

**Labour Management Cooperation in Railways
Probing a Contemporary dilemma in India****Dr. Sudipta Sardar**Link : <https://bit.ly/48Ksxkf>

Abstract : Indian Railways was an integral part of India's economic development before the First world war. Trade Unions in India, like most other countries, were a result of this Industrial development. This article attempts to show that understanding events requires a comprehensive analysis of the period of railway policy, railway workers and their unions from the second half of the 19th century to the 21st century India. These actions took many forms: forms that were not the primitive predecessors of twentieth-century unionism, but which sometimes were including formally organized trade unions. Often these activities were planned, complex and effective reactions to work-related oppression and exploitation and their perceived opportunities for employees. In this article I want to trace the growth and the development of railway employees and trade unions of Indian Railways and I am also focusing on the matter of labour. Indian Railways has had two recognized unions since independence. India like everyone else Union of Indian Railwaymen, National Union of Indian Railwaymen and some not known as the Railway Mazdoor Union, but to avoid multiplicity and competition among themselves. According to unions, Indian Railways has adopted a policy of having one union in one organization. After Result of secret ballot in November 2007, Northern Central Railway Mazdoor (NCRMU) is one of the recognized unions in Indian Railways. Also, what's to come the arguments presented in this article will indeed serve the railway workers very well. They implemented versatile and important forms of collective action; they were role models on one level. The existence of a growing working class, during a certain level of railway work showed a lot of complexity and idiosyncrasies that gave rise to different forms to protest Finally, the paper concludes that the development that led to the Indian Railways and workers are examples of the difficulties of the entire labour movement and railway work Politics in India.

Key-Words : Railways, Workers, labour, Caste, Trade union

Introduction :

The decisive company depends largely on the cooperation of the labour office whose main aims to researching the topic of the functionality of Indian Railways. Manpower Management Collaboration Programs is considered important for three reasons. The first and crucial reason is to search understanding the state of labour management cooperation in India's largest company. Second, the rail transport sector in India is almost dominated by the public sector. Public companies are expected to step up and set an example in labour market relations. Third, Indian Railways will create a model of industrial relations in India. The earliest railway the lines were confirmed in 1849 and construction began in the 1850s. There were two of them experimental Lines Selected by Lord Dalhousie; one was a 121mile line in Bengal Howrah north to Burdwan; the other was a 35-mile line east of Bombay Kalyan. In the years 1859–1909, almost 1,000 kilometres of railways were opened per year. Before 1899 the area served by railways exceeded 50% of the whole country and in 1914 it exceeded 75% of the total area. Indian Railways (IR) continues to be the largest commercial enterprise in the world an employer with

approximately 1.7 million employees, which speaks of the large workload inventory of accumulated social capital. This social capital, especially on the IR human side, played well important role in the successful management of the organization for more than a century. Railroad Construction was very labour intensive. We make two general remarks below. First of all, the Government of India had a strong influence on the railways from the beginning but over time, the role of the government grew. How then did the railway unions allow the workers to sink into such a predicament? Is the fact undoubtedly contributed a lot to the success and sophistication organization and labour solidarity?

The railways were partially nationalized in the 1880s and 1908, and full nationalization took place between 1924 and 1947. Another effect to the integration of the railway market and the national income of railway workers had seen. The workforce is perhaps the most advanced in railroads due to the fact that they are different. The railway working classes are more homogeneous and perhaps better collective in negotiations. The railway workers had demanded an increase in basic pay, service security and other facilities for the last so many years, so they arranged a general strike for their rights, but the competitive situation between unions weakened them bargaining power. The result was the failure of almost all railroad strikes competition between unions.¹ Union competition led to a lack of cooperation, except occasionally between unions, but also between unions and management, which influence the achievement of railway goals such as productivity, profitability, travel safety, etc. We are trying to improve our membership support; these unions filed complaints and organized illegal strikes. Those unions presented a petition grievances and frequent organized illegal strikes (NFIR, 1976) in 1970-71, 1973-74, 1977-78, 1978-79, 1983-84 and 1986-87. Trade unions also got in the way introduction of uniformity measures in the principles governing all work departments to the conditions. If the working class wants to achieve hegemony from a "Gramscian" perspective, it must patiently build a network of alliances with social minorities.

