THE GENESIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL
REGIME THEORY: LABOUR AND SOCIAL JUSTICE, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND IDEAS

by

Sarah Elizabeth Coombs
Department of Political Science

Submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Faculty of Graduate Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario
October 1996

National Library of Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions et services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file   Votre référence

Our file   Notre référence

0-612-21040-5

Canada

ABSTRACT

This study examines the immediate causes of the International Labour Organization's creation in 1919. While the root cause of all the variables isolated may be attributed to World War I, there were other immediate causal factors in the ILO's establishment. The ILO provides an excellent historical case study of the conditions necessary for the formation of an international regime or organization. The gap that this study fills is the examination of two immediate factors, the rise in influence of organized labour movements and the transition of social justice as an underlying idea to the liberal mainstream, as necessary conditions in the successful creation of the ILO in 1919.

The theoretical basis of this study rests upon international regime theory and uses Gail Osherenko and Oran R. Young's framework articulated in the introductory chapter of *Polar Politics*. This study particularly explores the role of ideas in the creation of international regimes or organizations.

The organized labour movement was a champion of the idea of social justice and it had an influential position in society in 1919. Consequently governments could not ignore the demands of labour to establish international institutions based upon social justice. The case of the ILO suggests that underlying ideas may be the key component to the formation of new international regimes. But the idea requires a champion to be translated into action. The case of the International Labour Organization demonstrated the necessary conditions for international regime formation and it is a case which remains relevant today.

Keywords: International Labour Organization, ILO, regime formation, transnational social movements, organized labour movements, trade unions, social justice, liberal internationalism, Woodrow Wilson, World War I, Idealism, ideas, international organization, globalization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Table of Contents

LIST OF APPENDICES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Along with the emergence of a global economy over the past two decades has developed a range of increasingly "global" social and economic problems. However, there are to date relatively few effective international institutions to cope with such problems. There is "a mismatch between global institutions and global needs; the introduction of new issues and new sources of bargaining power into old bargaining forums; the need for urgent action in the face of great uncertainty; and the shifting composition and weight of coalitions, as traditional partners adapt their behaviour to new circumstances and objectives."[1] Modern social and environmental issues have a parallel in the problems experienced by labour in the late 19th century. In both cases, there were few enforceable standards and only limited regulation. Both raise the same questions: whether international regulation through some sort of organization or regime is feasible, and what sort of conditions are necessary for a regime or organization to be created? Existing global structures are unsuitable to deal with many of the social issues; such as environmental degradation, pollution, unemployment, welfare, development, population, gender and sexual equality, disarmament and human rights. It is important to determine if the conditions needed for changing those structures are present in society today.

The distinct phases of international relations history have coincided with the conclusions of international cataclysms or crises. The dominant theoretical paradigm of each period of international relations has grown out of a major conflict. Most recently, for example, the end of the Cold War has radically altered the configuration of the players in the international arena. Already, there has been a shift from security concerns in world

[1] David Glover. "Global Institutions, International Agreements and Environmental Issues," *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, eds. Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey R.D. Underhill (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1994), p.277

politics towards concerns over social and economic issues such as population, environmental destruction, womens' rights and intellectual property rights. Naturally, social issues are not confined to national boundaries and are increasingly global in nature. For example, the clear cutting of the Brazilian rainforests has consequences for the health of the entire world, not simply Brazil or the local inhabitants. Furthermore, the globalization of the world economy over the past century has tremendous implications for how social issues are tackled by governments and international organizations.

In order to isolate the conditions necessary for the development of new global structures, it is helpful to look at a situation which is similar. As I have already suggested the social problems of the 1990's bear some resemblance to the problems labour experienced in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. To demonstrate this, and to draw some instructive parallels, I have examined the conditions which led to the creation of the International Labour Organization (ILO) in 1919. There are lessons to be learned from the founding of the ILO for those interested in introducing similar regimes today. The ILO was one of the first international organizations to cope with social issues on a global scale. Labour had been considered strictly a domestic issue during the 19th century. The ILO was established after World War I, a cataclysmic event that changed the face of the international politics.

