteworthy addition to the composition is the new motor transport worker. Motor transport has grown to such an extent that at one time a Railway Minister took it as an affront to his trade and wanted to put brakes on it. Then he found that both are part of the same national economy! The life of the road transport worker is extremely unstable, migratory and coupled with the exhausting hours of work, it makes him desperate, individualistic and unstable in organisation. At the same time, the trade makes him intelligent, not badly paid, technical-minded, and capable of leadership. Driving through several towns or states, he acquires quite a new vision of things and life around.

Apart from the production worker, the growth in the services, maintenance and distributive trades has been at a faster rate than in any other sector. Employment in different branches of the public sector in civilian employment has grown to 7.66 million by September 1962. Employment in Posts and Telegraphs has doubled in the ten years of 1951 to 1962, from 1,73,302 to 3,87,641. The number of commercial establishments rose from 2,26,000 in 1951 to 4,04,000 in 1961. The rise of the salaried employee-worker in the banks, life insurance and such other branches has been quite remarkable.

Herein, we apply the definition of the working class to all those who live by wages or salaries and are in some form connected with the labour process and do not own the means of production. Since office and trade workers as

well as engineers and technicians, like the workers, do not, as a rule, own the means of production, they are included in the working class. As to who constitutes the working class has been the subject matter of international discussion in the recent period and the conclusions arrived at there should be studied.

Formerly, there was the opinion that none but the worker who directly produces surplus value by handling objects of labour could be included in the definition of the working class. But a greater attention to this question, its theoretical aspects as well as modern technological and social developments have given us a better understanding of the question.

*Another noteworthy feature of the composition of the new working class is the entry into it of the young woman worker. In big cities, she is found doing assembly-line work in pharmaceutical, chemical and even engineering concerns. In many cases, they are forced to quit as soon as they marry. This young woman worker on the assembly line and in the offices is a product mainly of the newly developing capitalism after independence.*

Thus the composition of our working class in the matter of size, trades, skills, sex, education has undergone and is daily undergoing changes of great significance. And these changes create new and complicated problems for the movement.

As is inevitable under capitalism and especially of an under-developed country, the growth in industry and employment is accompanied by rising unemployment. The ruling Congress Party, its planners and philosophers all admit this fact. They are unable to provide enough jobs to those coming on the market for employment.

The developing capitalism converts more and more peasants and the petty bourgeoisie into propertyless wage-earners and throws them on the employment market. At the same time, production fails to expand enough to absorb them all. Thus while the employed worker fights to get higher wages and better living and working conditions, the capitalist system tries to disrupt his struggles with the

pressures of the unemployed on the labour-market. The employed worker has, therefore, to seek class solidarity with his unemployed brother in the common tasks.

#### IV

The trade union organisation of the working class in India has made great strides in the last few years. The most important and basic change is that today no single trade or section of the working class is ignorant of the trade union as such. Almost every trade has a trade union organisation. We had over 11,000 registered trade unions in the country in the year 1960.

This does not mean to say that the majority of workers are in the unions or that they are all union-conscious. To many the union is a temporary agent or middle-man to talk to the employer or the law-court concerned of his grievance. Even in spite of this great shortcoming, the present situation seems to be that every sector of employment, including the small, unorganised industries have had an experience of a strike-struggle. And every such struggle makes the worker union-conscious.

Almost the entire large-scale industry, trade and commerce, as also government employment has some form of TU organisation. Such was not the case before independence.

Most of these organisations are based on the principle of industrial organisation and not on narrow craft divisions. Craft unionism is a narrow backward form of trade-unionism and it still dominates even in an advanced capitalist country like England.

In the last few years, most of the trade unions have developed into all-India TU federations. Where a trade is regionally confined, they have regional federations. As one knows, federating is a higher form of consciousness and organisation than single unit trade unionism.

TU organisation has also taken the form of an all-national centre of the class as a whole, irrespective of trade divisions (viz. AITUC, INTUC, HMS etc.).