Ian Kerr describes in his article "The Railway Workshops and their Labour: Entering the Black Hole", History of Indian railway workforce is one of the biggest black holes in Indian history as it is almost non-existent in-depth research on this topic.² The purpose of this article is therefore to illustrate the above stated opinions in relation to railroad work and in construction and an open line in the history of Indian railways. Our empirical analysis examines whether this has changed ownership affected labour costs which cover railway delivery costs at a certain fixed network investment level. Use of management reports Government of India; we are creating a new historical database of major railway systems who led railway workers in the history of Indian railways.

Some of the problems faced by railway workers in colonial India

This article uses research on railway workers to explore and explore that complexity labour policy. Because Indian railways were directly controlled by the state, although generally Industry run by private companies offers a good opportunity for research various aspects of colonial rule in relation to labour groups such as racial discrimination, establishing power, disciplining labour and suppressing strikes. The economic and cultural roles attributed to British technology in the form of the railway through the modernization of Indian customs reflected racial difference and hierarchies of Skills and Work Practices in Indian Railway in 20th Century and by 1919 the native workers were alienated from their work. But the tensions caused by racial discrimination.³ It was in October 1920 Persistent rumour that railway workers at Khurda Road, Bengal Nagpur Railway (BNR) would stop all transport and traffic during the puja if not complied with by the BNR agent demanding a 75 percent pay rise Connection (RWA).⁴ As a result, on October 8, almost everything Kharagpur location and railway staff and all workshop staff went effect in reality, the relationship between "colonizers" and "colonized" was not that close. One of the main recommendations of the Royal Commission was that workers should be had to undergo medical examinations. When medical examinations represented discipline state, bribery symbolizes the cancellation of disciplinary proceedings. Such practices were also common among station owners in Howrah who had to pay a certain monthly fee for private entrepreneurs to protect their jobs.

Chitra Joshi says there were differences within European residents by place of residence Europeans worked in factories and worked closely with local workers 300-800 rupees. It was described as “accustomed to noise, dirt and unpleasant consequences inseparable from native labour.”⁵ For Joshi, the factor limiting racialism comes from outside the class and not from the practices of the colonial state/European manager.⁶ The split in the Railway Workers’ Association (RWA) in the late 1920s was explained “The difference between ranks is built into the colonial structure of railway work” and the divisive racial policy of the Railway Board constantly promotes it. In the first for example, the radical activism that spread to the East Indian Railways in the summer 1920 was focused on economic complaints. So in the meeting held in Sealdah on the 4th of July in 1920, the general secretary of the association asked the railway board to do it early notice of the processing of a request for a significant salary increase. At 25th July, an RWA branch was established in Kharagpur and soon after nearly 10,000 Representatives of East Bengal Railway, East Indian Railway and Bengal Nagpur Railway meet there to pass resolutions demanding 75 percent pay in March 31, 1919, plus seasonal additions; railway labour delegation Legislative Council; appointment of a conciliation board; and coercion Workers’ Compensation Act, which is the same as in the UK until RWA was the only union that spoke for all railway communities.⁷

However, the union had demanded equality between Indians and Europeans, e.g., salaries, allowances, houses, admission to European institutes, etc. The whole of Indian the Federation of Railwaymen clearly had more radical aims and sought to disband the colonial structure of the railway workforce and the creation of complete equality. Sign up this her union was founded in 1924 after the 1924 All India Railwaymen’s Conference (AIRC). Interestingly, this meeting took place in Bombay while e.g., the above overview of the possibility of a strike in 1920-21 shows the centre of activities. The main resolution of this meeting stated that all racial discrimination in railway services be completely removed from all state railways used by the state or companies. They were the furthest from the orthodox of an urban proletariat based on factory work. They best describe the transitional phase, of India’s emerging working class. Most of them were villagers who were paid to building a workforce was for temporary. The railroad contractor says, “I heard, although he loves money, he prefers complete unemployment and often needs to be drive away from the village in the morning to force him to earn a good daily wage by painting the neighbourhood. Coolie work prevailed: men, women and children used their muscle power and simpler tools for digging and transporting earth and stone.”⁸

Although, there 20 percent of each location’s workforce was skilled workers. Bridges are needed for many skilled workers; embankment or cutting required ‘mainly soil moving angles. In the year however, all segments of this vast wage labour proved suitable conditions for collective action. Two reasons govern the examples studied so far. The first, and often the most explosive, was salary arrears. This sometimes this involved lower than promised late payments amount the second was the demand for higher wages. Other reasons were disputes over the matter controllable or working conditions. The latter was often met with resistance for farmers to accept such work or unfavourable work practices. In 1919 was often a watershed year in industrial policy generally for workers. In building this story, many of the previous blows, especially in time of Swadeshi movement in Bengal in 1906-07 is struck off the record and maybe from memory. There have been at least five strikes on Indian railways since 1897-1905. The breach of intelligence gathering was accompanied by fear of the “new industrial workers successes”.