After World War I eradicated the old balance of power system from the 19th century, there was a major shift in the dominant intellectual paradigm to idealism, and more specifically, liberal internationalism. Charles W. Kegley has examined the response of international relations theory to such changes in the international system. He noted that paradigmatic revolutions emerge and are energized by changes in world politics.[2]

---

[2] Charles W. Kegley. "The Neoidealist Moment in International Studies? Realist Myths and New International Realities," *International Studies Quarterly* (vol.37, no.2, 1993), p.132

Kegley has also noted that the end of the Cold War was a turning point similar in effect to the end of World War I. If so, the idealism of the inter-war period could be applicable to international relations today.[3]

Kegley is not alone in suggesting that a reevaluation of Wilsonian liberalism is taking place in international relations. David Long also has begun to explore the similarity of current post-Cold War international features and the post-World War I period. Long identifies several striking parallels between the post-Cold War international system and the post-World War I era, with particular attention to the concerns of inter-war writers and historical analogies between 1996 and 1919.[4] However, Long continues that it is not only the historical similarities which are important but rather the theoretical significance of inter-war idealism and its relevance to the current period of international relations.[5] Long and Kegley are a clear departure from E.H. Carr's damming condemnation of inter-war idealism in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. However, Long and Kegley help to bridge the nearly 80 year gap between the ILO's creation and the current international situation which appears to have a renewed interest in idealism.

Another area of inquiry which is currently popular is research into transnational social movements. Social movements can be defined as:

> loose associations of actors who work for their goals (out of necessity or choice) at least in part outside of 'traditional' political channels. They are thus *relatively autonomous* from traditional political institutions, although individual movement members... often share direct experience in such

---

[3] Kegley p.133

[4] David Long. "Conclusion:Inter-War Idealism, Liberal Internationalism and Contemporary International Theory," *Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis: Inter-War Idealism Reassessed.* eds. David Long and Peter Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p.318-323

[5] Long p.322-323

institutions (e.g. government, political parties).[6]

Literature on transnational social movements "explores the significance of social movements for the theory and practice of international relations."[7] The organized labour movement which was key in the ILO's establishment, is one example of early transnational social movements. Further, it will become evident in chapter two that the labour movement had an impact on the international system. Fundamentally, the current examination of social movements is significant to international relations in that it recognizes "that some (transnational) social movements are engaging in practices which may contribute to the reconfiguration of modern politics."[8] Some of the 'new' social movements such as environmentalism, feminism, and black power, could learn valuable lessons from the experience of the labour movement. The current interest in the role played by transnational social movements has also facilitated reevaluation of the creation of international institutions whose aim was to ensure peace as well as the influence of Wilsonianism.[9] The recent recognition of the capability of social movements to influence change in the international system has strong ties to both the creation of the ILO nearly 80 years ago and current international realities.

Although the creation of the ILO occurred nearly 80 years ago, it has renewed relevance currently. The ILO provides a window into the conditions necessary for an international organization or regime to be formed. Many of the conditions which were necessary in 1919 to the ILO's creation, appear to be present again in the post-Cold War international system. As a result, it is worthwhile to reconsider why the International

[6] Cecelia Lynch, "E.H. Carr, International Relations Theory and the Societal Origins of International Legal Norms," *Millennium* (Vol.23, No.3, 1994), p.589

[7] "Social Movements and World Politics: Editors Note," *Millennium* (Vol. 23, No.3, 1994), p.511

[8] ibid p.512

[9] Lynch p.612

Labour Organization was founded in 1919. Before continuing, it is important to note the full range of explanations given for the ILO's creation and how these explanations are not entirely satisfactory.

During the 19th century various political movements as well as concerned individuals became interested in creating an international organization to protect and regulate the conditions and standards of labour. Labour also became an increasingly important domestic concern from the late 19th century onwards. Increased attention to the issues relating to workers has led to a myriad of explanations for why the ILO was created in 1919.

The first of these explanations has been offered by many authors. This attributes the ILO's creation in 1919 to a desire to protect Western Europe from the revolutionary forces which had arisen in Eastern Europe, and in particular Russia. A major proponent of this reason for the ILO's establishment has been Robert W. Cox who suggested that the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917 so frightened the governments and businesses of the industrialized nations in the rest of the world, that the ILO was created in response to these fears. Other governments believed that the Bolshevik revolution was a potential source of danger if it spread. There was reason to believe that the already unstable domestic situations in many European nations after the signing of the armistice could give rise to revolutionary outbreaks.