This development started as far back as in 1920 when

the AITUC was founded. But it got strengthened after independence. The growing strength was, however, weakened by the split in the movement and the rise of several all-national TU centres. While some splits were due to our mistakes, the main driving force behind the disruption is the policy of the bourgeoisie of keeping the working class divided and thereby weakening and preventing its class-consolidation. Even then, the all-national class organisation has become a powerful weapon in the hands of the working class.

There is still a tendency in some sections to keep their trade federations independent from the all-national centres. Sometimes, the independent federation grows out of a desire to avoid the effects of disunity in the central organisation and the political implications of joining the national centres. Some federations (viz. government employees) are prevented from joining the national centres.

The absence of a single united national centre prevents the worker from confronting the employer with united action and leadership of the class as a whole.

*In times of acute crisis, the commonness of demands moves the workers so powerfully that they unite from below, while the top leadership of various central organisations remain divided, as has been in many general strikes in the big centres of Bombay, Calcutta etc.*

With the growing discontent over the rising prices and the fall in real wages, the urge for common action is growing stronger.

So far in the history of the Indian TU movement, there have been big strike actions of the whole class on a local regional level like the Bombay general strike of July 28, 1958 and August 20, 1963, or the strikes in Calcutta. A general strike on an all-India level of a whole industry or trade has become a possibility like the strike in all the banks. To strike on an industrial basis has become possible for the workers and their trade unions on an all-national level in many sectors of the working class.

But we are still far off from developing even an all-

national action in some of the biggest organised sectors such as engineering or iron and steel or railways. Even the 1960 government employees' strike failed to bring out the railways on a national scale.

The class-consciousness, class-solidarity and organisational ability of the working class has not reached that high pitch, where it can take an all-national class action even for its immediate and urgent economic demands.

The persistent refusal of the bourgeoisie and the government to recognise the unions which have a popular backing but which are not to their liking, has been the biggest source of disruption and division. Recognition of union is recognition of the collective will of the employee, i.e., of the class. Hence the bourgeoisie resists it.

When it is no longer possible to resist it, the government and the employers weaken the recognition by imposing conditions of a kind which try to prevent the union from being a real representative of the workers. In fact, in India today, the union which is declared "most representative" by law and by recognition is in most cases unrepresentative.

But the very fact of recognition by law compels the workers to enter into such unions, which gives them a fictitious mass character. But in times of crisis, such unions become ineffective in serving the bourgeoisie by preventing mass actions. As was seen in many cases, the AITUC unions led the movement and when the employers had to concede the demands, they signed agreements with the INTUC.

This situation, however, is not uniform throughout the country. The AITUC has in various industries powerful unions which are recognised by the employers.

*Despite the existence of many national centres and rival trade unions, sometimes as many as five or six in a plant, a certain amount of unity at the national level takes place through the tripartite conferences and the all-national industrial wage boards.*

Capitalism in India tried to continue the traditions of the British period even after independence in the matter of

anarchy of wage-rates, anarchy of industrial law, absence of an all-national standard of wages, rights and laws, absence of uniform contracts, absence of a standard rate for the standard job.

All these affected the bargaining power and unity of the working class. The capitalists used this in two ways. *First*, to fight the workers' unity and *secondly*, to fight their own internal competition against each other by utilising the uneven conditions in the production of surplus value and the price of labour power and wages.

Because a series of struggles waged by the workers and also because of its own needs, the bourgeoisie and government have been moving towards accepting in principle an all-national minimum need-based wage and an industrial wage-rate on an all-national scale. The installation of the various wage boards has helped in unifying the workers on an industrial level. It also helps the bourgeoisie towards further concentration of capital. In many industries, as a result of the wage board awards, both workers and employers have been made to confront each other on a national scale. This has been a distinct gain for our class and must be given an organisational form.

Along with the tripartites and the wage boards, the government has created a body of industrial relations law which has two contradictory aspects. By curbing the right to strike, by forcing almost compulsory arbitration (though called 'voluntary') on the workers through tribunals, boards, etc., the worker is gradually pushed away from direct class-action against bourgeois compulsions.