The state developed an appropriate strike system described as “an operation involving nothing else than the making of all the necessary preparations for the acquisition of troops and the police are ready to act immediately in an emergency. The immediate actions were as follows: First, to keep open the main railway lines and the telegraph and second, to protect railroad property, non-strikers and their families. However, on February 1st Purulia district SP and sub-divisional officer met the attackers but were threatened to “go further” with all the men who refuse to return to work’ continued, and also the refusal of the workers back to work Meanwhile, two workers were charged and arrested for stone throwing, which further encouraged the workers, known as the mafia, to boycott work, which was then silenced by

the police. Some Bengali newspapers echoed the same sentiment. Bluff and wholesale arrests and incarcerations were not good for the government and were actually decreasing government authority. Thus, Gandhi in, to Jharia on 5th February 1921 that labourers had the strength to use their lathis, but that would harm them They did not know when and against whom to use their sticks.⁹ He further advised them to make their hearts 'pure' and 'not to strike in the first instance but to reason with their employers.

Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya has argued that the basic principles of Gandhi's industrial discourse were double First was mutual interest and second was a non-violent relationship between them.¹⁰ The Ministry of the Interior has published the only concerns about the rail strike were concerned about its political aspect and its impact on the rule of law. Workers at the Lilooh Workshop went on strike in February 1921. Strike Started on the 28th of the month and in the subsequent meeting in March the staff decided to wait until the 5th before 'unleashing the violence. On the 3rd, a meeting was held, presided over by Saadat Ali, and according to the Amrit Bazar Patrika, was attended by other members of the Khilafat Committee. Attempts were made to take over the strike and it was claimed that Hakim Saadat Ali, president of the Howrah Labour Union, was conducting the strike. Here, as Partha Dutta has remarked, "Whatever the claims made by the union, it obviously stepped in only after the workers had decided to strike independently."¹¹

Narrative accounts of the railway strikes informed by Marxist perspectives, written during the period and later, have stressed the significance of the events around 1919 signalling the arrival of a more mature phase of the labour movement in India, mirroring events in labour movements outside India. Commenting on the EIR strike of 1922, M. N. Roy noted, "about the same time that the German railway strike and the revolutionary action of the Rand miners were attracting the tense attention of the world, India was also visited by an industrial strike of quite a serious and extensive nature, the strike of the workers of the East India Railway.¹² Most of them defined this period, 1919-21, as 'the period of genesis of the Railway labour movement', precisely because 'the period saw the birth of strong, well built unions in the Indian railways. The strike-accounts we have seen above make it clear that wages were the primary reason for strikes. The post war surge in strikes was undeniably related to the rising prices of necessary commodities of life. However, the claim, mostly in Marxist perspectives, that the previous period was marked with 'little class consciousness' because they were not 'organized' is not a helpful way to understand the real politics of the workers of this period. In the later period too, when unions like the RWA and others existed, only rumours of the strike persisted.

The Jamalpur workshop strike that started on 2nd December 1919 brought out some interesting features of workers' politics. That workers had some prior consideration of going on a strike before the 2nd is attested to by the fact that a few notices written in Kaithi were found pasted on the walls of workshops on 27th November.¹³ The notices mentioned workers' discontent regarding pay conditions and Sunday labour. The SP Monghyr, on 9 th December noted three notices written in Hindi within the coolie yard. This makes it very clear that the workers started the strike by themselves, without any outside intervention, as even after a week police report did not mention the mediation of any organizations or individuals. Moreover, the way the workers mobilized themselves in the initial days speaks of their independent action. The 10 th December meeting, which was attended by at least two thousand men, brought in the first instance of outside mediation in the form of Bhagwan Singh, who was not a Railway workshop worker. The Work Manager instead posted a notice at the Workshop gate on 24th December giving them 'one more opportunity to return to work unconditionally. This was followed by an anonymous response found posted at the same gate on 29th December. The letter tried to invoke the qualities of forbearance and patience as the only ones through which success can achieved through strike. One Habib Mia who addressed the meeting accused for the earlier selected delegates with not 'doing anything' to achieve the demands. The intra-subaltern nature of the politics must also be clarified.