An example of the unrest which was rampant in Europe immediately after World War I ended was the grave situation in Paris. While the Paris Peace Talks were taking place in the early months of 1919, Clemenceau moved thousands of troops into Paris as a

precaution against rioting in the streets.[10] Other examples of the revolutionary fervor in Europe occurred in usually stable and peaceful democracies such as the Netherlands and Switzerland. Further, there were extreme trade union protests in Britain, France and Italy.[11]

Prior to the outbreak of World War I, labour unrest had been increasing because of rising prices, declining wages and stubborn employers who refused to bow to workers demands for better wages, conditions and lower working hours. By the conclusion of the Great War, it was believed that poor labour conditions were a threat to both domestic and international peace.[12] The Allied powers had a justified concern that the armistice would be followed by widespread social conflict as the years preceding World War I had been marked by labour unrest, and labour unrest was one of the hallmarks of the months preceding the Bolshevik Revolution in October 1917 in Russia. Labour unrest in Russia grew into full scale revolution and the Bolsheviks were swept to power as a result of the successful revolution. Consequently, there was a sense among the Allied powers that some type of concerted action was essential to stop the growing spectre of Bolshevism.[13]

While the spectre of Bolshevism has often been suggested by commentators as an overriding explanation for the creation of the ILO in 1919, there were certainly other forces which had a more direct impact. The Bolshevik explanation does not account for the fact that private voluntary non-governmental organizations, such as the International

[10] Edward Phelan. "The Contribution of the ILO to Peace," *International Labour Review*, (vol. 59,no.6, 1949), p.608

[11] Phelan p.608

[12] John Price. *The International Labour Organization: Fifty Years On.* (London: Fabian Society, 1969), p.1

[13] Robert W. Cox. "ILO:Limited Monarchy," *The Anatomy of Influence: Decision-Making in International Organization.* eds. Robert W. Cox and Harold K. Jacobsen (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), p.102

Association for Labour Legislation, existed with a degree of success prior to the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. The fear of the spread of Bolshevism had nothing to do with the creation of the International Association for Labour Legislation. Further, the fear of Bolshevism cannot explain the increased role that organized labour movements gained which aided in the creation of the ILO. If anything, the fear of Bolshevism might have been expected to damage the credibility and influence of labour groups with the political elites because of labour's ties to the political left particularly in Europe. At best an indirect effect the spectre of Bolshevism had was to create an incentive for governments to embrace reformist actions both domestically and internationally.[14] Governments in Western Europe and North America preferred reforming the existing system to losing power altogether. The fear of unrest, revolution and Bolshevism were part of the reason that the ILO was created but the establishment of the ILO in 1919 can not be entirely attributed to this explanation.

The second explanation of the ILO's creation in 1919 is related to the issue of international competitiveness of industry. Governments of industrialized nations were reluctant to undertake dramatic social legislation to improve their respective domestic labour conditions because they feared that the increased costs to their industries would make it difficult for them to compete with producers in countries with lower standards. The international competitiveness of domestic manufacturers was of primary concern to both governments and businesses. The growth in international trade between nations only served to increase the concern over international competitiveness. George N. Barnes, a Labour Party member of the British War Cabinet, was a major proponent of the international competitiveness explanation and stated that "the need had arisen for leveling out industrial competition between the nations by raising the conditions of labour in the

---

[14] Harold K. Jacobsen. *Networks of Interdependence: International Organizations and the Global Political System*, 2nd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984), p.214

lower-paid countries."[15] Barnes articulated the concerns of the advanced industrialized nations, which was the fear that their products would be undercut in price by goods from these lower-wage countries. Barnes was especially concerned that Eastern (Chinese and Japanese) labour conditions be raised to a higher level because European products were being supplanted by cheaper goods manufactured by lower-paid Eastern labour.[16] Barnes and other proponents of this explanation viewed the ILO as a response, so "that the general standard was raised by concurrent change and no country was unduly penalized by giving rein to humanitarian impulse."[17] James T. Shotwell, who was both a Director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace as well as a member of the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, also presented international competitiveness as the explanation for the ILO's creation in 1919. According to Shotwell, who was a participant in the Labour Commission set up in the Paris Peace Talks, the ILO was viewed as a more effective way of administering international labour laws. The ILO was viewed as more effective as "it raised the common standard of the conditions of life, so that nations which lead the world in social reform were not placed at an undue disadvantage by those which compete with them by the exploitation of their labour."[18]