At the same time, through concessions, wage-increases and legal pronouncements guaranteeing some protection to the rights of the worker, workers are enabled to make a few gains which help them to build class-solidarity and strength. In the long run, however, this may tend to blunt the class-outlook of the worker, unless the leadership of the unions keeps class-consciousness alive in other ways.

The creation of a body of industrial law replacing direct collective bargaining by tribunals, judges and trade union

lawyers, and lending the power of the bourgeois state machine for enforcement of such laws mainly against the workers is leading to conditions wherein the tribunal and the talking lawyer are becoming substitutes for trade unionism and trade union action.

Not militant workers but good-tongued lawyers are swamping the unions and become top office-bearers of unions, without having the least connection with or responsibility for day-to-day work or struggles of the workers. No doubt, we do recognise their services and the need for them. Many of them are good leaders also. But one cannot ignore the danger of such a development where the worker comes to replace the union by the lawyer and the tribunal. The union ceases to be an organ of class-struggle and becomes the organ of court-battles.

*We have to keep the worker on the basic class-line, without a sectarian rejection of ALL tribunals, arbitration and legal solutions of disputes and also without the reformist substitution of class actions by UNRESTRICTED adherence to compulsory arbitration, tribunals, etc.*

Fortunately, the reactionary section of the big bourgeoisie itself resents and torpedoes the laws and tribunals and boards, thus helping to destroy the illusions which their own state leadership tries to build round them.

Secondly, because the existence of TU organisers who are not unmindful of the danger and who seeing the ineffectiveness of bourgeois law to render lasting relief to the workers, are prepared to take positive class-actions, reformism and bourgeois ideology are not the dominant trend. Yet we have to be vigilant against the danger of both reformism and sectarianism.

In short, in the last ten years, the TU movement has attained higher levels of class-organisation. It has made positive gains for the working class in the matter of the defence of its rights. It has helped to create a uniform all-India body of laws and awards, which in the main have taken the worker forward but they also pose positive dangers for the future if not used properly. The worst features

in the exploitation practices of the bourgeoisie have been curbed. But the absence of TU unity is the greatest drawback in the present situation, though unity in action from below is growing.

In the near future, the struggle for higher wages and the fight against their erosion by high prices, the struggle to curb monopoly by means of nationalisation measures, and thereby help the industrial growth forward and keep it free from the inroads of neo-colonialism would claim the attention of all trade unions.

## V

The question of ideologies that are being pushed forward on to the working class is a very important matter.

Our working class being new, carries with it the remnants of the feudal ideology, the strongest expression of which is the caste ideology. Despite the levelling influences of capitalist production and particularly the factory and town life, feudal ideology of caste and hierarchy are very strong among the workers.

*In order to retard class-unity, the bourgeoisie, despite its programme of democracy and equality, does not hesitate to use the caste-factor to disrupt the working class. Appointments, promotions, engagement for hire, etc., are governed in many sectors by caste considerations. The logic of the capitalist order, however, militates against its continuance and domination.*

The ideology of the bourgeoisie is bourgeois nationalism, denial of class-contradiction and affirmation of class harmony, abstract humanism, human relations in industry, doctrine of trusteeship and welfare state. All these must be combated.

The ideology of the working class is that of scientific socialism, of proletarian internationalism, of Marxism-Leninism, of class-struggle. The working class takes a long time to become conscious of it, though it is its own product.

It is not necessary to state here the fundamental prin-

ciples of scientific socialism. The three main principles of scientific socialism can be learnt from the classics.

It has now become an urgent task to carry these principles of scientific socialism to the working class, because the Congress Party and its ideologues are debating the definition of socialism and its true meaning.