Worker's politics were also mired in the contesting positional ties of gaining control over others. Habib, for instance, tried to take control of the situation by accusing those co-workers who earlier had formed the delegation. During the meeting a division occurred, one group came out in favour. The next day about continuing work, the other was in favour of going to the store, but no begins to work when he is not sure of his requirements, and the third even begins to approach in the shops and wanted to forcibly arrest everyone who wanted to. Returning to the question of violence, we saw that intimidation and threats were not unusual ways to achieve strike unity. Industrial violence in the form of train burning or tear lines was common among the strikers. In fact "crime" on the railway in the form of a "train" prevailed during the Madras Presidency in the 1920s. Most importantly, David Arnold argued both bands and plates over who had access to the tools Committed this "crime".¹⁴ Another characteristic of this period was mainly the theft of goods from the railways presumably by railway workers.

Based on figures provided by Bengal Bihar Police and Orissa, U.P, Punjab, Central Provinces, North West Frontier Province and Assam, 11,265 property crimes with convictions, at least 2,030 servants were condemned. In Asansol (BNR), 25% of guards were convicted of theft in the year 1920. On August 24, 1946, one of the most heroic and glorious struggles of the workers began, Class, South Indian Railway Strike.¹⁵ The railway workers demanded a pay rise in basic salary, daily compensation, service security and other services for the last so many years. During the war, the Indian government announced that all their demands had been met Viewed at the end of the war. But at the end of the war, the railway workers were threatened approximately 3 lakhs with layoff of staff and cut in DA and salaries. To fight back official attack on trade unions and democratic rights 40,000 employees, including station managers, various types of auxiliary officers, punters, shift workers, installers, mechanics, porters and even some better paid drivers went on strike. At the midnight on August 24, 1946 it was in response to a call of the SIR Labour union and the Station Masters Association. The entire railway traffic stopped on the SIR covering 40,000 miles from Madras City in the north to the southern Peninsular of India in Malabar, the states of Travancore and Cochin and Tamil Nadu.

Beside at the beginning of September the workers steadily returned to work after the strike continued. Therefore, only 20 percent of the workers went on strike. The railway administration had could increase both passenger and freight volumes, although this was done still limited to daylight. The government offered a region to S. Guruswamy of "the Union of Indian Railwaymen" to contact the main leaders of the strike who were not in custody to take steps to call a strike.¹⁶ A meeting those leaders agreed on September 22 to consider calling off the strike. Therefore, representatives of the sub-unions met at Tanjore on September 22 and unanimously decided to end the strike. The martyrs of the SIR strike were honoured in the meeting who faced police repression and gave their lives for the working class. They too committed to the struggle against exploitation and tyranny. There were several interesting elements to this strike. First, signalmen were in practice all Brahmins. This fact undoubtedly contributed a lot to the success and sophistication organization and employee solidarity.

It is also recommended instance an intermingling of caste and class-based concerns." Caste concerns are suggested by the demand that vacancies in the traffic and telegraph departments, except the lowest, should not be filled by outsiders because it is hard to be kept down by natives of other castes, no more competent, being placed over your head. Caste exclusivity also weakened the motivation for the strike among other workers. Caste membership provided a powerful yet inherently limiting basis for worker organisation and protest.¹⁷ First, the Brahmin presence in South India also suggested the possibility of a connection between the strikers and the political situation of Western and South India. Secondly, the failure and aftermath of the strike demonstrated the difficulty faced by worker movements in colonial India especially where the colonial government perceived vital interests to be threatened. The Government of Bombay and the Government of India intervened actively to minimise the disruption of the rail traffic and after the strike both levels paid considerable attention to the question of how to prevent such strikes or to minimise their effects if they did occur. Three proposals were actively considered.