The idea that some sort of international labour organization should be motivated by economic necessity can be traced to Daniel Legrand in the mid 19th century. There had long been a realization that international differences in working conditions would jeopardize the competitive position of manufacturers in those countries that were socially

[15] George N. Barnes. *History of the International Labour Office*. (London: Williams and Norgate Ltd., 1926), p.37

[16] Barnes p.45-47

[17] Barnes p.37

[18] James T. Shotwell, ed. *The Origins of the International Labour Organization*, vol.1 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), p. xviv

advanced. Thus, any country implementing laws which would protect its workers would put itself at a disastrous economic disadvantage.[19] Britain was particularly concerned and proposed the idea of a permanent international organization to deal with labour regulation as early as the Berne Conference of 1906. The British government believed that labour legislation had become a necessity in order to safeguard the relatively high standard of living in advanced industrialized nations.[20] International competitiveness was a valid concern with respect to labour legislation, as setting domestic labour standards was not alleviating the problem of manufacturers being undercut by competitors from nations that were not compelled to improve working conditions and then profited from the lack of labour standards.

Although international competitiveness is a valid explanation for the creation of the ILO in 1919, the issue of free competition was also used as an argument in opposition to domestic and international labour regulation. Many large U.S. businesses did not regard the ILO as a positive idea. They viewed regulation of any kind as distorting free competition, even though labour appeared ready to cooperate with capital on an international basis and the ILO was designed to eliminate unfair competition.[21] Although this explanation was acknowledged in the Preamble of the ILO constitution, it alone can not fully account for why the ILO was created in 1919. The same groups who supported this explanation also comprised a significant segment of the group who opposed establishing the ILO. The major problem with international competitiveness as an explanatory variable in the ILO's creation was that it was grounded on shaky economic

[19] Victor-Yves Ghebali. *The International Labour Organisation: A Case Study on the Evolution of the U.N. Specialised Agencies.* (Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1989), p.3

[20] Barnes p.35

[21] Shotwell vol.1 p.xxi

theory. It is questionable whether regulation promotes or hinders free competition and consequently, this casts doubt on the validity of this explanation.

The third explanation given for the creation of the ILO was the failure of earlier private non-governmental organizations to achieve any substantial results. Private international non-governmental organizations had been instituted with a fairly low degree of success, prior to the creation of the ILO. It was the failure of these organizations which nudged governments towards a permanent institutional structure.

The first organizations which developed in the 19th century were voluntary. For example, during the 1870's the *Congrès international de bienfaisance* concentrated its efforts on improving labour conditions in Germany, Switzerland and France.[22] But this organization did not survive very long or produce any significant success in improving the conditions of labour. In spite of this failure, there was a growing social conscience in Europe which led, in 1901, to the establishment of the International Association for Labour Legislation which can be considered the predecessor and model for the ILO.[23]

The International Association for Labour Legislation was founded by a group of well-intentioned scientists and economists who were devoted to the concept of social justice. It was a voluntary organization for Europe composed of academic economists and scientists who studied labour legislation. The purpose of the organization "was to serve as a link between those who in the different industrial countries considered legislation for the protection of working people to be necessary," to facilitate the study of labour legislation and the humanization of various national laws and regulations, as well

---

[22] Ghebali p.4

[23] David A.Morse. *The Origin and Evolution of the ILO and its Role in the World Community.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), p. 7

as to foster the holding of international labour congresses.[24] Although the International Association of Labour Legislation was a private institution, it had support from national governments, including money and representatives. Despite the short life of the Association, it contributed to international action on labour issues through the passage of international conventions. The International Association for Labour Legislation succeeded in having two conventions adopted in 1905. One of the conventions forbade the night work of women in industry and the other outlawed the use of white phosphorus in the manufacturing of matches. Other than these two conventions there were few practical results.