Though they speak of the means of production being in the state sector as the foundation of socialist order, yet when you analyse the whole of their thinking, it is nothing but a liberal, humanitarian bourgeois order at best. They speak even of a class-less society, without defining what a class is and what the state-power is and going to be. They sidetrack the main issues by raising questions of violence and non-violence, of morality and ethics or democracy in the abstract.

The Congress leadership has been selling the developing capitalism as the march of incoming socialism or socialist pattern, being built by a welfare state for the benefit of all Indian people. But the growth of monopoly, the huge wealth of the profiteers, the falling real wages, the anti-social conspiracies of the magnates of sugar, textiles, coal, tea, jute, etc., the stinking corruption in the top ruling circles, the dictatorial administration of bureaucrats, culminating in the recent crisis in political, economic, ideological and moral field forced the ruling circles and ideologues of bourgeois philosophy, to whom the name of Marx is anathema, to begin to question their own so-called definition of "socialism" which they were supposed to be following. The attempt to sell capitalism as socialism has failed. Now a new offensive with the same old ideological weapons will be launched.

*We must utilise this crisis, this confusion in the bourgeois ranks. We must tell the people what minimum programme they must follow to curb the development of monopoly capitalism and to bring in a democratic non-capitalist social order to begin with. We must put before them the principles of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism.*

The trade unions, which are directly connected with the day-to-day manifestation of the class-struggle with feudal and capitalist ideology and actions, must be given clear understanding and perspectives.

It has been a shortcoming in our work that while the Congress Party and other parties preach to their TU leadership all sorts of ideologies, we have not done enough to give our own workers the understanding of the principles of scientific socialism.

It has been our shortcoming that while the TUs have to struggle every day with the false notions of bourgeois economics in the matter of wages, prices, wage-price spiral, profits and surplus, bonus, productivity, rate of interest and profits, taxes and depreciation, rehabilitation and expansion, our own TU functionaries are not provided with the Marxist understanding of these concepts, which alone can help us to approach and solve the problem in a correct way.

The shortcoming has been due to the fact that some people think that it is only the job of the "theoreticians" of the Central Executive Committee to study the theory of Marxism and that it is the job of the TU functionary to do day-to-day practical work, lead strikes, etc., according to the "given line". Such un-Marxian "division of labour" has led to disasters in the past and will lead the same way if we do not change our methods and approach.

The Party has from very old times, since it became a force in the trade unions by leading the mass struggles of 1927-28 when for the first time trade unionism acquired a real mass base, has been taking scientific socialism and Marxism to the rank and file worker.

Long ago, even the AITUC in its aims and objects, spoke of the socialist Republic of India and the socialisation of the means of production. Long ago, the AITUC accepted the definition of trade union as an organ of class-struggle. The trade unions of the AITUC have even forced the old trade unionism of the INTUC and the Gandhian school to give up its policy of sectarian isolation, craft-narrowness and bourgeois conciliation and ban on strikes in its organisational line. The 1952 convention and the fraction meeting

of 1953 dealt with these questions in its papers, which you can read.

The problem now has gone a stage further in the new crisis of the bourgeois order and the ruling party.

Formerly, we alone spoke of socialism. Formerly we alone were the significant force in the TU movement. Formerly, neither British imperialists nor the Indian bourgeoisie pretended to preach socialism.

Things have changed in the recent past, since the powerful advance of the socialist camp. Now even the bourgeoisie and its parties have accepted "socialism" as the national goal, by which they mean nothing more than attaching some humanitarian ethical-moral labels to capitalism and covering it up with an attractive foil to dope the worker and blunt his class struggle.

Hence, we must carry out an intense educational campaign in the working class, differentiating our scientific socialism from the bourgeois "socialism" of the INTUC, the Congress Party, the PSP and others.

## VI

As regards the fifth question of the struggle against high prices and taxes, for higher wages, DA and bonus, for correction of the fraudulent index, and for nationalisation, the raw material has been placed before you for discussion. We need not dilate on it here unless some questions are raised for clarification. A draft resolution outlining the demands and slogans of the immediate future is being placed before the all-India trade union conference, which will be meeting on December 13, 1963.