The multiple divisions of Indian society coupled to the complex occupational and grade distinctions of the permanent railway workforce did provide a fertile ground for the application of divide and manage tactics. And whatever seeds were sown by the British they found easy germination in the formation of communal unions among railway workers in the 1920s and 1930s. But that is a later development. What is crucial for this paper is that many railway workers in the 19th century displayed a developed capacity for collective action including organised trade unionism. The 19th century labour history of India is an open and exciting area. So much remains to be done-not least with respect to the railway workers. And those railway workers, construction and open-line, I have argued here well illustrate the presence of a growing working class in 19th century India; a class still ill-defined and internally differentiated which did nonetheless engage in many and varied forms of collective action. The specific manifestations of those actions must be studied and understood within their historical context informed by a broader understanding of the processes leading to the creation of an Indian working class.

Railway Workers and Their Unions

The first point which must be grasped in order to understand the strike of May 1974 is the absolute and relative decline in income which the railway workers had endured for as long as two decades before the strike. The single most important cause of the decline was that the Indian railways were run as a government department by the ministry of railways. Unlike other departments, however, the railway was a revenue-producing service. The Indian railways were, like BHEL or Hindustan Petroleum, a public sector concern producing goods and services and sometimes-producing a profit. It even earned foreign exchange through the manufacture and export of railway equipment. Nevertheless, because it was created by the British long before the rest of the public sector was dreamed of, the railway was administered as a government department rather than as an independent corporation. Therefore, like the clerks and peons of the bureaucracy, the railway workers were treated as government servants whose wages were determined by Central Government pay commissions.

There were three pay commissions between 1947 and 1974. The First Pay Commission of 1947 set down uniform rates of pay out of the multiplicity of rates inherited from the various pre-independence railway companies. It also provided for a dearness allowance (DA) formula that would compensate workers for increases in prices. However, the DA formula as it was actually applied by the government did not fully make up for the increase in the cost of living. By the end of the 1950s railway workers' incomes had become seriously eroded. Despite the decline, The Second Pay Commission of 1959 did not actually increase the remuneration of central government employees but merely merged the accumulated DA with wages and handed down the total as a pay revision. Despite the fact that the decision was taken in October 1973, over three years after the appointment of the commission, the increase was backdated only to 1st January 1973. The niggardly award of the Third Pay Commission could not have come at a worse time for the railway workers. During the years 1970 to 1973 when the commission deliberated and the government dithered, India experienced its worst inflation since independence. Under the impact of drought and oil price increases, wholesale prices increased by seventy per cent between 1968-69 and 1973-74, with a thirty per cent increase being recorded in 1973-74.

The railway workforce was amongst the most highly unionised in the country and had traditions of strike action extending back to before the First World War. The answer to this problem can be found in the history of the recognised unions and their relationship to the railway management. The history of the relations between unions and employers in many Indian industries is one of a cycle of repression and accommodation. In the initial stage, a militant union leads workers in a strike campaign, first of all for improved wages and conditions, but also for recognition of the union. Having won recognition after suffering the rigours of repression, the union settles into a steady conservative relationship with the employer. In many cases the relationship with the employer cuts the union off from the workers and

their problems. Such a situation provides fertile ground for the growth of dissident splinter unions leading militant campaigns and overtaking the established union in the allegiance of the workers. The employers may successfully be able to repress the competing union, but if they are not, the employers will aim to establish a relation-ship with it similar to the existing recognised union.¹⁸ Processes of this kind, sketched out rather schematically here, have been analysed historically in a number of studies of trade union.

However, in the case of the railways, the powerful weapon of the lockout was rarely available to management. Whereas a factory owner could simply close a plant and starve the workforce into submission at the cost of a temporary loss of profit, the railway management ran an infrastructural service which was impossible to stop without massive political complications. Moreover, the public pressure which fell on the railway management and on their superiors, the politicians, in the event of a strike made them keen to avoid strikes. Therefore, in the interests of long-term stability in labour relations, railway management modified the tactics employed by other employers and aimed to build up a more nuanced relationship with its unions. The policy which they implemented could be described as a policy of co-option, one which attempted to integrate unions into the administrative structure for management purposes. The effective result of the practices of the recognised unions was to make them avenues of corruption. Having eschewed the tradition of collective action, they turned to taking up the grievances of individual workers on petition. It was not long before money was being demanded for the service. The unions became a means through which a worker could obtain a promotion, a transfer or a favourable hearing in disciplinary proceedings so long as sufficient money changed hands.