Even though there was governmental participation in the conferences that the International Association for Labour Legislation held, the decisions were not legally binding and there was no permanent organization to continue education and pressure on the member governments between the bi-annual conferences.[25] This was one of the major shortfalls which eventually destroyed the organization. The unofficial nature of the International Association for Labour Legislation had serious disadvantages. Furthermore, because of its unofficial nature some governments were concerned as to whom the organization was representing. The British government was particularly concerned because the International Association for Labour Legislation was not representative of governments, employers or workers and the views expressed by the organization were those of a relatively small number of individuals, most of whom were not directly involved in industry.[26] Although the International Association for Labour Legislation held bi-annual conferences, when World War I erupted the organization simply died.

[24] Ghebali p.4

[25] Barnes p.33

[26] Anthony Alcock. *History of the International Labour Organisation.* (London: MacMillan, 1971), p.12

International non-governmental organizations were not effective instruments or adequately representative.

Notwithstanding these shortcomings, the experience of these private voluntary organizations demonstrated the increased willingness of some national governments, such as Switzerland, France, Britain and Germany, to participate in international organizations. Even though it is clear that the first attempts to create a international organizations on labour issues failed, this explanation does not convincingly explain why the ILO was created in 1919. The ILO was created to do more than simply fill the void left by its predecessors, although the ILO did address many of the shortcomings of the earlier attempts. While the failure of international non-governmental organizations to adequately provide international labour legislation was not the most important reason why the ILO was created in 1919, it does provide evidence that there was a perceived need for international labour laws.

The fourth explanation attributes the establishment of the ILO in 1919 to the increased power and influence of domestic trade unions. I will discuss this explanation in more detail in chapter two. During the 19th century the domestic trade unions did not have any significant role in advocating international labour legislation, as trade unions were generally poorly organized and only included skilled workers. However, towards the end of the 19th century organized national labour movements gained recognition and consequently acquired more importance and influence in domestic politics. Organized labour groups began to grow at the end of the 19th century since unskilled workers began to unionize for the first time. In the case of Britain, new political parties had members elected to parliament, specifically the Independent Labour Party (ILP) in 1893 and the Labour Party in 1900. As a result of the more prominent role of organized labour groups, governments adopted "a more interventionist posture. It was this domestic pressure and

pressure from international labour non-governmental organizations (INGO's) which contributed to international action."[27]

Victor-Yves Ghebali suggests that the creation of the ILO can be attributed to pressure by trade unions, which had been strengthened during World War I by the need for labour's cooperation and this accounts for the political decision of governments to establish an international institution responsible for regulating labour conditions.[28] Labour was strengthened during the first World War by "sacrifices made for the war effort by the working masses in the name of a 'sacred union' which called for real compensation."[29] Furthermore, the trade unions became more powerful during World War I by cooperating transnationally. Trade unions in Britain and Western Europe had been pressing for the institution of some form of machinery in order to internationally regulate the conditions of labour. During the first World War, U.S. trade unions led by Samuel Gompers joined the forces urging the creation of an international body within the peace settlement.[30] In addition, the domestic labour movements had an elaborate peace program which was independent of their respective governments.[31]

Organized labour movements gained prominence in the first two decades of the 20th century on both the domestic and international levels. The recognition of labour and its concerns at the Paris Peace Talks was an affirmation of the new influence which

[27] Jacobsen p.214

[28] Ghebali p.6

[29] Victor-Yves Ghebali. "From philanthropy to foundation: The roots of the ILO," *World of Work: The Magazine of the ILO.* (no.8, June 1994), p.10

[30] Price p.1-2

[31] Austin van der Slice. *International Labor, Diplomacy and Peace, 1914-1919.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennslyvania, 1941), p.2

domestic trade unions held, as international recognition of labour by the world powers was unprecedented. Labour had not only cooperated in the war effort, it had lost a significant number of its membership to the war and had ensured that domestic industry could supply the war needs. As such, Labour demanded that it be part of the process at the Peace Talks in creating the social clauses within the peace treaty. Governments could not legitimately deny labour some sort of recognition because of the power that labour held domestically and the sacrifices workers had made during World War I.[32] The organized labour movements had transcended national boundaries and could not be ignored by governments when drafting the Peace Treaty. The increased power of domestic trade unions was highly influential in the establishment of the ILO in 1919 as governments could not simply overlook a highly effective and potent domestic pressure group. However, the increased power and influence of the organized labour movement is not the only explanation for the creation of the ILO in 1919. Since the International Association for Labour Legislation was created in 1900 without any support or influence of labour, it is obvious that there were other influential forces which desired the implementation of international labour laws. The growth in power of the organized labour movements is not the whole explanation as to why the ILO was created in 1919. What has not been adequately explored with respect to the organized labour movement is its rising importance during World War I and how it used its influence to gain tangible results in the Treaty of Versailles. Furthermore, the connection between the influence of organized labour movements and the idea of social justice has not been examined in depth.