The conference, the demands and the struggles envisaged, if the demands are not met, will not only carry the working class and the trade union movement forward. It will also provide a democratic corrective to the growing concentration of monopoly wealth and the crisis of the national economy. The working class by this intervention is not only satisfying its own class-demands. It helps to provide the solution of the problems of all toiling people and the country as a whole.

## Appendix

### **RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL CAMPAIGN FOR REDUCTION IN PRICES AND TAXES, INCREASE IN WAGES, DEARNESS ALLOWANCE AND BONUS, AND FOR NATIONALISATION**

---

*The following resolution was adopted unanimously in the All-India Trade Union Conference, in Bombay, on 13-15 December 1963.*

1. The All India Trade Union Conference, convened by the A.I.T.U.C. to discuss certain immediate and most pressing issues confronting the working class and the toiling people of our country and to find practical ways and means for solving their burning problems which have assumed a countrywide character, has arrived at the following conclusions and decisions:

2. In the opinion of this conference, the biggest single issue with a countrywide impact on the day-to-day life of the common people is that of rising prices of food stuffs and essential commodities and the constantly rising upward curve of the cost of living of the masses, and this is happening despite the rise in national production and national wealth.

This development has become even more pronounced and has assumed unprecedented proportions in the recent period. Prices have gone up by between 15 to 40 per cent all over the country. No commodity or article which enters into the normal family budget of the working people has remained unaffected. The prices of basic foodgrains have spiralled to heights beyond the reach of the poorer sections of the community in both town and countryside, while an organised black-market

flourishes as never before in sugar, rice, etc. In certain parts of the country, high prices have been accompanied by an absolute physical non-availability of foodgrains, resulting in near-famine conditions.

The suffering and privations of the toiling masses know no bounds. Their already modest living standards are being further depressed every day.

3. This conference is categorically of the opinion that this phenomenon—of high prices and scarcity, of the ever-rising cost of living and decline in the real wages of all categories of workers and also the fixed income earners—is not mainly the product of natural causes, agricultural shortfalls, or climatic vagaries as the Government seeks to make out. Where such natural causes may have arisen they have been further used by the anti-people profiteers for their selfish ends.

This crisis is essentially a man-made one. Its creators are firstly, the monopolies who control the decisive sectors of the country's industry, banking and commerce, and who are utilising their economic dominance to boost up prices of their products in a sheltered market, to create artificial shortage whenever their profits demand it, and even to obstruct and sabotage full utilisation of the productive capacity which is at their disposal, despite the requirements of national economy and the people.

Secondly, the market in foodgrains and several crops is overwhelmingly dominated by the big, wholesale traders and their combines, by all manner of profit-hunting middlemen and speculators, by hoarders and black-market operators who are permitted with impunity to carry on their anti-social and criminal activities, with the help of bank loans, the stock-market, LIC investments, etc.

So daring and powerful have these interests become that they have engineered a major sugar scandal in the country, a major rice shortage in West Bengal with blackmarket prices ruling higher than during the Great Famine of 1943, and a sharp rise in wheat prices of more than 25 per cent even in wheat producing tracts in North India.

A simultaneous phenomenon with catastrophic consequences

is the deprivation of the small farmer of fair prices for these very foodstuffs and crops of which he is the primary producer. The peasant is constantly defrauded by these very sharks and exploiters of his legitimate price for, and return on, his sugar-cane yield, paddy, wheat or raw jute.

Thirdly, this conference indicts the Government, both at the Centre and in the States, for not only allowing the monopolists, price-racketeers, speculators and hoarders to play havoc with the necessities of the common man's life, but for showing no practical inclination, apart from words, to use its sweeping emergency powers to protect the people from the robbery and exploitation of the profiteers.

Moreover, the Government itself has contributed massively to the rise in prices by its inflationary budgets and its deliberate policies of adding to the crushing burden of indirect taxes which directly affect the common man's pocket.