By the middle of 1973 there was a general, though undirected, feeling that the AIRF needed an infusion of new ideas and leadership. The sentiment, however, had been current in sections of the zonal leadership for some time. Supporters of the Samyukta Socialist faction in the Socialist Party initiated discussions with the Royists in the AIRF and persuaded them to back a move to bring George Fernandez into the central leadership of the union. Fernandez was singled out because he had established a formidable reputation as a trade union leader in Bombay and had the credentials of having supported railway workers' struggles in the past. First of all, Fernandez was asked to stand for the presidency of the AIRF union in the central railway. Fernandez quickly realised that he was being presented with an opportunity to extend his trade union and political influence outside his Bombay base into the rest of India. Therefore, he agreed to the proposal, stood for the position of president of the union and, in June 1973, was elected. At the next annual convention of the AIRF, held at Secunderabad in October 1973, Fernandez stood for the position of president of the AIRF.

The conference was being held little more than two months after the loco running staff strike which had so shaken the status quo in the railway labour movement. The dilemma places the union movement in a permanent state of uncertainty and risk. Such a state is not conducive to the emergence of the independent but institutionalised labour movement which characterises developed-countries. Moreover, it is not conducive to the growth of a labour bureaucracy to staff the movement. However, the labour bureaucracy craven the stability of the movement and as a result all the decision of militant actions has been rarely taken by the labourers. The history of the rail unions, with their long periods of stagnation interrupted by outbursts of militancy is repeated throughout the Indian labour movement. When the railway workers forced the AIRF to lead the historic May 1974 strike they showed their potential to break the bounds of the kind of token action beloved of the institutionalised social-democratic labour movement. However, the organisational and political weaknesses of the labour movement as a whole meant that the strike was not joined by other sections of. The working class and its full potential were not realised.

Conclusion :

But such expressions were also partially a recasting of ideas that were in dialogue with processes affecting and influencing the workers lives. Most important here is to recognize the role of European or Anglo-Indian organizations in the development of railway labour politics in India. In spite of harbouring racial feelings, these individuals and organizations through their own experience of English labour movements and reforms, introduced representatives of railwaymen to Parliament and a Compensation Act on the lines of one in Great Britain; appointments of Conciliation Boards and so on. The action of the maintenance gang men brings us back to the situation of the construction workers both in terms of the kind of work being performed and in the more volatile response. Indeed, disgruntled or discharged maintenance coolies and construction coolies shared a protest technique. This was dacoity and train-wrecking. According to Dipesh Chakraborty's view that these activities were carried out by the lowest, depressed castes whose background exposed them in the context of a violent act but more permanent practice maintenance, wrecked trains in a gesture that "stood halfway between crime and protest." The main results are: The Indian government had a strong influence from the beginning on the railways, but the role of the government increased over time nationalization. The performance of Indian railways was very different before and after 1920. Between 1850 and 1919 there was a tendency to increase production, productivity and profits. After dividend guarantees and state ownership had a surprising effect on the railways. Ultimately, railroads increased market integration and national income but railroads could have contributed to the economic development of India also. When the railways are restored for private management, it personally would like to see some kind of plan based on which it is designed employees are given many opportunities to acquire railroad securities; under which they get a voice in management even before the acquisition significant inventories; and each individual worker also receives the opportunity to earn additional benefits in addition to reasonable regular pay or extra payments for doing more work than usual. But like I said, I disagree that our railways have been ineffective in the past and I am sure of that the adoption of any plan would destroy the efficiency of their operations control and management in the hands of employees and assign them no financial responsibility for the results of their management.

Notes & References :

1. In the case of the railways this point has been emphatically made by Bipan Chandra, *The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India*, New Delhi, 1966; Lajpat Jagga, *Emergences of the Labour Movement on the Railway in India, 1899-1925- A Preliminary Survey*, M. Phil Dissertation, JNU, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 236
2. See the recent article by Ian Kerr dealing with the 'representation' and 'representations' of the railways for a discussion on the functions of railways, in terms of their politics of representations to different and varied target groups. *Modern Asian Studies*, 2003, p. 46
3. Lajpat Jagga, op., cit., p. 114
4. "Pet Ke Waaste" : Rights, Resistance and the East Indian Railway Strike, 1922 by Lajpat Jagga Published by Sage Journal, 2014, p. 114
5. Chitra Joshi, *'Lost Worlds: Indian Labour and its Forgotten Histories'*, Permanent Black Publishers, 2003, p. 54
6. Letters to the President, Railway Board, July 1922-July 1923, N. M. Joshi Private Papers, First Instalment, file no. 11, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi [Henceforth NMML], Nehru Memorial Museum and Library