The fifth significant explanation for why the ILO was established in 1919 can be attributed to the concept of *social justice*. I will look more thoroughly at the importance

---

[32] Ghebali *The International Labour Organisation*, p.7

of social justice in chapter three of this study. Social justice is not a precise set of principles and yet David A. Morse, Director-General of the ILO between 1948 and 1970, has explained the creation of the ILO as a reflection of a strong belief in the importance of fostering social justice. The constitution of the ILO was reflective of humanitarian impulses and stated that the ILO was "Thus founded to advance the cause of social justice and in so doing, to contribute to the establishment of universal and lasting peace."[33] Social justice was intimately linked, according to many commentators, to the desire to prevent more war and create a permanent peace.

This explanation hinged on the belief that protecting workers would ensure social peace, both domestically and internationally. The international regulation of work conditions would have the virtue of preventing the social upheavals that would occur once workers refused to tolerate the societal status of outcasts.[34] It was not so much the humanitarian impulse which drove this explanation, but rather an intense desire to avoid any further conflict which required social justice as the engine to drive reform. The idea of social justice was reflected in the mandate given to the ILO in its constitution which was to promote "Lasting Peace through Social Justice."[35] The ILO was a vehicle through which world peace was to be rebuilt and developed with a genuine respect for human dignity and spiritual values.[36] Therefore, the ILO was an integral component of the peace process after World War I and was an evolutionary expression of reform. World War I did not come about because of a lack of social justice. Rather, it was the breakdown of the old balance of power structure while had governed international relations for the

[33] Houshang Ameri. *Politics and Process in the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations.* (Great Britain: Gower, 1982), p.207

[34] Ghebali *The International Labour Organisation,* p.3

[35] Morse p.9

[36] Morse p.10

preceding century which was more responsible for the outbreak of World War I. The spectre of continued war and social unrest was unthinkable and the institution of an international organization based on the principles of social justice was viewed as the only way to forestall any more upheaval in the international system. James T. Shotwell, a strong proponent of social justice, noted that "universal peace can be established only if it is based on social justice."[37]

As a result of the spectre of further unrest and upheaval which cast a shadow over the Paris Peace Talks, social justice became an influential factor in the creation of the ILO. While this explanation is not devoid of merit it has not been adequately explored. There was much more to the acceptance of social justice as a governing principle within international relations during the inter-war period. No attention has really been devoted to the strong parallels between Wilsonian liberalism and social justice. The liberal internationalist approach to international relations has been studied because of the immense shift in the dominant theoretical paradigm to idealism, which occurred in the closing years of World War I. However, relatively little contemplation has been given to how social justice was incorporated into the new approach. Also there has been no explanation as to why social justice became a mainstream and accepted concept in the 20th century, although it had been espoused by "radical" elements during the 19th century. This explanation for the ILO's creation in 1919 has not yet been fully explored and consequently I examine the nuances of social justice in chapter three.

As yet few authors have considered that no one overriding variable was the explanation for why the ILO was created in 1919. What has not been adequately achieved so far is consideration of a combination of variables in explaining the ILO's

---

[37] Shotwell vol 1 p.xx

establishment. This is the inadequacy which this study will fill. To date there has been a gap, in that no commentator has interpreted the founding of the ILO as being influenced by the combination of the rise of organized domestic labour movements during World War I with the acceptance of social justice in the post-World War I era. It is the combination of the rise of organized labour movements and the acceptance of social justice in the post-war consensus which were the most influential forces in the creation of the ILO. However, it should be noted that each of these forces was unable alone to establish a permanent international organization on labour issues and thus, it is particularly significant to this study to understand what conditions were present after World War I which allowed for the ILO's establishment. The recognition of labour and the acceptance of social justice by the political mainstream coincided with a shift in the dominant intellectual paradigm to idealism, which occurred in response to the breakdown of the old balance of power system of international relations culminating in World War I. The combination of the rise of the labour movement and the idea of social justice together lead to the creation of the ILO. What this study will show is that these two variables were far more influential than any of the other variables presented in the ILO's creation.