4. The sufferings of the vast toiling masses can be easily gauged from the plight of that section which is the most united and best organised, the most experienced in class battles and the best equipped to defend its interests—the working class in our factories and mines, as well as the white-collared employees of commercial and banking establishments, all of whom have learnt to follow one trade union organisation or another.

Even this great and growing working class, directly engaged in the production of wealth, stands today virtually stripped of any effective protection against the rising price levels and consequent erosion of their real wages. All their gains in money wages, secured through numerous struggles, stand in danger of being completely wiped out if the present price rise is allowed to go unchecked.

The Bombay textiles and a few other individual concerns are exceptional instances where the dearness allowance paid is not only adjusted on a sliding scale with the cost of living indices, but also affords full neutralisation for the rise in the index though only for the lowest-paid category of workers. But, generally speaking, the D.A. systems prevalent today are either fixed amounts at a flat rate or vary according to the cost of living indices but do not ensure more than 70 to 85 per cent



neutralisation. In both these types of dearness allowance schemes, a very serious decline in the workers' real wages is taking place as a result of run-away prices.

In the public sector undertakings, where Government is expected to act as a model employer, either no D.A., or very low D.A., is paid, and nowhere is it linked with the cost of living index.

Further, tens of thousands of workers are employed in such industries, mines and plantations where the separate category of dearness allowance does not exist at all, and the wage paid has no link whatsoever with the cost of living indices.

The situation is still further aggravated by the gross manipulations in the compilation of many of the official series of cost of living, or consumer price index numbers in different centres, as a result of which the real extent of the price rise is being deliberately concealed in order to deprive the workers of their rightfully due compensation in the form of higher dearness allowance on a sliding scale. For example, between September 1962 and September 1963, the all-India consumer price index moved up by 3 points only, during a period in which every objective source has estimated the price rise at between 15 to 40 per cent!

This monstrous fraud, obviously perpetrated by the bureaucracy and employers acting in collusion, has been well exposed by all the main T.U. centres with reference to the Bombay indices, and the great 'Bombay Bandh' strike on August 20th has compelled the State Government to undertake an 'expert' review of its index figures and the method of their compilation.

Bogus statistics have become an important weapon for worsening the conditions of the workers. Reliance on them would mean, for example, that all those Central Government employees who are governed by the Pay-Commission's award would scarcely be able to qualify for a D.A. increase on the basis of a stable 10-point rise in the index lasting for 12 months, which is the pre-condition prescribed for getting a higher D.A. Actually, this 10-point rise in the index series based on 1949 is the equivalent of no less than 35 points of the old series based on 1939.

The struggle for exposure and correction of the fraudulent index figures is therefore assuming great importance and an all-India character.

This conference also notes with indignation how cynically the employers have torpedoed with Governmental connivance the solemn tripartite agreement of 5th August 1963 to the effect that cheap grain shops should be opened throughout the country at every establishment employing 300 or more workers. Even such a measure for partial relief to the working class has remained on paper to this day both in the private and public sectors.

5. While the steady erosion of real wages is now an admitted fact, it must also be remembered that lakhs of workers in the small-scale and less organised, sweated sectors of industry and trade have never even enjoyed the benefit of the Minimum Wages Act to which they are entitled. In many such cases, minimum wage-fixation committees have not been appointed despite all representations; in many more, the wages prescribed by such committees are not implemented by the employers concerned, and the Government machinery does not enforce them. In still other cases such minimum wages fixed several years ago have become out of date and urgently need to be revised upwards, but no such action is taken.

Consequently the economic condition of this section of the working class which is normally not covered by wage boards, tribunals, or collective agreements is the worst prevailing in the country.

Wage-fixation bodies without exception have been refusing to accept and enforce the need-based norm for minimum wages which was unanimously recommended by the 15th Indian Labour Conference of 1957.