7. Report from SP, BNR to the office of the DIG, Crime and Railways, Patna, 9th October 1920, This report categorically stated the reason for the strike to be the transfer of Mr Woodhouse
8. Panchanan Saha, *History of the Working-class movement*. People's Publishing House, New Delhi 1978. p. 75
9. Kalikinkar Dutta, *India: Gandhiji in Bihar*, 1969, Bihar Secretariat Press, 1969 p. 76
10. Sabyasachi Bhattacharya, "*The Indian Working Class and the Nationalist Movement*", South Asia 1986, Modern Asian Studies, Cambridge University Press, p.59
11. Partha Datta, "Strikes in Greater Calcutta Region 1918-1924", *Indian Economic Social History Review*, 30, no. 1, 1993, pp. 81-84
12. M. N. Roy, "*The Railway Strike in India*", published in International Press Correspondence, vol. 2, no. 37, 1922, kept in file no. 88 of 1922, ACH. Roy at this time was writing from Moscow
13. G. Huddleston, "*History of East India Railway*", Calcutta, Thacker Spink and Co. 1908, p. 245
14. David Arnold, White Colonisation and Labour in the 19th Century India, *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* XI :2, January, 1983, pp. 133-158
15. Fortnightly confidential Reports for September 1946, from Madras Tamilnadu Archives, Madras
16. Ibid, pp. 16-18
17. Sumit Sarkar, "*The Conditions and Nature of Subaltern Militancy: Bengal from Swadeshi to non co-operation 1905-22*", Nehru Memorial Museum Library, 1982, p. 275
18. Rajani Kanta Das, "*History of Indian Labour Legislation*" (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1941) pp 257-258. Dipesh Chakraborty, "*Rethinking Working Class History*", Princeton University Press, 2000, pp. 156-162

References :

Ministry of Railways, Spare the Nation's Lifeline, New Delhi, 1974

See for example Francine Frankel, India's Political Economy 1947-1977, New Delhi, 1984, pp 528-30; L and S Rudolph, In Pursuit of Lakshmi the Political Economy of the Indian State, Chicago, 1987, pp 274

B K Bhargava, India's Seventh Five Year Plan 1985-90, New Delhi, 1986

Sumit Sarkar, "Subaltern Militancy", pp. 308-9, 314-16

Southern Railway Firemen's Council, Memorandum Submitted to the Honorable C M Poonacha, Minister for Railways, Government of India, Madurai, 1967

Indian Railwaymen, March 1974, p. 6

Indian Railwaymen, March 1974, p. 15

For an exposition of the social-democratic reality beneath the revolutionary rhetoric of the CITU see E A Ramaswamy, Worker Consciousness and Union Response, Delhi, 1988, and K T R Mohan and K R Raman, 'Kerala Worker Rises against Indian Big Capital: EPW, 2-7-88, pp 1359-1364

Katz, H.C. Kochan, T.A., and Gobeille, K.R., (1983) Industrial Relations Performance, Economic Performance and QWL Programmes : An Inter-Plant Analysis, *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*

Mamoria, C.B., and Mamoria, S. (1985) Dynamics of Industrial Relations, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay

Indian Railways Administration and Finance – An Introduction, 1976 New Delhi

Andrabi, Tahir, and Michael Kuehlwein Railways and Price Convergence in British India, Journal of Economic History, 2010

Madras Times, March 19, 1878

“Introduction”, in R Cohen, Peter C W GLutkinid and P Brazier, “Peasants and Proletarians: The Struggles of Third World Workers”, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979)

4. Tamil Nadu State Archives. Madras PWD (Railway), May 19, 1890, No 690 MR (B)

4. Railway Department. Railway Establishment, Progs, August 1899, Nos. 150-157 B, Notes. NAI

About the author :

Dr. Sudipta Sardar is the Vice Principal of Rabindra Bharati Mahavidyalaya