6. This conference also expresses the profound dissatisfaction of the entire working class with the injustice and anarchy prevailing in the field of bonus payments. The tremendous profits which are being appropriated today by the bigger and organised industries on the basis of higher production in a protected monopoly market are not at all reflected in the so-called "profit-sharing" bonuses which the employers are compelled to pay

wherever the trade union organisation and movement are strong enough.

The workers' share in the surplus value which is the direct creation of labour is nowhere governed by equitable principles, and is subjected to all sorts of capitalist imposed preconditions or ad hoc awards based on a fictitious "Profit and Loss", as recorded by Company Balance Sheets. The whole position is one of uncertainty except where long-term agreements exist, and the claim for bonus has to be agitated afresh every year. In certain sectors of industry, no bonus is paid at all to this day. Lakhs of public sector employees, including even those productive workers in the Government-owned companies and corporations handling vital means of production, have so far remained excluded from the benefit of any bonus scheme, except such as lead to intensification of labour. Even though the Bonus Commission was appointed to go into the question of bonus for both private and public sector undertakings, under its terms of reference several public sector undertakings have been unjustifiably excluded from the Commission's consideration.

This conference voices the growing impatience of the workers at the inordinate delay in the completion of the work of the Bonus Commission which has been sitting for two years and has not yet submitted its recommendations.

7. In this situation, which is daily becoming more and more difficult for the working class and the toiling people in general, the need for immediate and substantial measures of relief has become imperative. This conference considers that the following minimum demands must be met by the Government and the employers without further delay, and necessary legislative and administrative steps to fulfil them must be initiated at once:

(1) A 25% general reduction in prices, especially in food-grains and all essential commodities of life; reduction in those taxes which fall mainly on the common people;

(2) An all-round 25% increase in the wages paid at present to all workers and employees of both the private and public sectors;

(3) Immediate linking of all dearness allowances with the consumer price indices on a sliding scale; where no separate

D.A. is paid, the consolidated wage to be linked up with the consumer price index;

(4) Cent per cent neutralisation for every rise in the cost of living to be automatically ensured for workers of all wage categories through a sliding-scale D.A.;

(5) Correction and revision of the existing fictitious and fraudulent or wrong official index figures and their calculation, through the agency of suitable tripartite machinery;

(6) Immediate fixation, and wherever necessary, revision of minimum wages for industries and trades covered by the Minimum Wages Act, and immediate implementation of wages already fixed thereunder; adequate minimum wages for agricultural labour;

(7) Submission of the Bonus Commission's report by the end of 1963, and announcement of Government's decision thereon within a month thereafter;

(8) Acceptance and implementation of the basic principle of a minimum guaranteed bonus, irrespective of profit or loss, to all workers and employees in all industries and trades, in both the public and private sector;

(9) Introduction of State Trading in wholesale business of foodgrains;

(10) Fixation and enforcement by law of fair, minimum prices to the peasant for his agricultural produce; and guaranteed supply to him at reasonable prices of essential articles for his everyday use;

(11) (a) Nationalisation of banks, export-import trade, and the oil and sugar industries under democratic control as a first step towards furthering State acquisition and control over decisive sectors of the national economy;

(b) Take-over by Government of all plants and mines which have been closed down by the employers despite their being productive units;

(c) Public sector workers to have the same democratic and T.U. rights as in the private sector.

This conference puts forward the above 11-point *Charter of Minimum National Demands of the Toiling Masses* as a plat-

form of unity and action for the entire toiling masses of the country, embracing not only the organised working class and its trade union organisations, but also all middle-class sections, working farmers, small traders and shopkeepers, and others who are groaning under the intolerable burden of high and rising prices, food shortages, black-marketing and profiteering, and the increasing load of indirect taxes.

The demands for taking over by the State of wholesale trading in foodgrains and progressive nationalisation of key industries, commencing with the private banks, oil monopolies, sugar mills and the country's export-import trade, correspond to the most vital interests of the overwhelming majority of our people. Their fulfilment can alone bring the anarchy in the food market under control, destroy the grip of the speculators and hoarders, bring down and stabilise prices, and strike a decisive blow at the centres of capitalist economic concentration and monopoly power, which are used today to swell the private sector's profits, rob the country of its foreign exchange earnings and resources, and exploit the common consumer mercilessly.

8. This conference is well aware that its Charter of Demands cannot be had for the mere asking, and that its realisation, even in part, will require the broadest possible unity and action of the toiling masses led by the organised working class. United organised and disciplined action mobilising the vast masses for struggle on these common demands can overcome the powerful resistance of the reactionary monopolists and their patrons inside the Government and the ruling party, and compel them to heed the people's voice.

This is no easy task. At the same time, this conference reminds the people of the massive power of their united action, a striking manifestation of which was the Great Petition and March to Parliament on September 13th last, which played a decisive role in smashing the hated and extortionate Compulsory Deposit Scheme, and making the Government undertake a review of its policies and performance. This experience should generate confidence in the people's minds and hearts that once they begin to move and act unitedly, their voice cannot be ignored by the ruling classes.

This conference, therefore, decides to initiate and launch an all-national campaign for reduction of prices and taxes for increase of wages and earnings, for D.A. and bonus, and for nationalisation.

The National Campaign will be launched on 1st January, 1964 throughout the country, and its opening phase will culminate in the observance of an all-India Day on 12th/13th January (the choice of date to be according to local convenience) through mass meetings, processions and demonstrations for the eleven demands listed above.

The National Campaign Day of the Toilers of India will be observed by the working people in every town and village, in every factory and office.

This conference hopes that the Government will not sit tight and allow the situation to deteriorate still further, thereby leaving the masses no alternative but to launch direct action on an all-national scale in defence of their most elementary interests.

There is still time for Government to pay heed to the burning demands of the people and to come forward with positive measures for the relief of the masses as outlined above.

Should the Government and the employers fail to show any response and make any substantial concessions to the working people, the National Campaign of the Toilers of India will be further continued with all peaceful forms of action including a mighty *NATIONAL PROTEST STRIKE AND HARTAL* throughout the country.

This conference appoints a National Campaign Committee consisting of Coms. S. S. Mirajkar, Dutta Deshmukh, P. Ramamurthi, Parvathi Krishnan, Kedar Das, S. S. Yusuf, P. Balachandra Menon, Mohd. Elias, S. A. Dange, Ranen Sen, T. B. Vithal Rao, Indrajit Gupta, K. T. K. Tangamani, Satish Loomba, K. G. Srivastava, and Coms. Barin Chowdhury (Assam), Manoranjan Roy (West Bengal), D. C. Mahanty (Orissa), Ratan Roy (Bihar), Ram Asrey (U.P.), B. D. Joshi (Delhi), Kartar Singh (Punjab), P. Kapatia (Himachal Pradesh), Swami Kumaranand (Rajasthan), B. Trivedi (Gujarat), S. G. Patkar (Maharashtra), Gerald Pereira (Goa), N. S. Reddy (Andhra), K. M.

Sundaram (Tamil Nad), Kallat Krishnan (Kerala), M. C. Narasinhham (Karnatak) and Homi Daji (Madhya Pradesh) with the right to co-opt. or join with such representatives from other Central T.U. Organisations and all-India Trade Federations, not affiliated to the AITUC, as may be persuaded to join in this campaign.

This conference authorises the Committee to take all the necessary steps to build a powerful unity of all genuine Trade Union Organisations of all affiliations including their leaderships, irrespective of their political views in order to make the campaign a success in achieving the demands outlined above.

The National Campaign Committee is authorised to review the situation as it develops up to 31st January 1964, and in the event of the Government's and Employers' failure on State and National level to respond satisfactorily to the Charter of Demands, to meet in the first week of February and to decide on the final preparations for the observance of the National Protest Strike and Hartal on a specific date.

The conference appeals to all sections and T.U. Organisations of the working class and salaried employees to co-operate in making the National Campaign of the Toilers of India including the proposed General Strike and Hartal a mighty historic success.