Part of this study's contribution is the employment of international regime theory to the formation of the ILO. Regimes are "social institutions composed of agreed-upon principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures that govern the interactions of actors in specific issue areas."[38] The International Labour Organization is an international organization with the requisite principles, norms, rules and decision making procedures in the specific issue area of labour. It thus represents the beginning of an international labour regime in 1919. It is worthwhile to study the ILO's origins through the lens of international regimes, as "the importance of international regimes is growing

[38] Gail Osherenko and Oran R. Young. "The Formation of International Regimes: Hypotheses and Cases." *Polar Politics*, eds. Gail Osherenko and Oran R. Young. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p.1

in a world in which increasing interdependence heightens the impact of the actions of individual states on the welfare of other states and their inhabitants."[39]

Young and Osherenko set out their approach within Polar Politics into three broadly based categories which are termed power-based hypotheses (interests), interest-based hypotheses (institutional bargaining), and knowledge based hypotheses (ideas).[40] By employing a research framework which evaluated all the possible domestic and international influences, the methodological framework determined which forces were the most influential.

As I am somewhat skeptical of each of the monocausal explanations for why the ILO was created in 1919, my analysis will involve a more plural, multivariate approach. In chapter two of this study, I will examine the rise of the organized labour movements. I believe that the ILO was successfully established in 1919 because organized domestic labour movements were involved, unlike the earlier attempts to found organizations for labour legislation. The literature does not connect the lack of organized labour participation to the failure of early non-governmental, voluntary organizations such as the International Association for Labour Legislation. Furthermore, other analyses do not connect the increased importance of organized labour movement and the idea of social justice which I will connect in Chapter Three. Chapter Two will examine the history of working conditions and why organized labour movements themselves were created. Then I will explore the development of the international movements in which workers became involved, particularly political and industrial movements. Finally, Chapter Two will look at the role of organized labour during World War I with particular attention to

[39] Osherenko p.1

[40] These three hypotheses are summarized in Gail Osherenko and Oran R. Young "The Formation of International Regimes: Hypotheses and Cases," in *Polar Politics* pgs 1-21.

the international conferences and the peace program which organized labour put forth during the war and at the Paris Peace Talks.

In chapter Three, I will shift the focus to the importance of social justice in the creation of the ILO. As I have noted there has been insufficient attention paid to social justice and how it was linked to the dominant paradigm of idealism after the war. Commentators have shied away from the obvious connections between the incorporation of social justice in an international organization and its ties with the shift in the dominant paradigm. In chapter three I will briefly examine the 19th century proponents of international labour legislation and the origins of idealism in international relations. Then, I will focus on how social justice moved from being strictly a radical, intellectual idea to an accepted mainstream liberal concept. I will also explore the implications of World War I. This cataclysmic struggle was the key event in the acceptance of social justice by the political elites and general public. Finally, I will examine the necessity of an international crisis to a shift in the dominant intellectual paradigm. The rise of the organized labour movement and the acceptance of social justice are the immediate causal factors of the ILO's establishment. Although World War I is not the focus of this study, it is arguable that the root cause of the ILO's creation was World War I. Not only did World War I change the face of the global economy, it was a shock to the entire international system. Although the rise of the organized labour movement and the acceptance of social justice as a governing idea are the immediate causal factors of the ILO's establishment, both factors can be explained by World War I. Despite the problematic issue of World War I, the focus of this study is on the immediate causes of the ILO's creation, even though the common factor of World War I thrusts to the fore.

The conclusion of this study will examine the linkages between the rise of the organized labour movement and the transformation of social justice after World War I. In

addition, the conclusion will make clear of the applicability of the ILO's creation to the current international situation.

CHAPTER 2

THE IMPORTANCE OF ORGANIZED LABOUR MOVEMENTS

The labour movements which thrived in most of the industrialized nations before, during and after World War I played an extremely influential role in the ILO's creation. This chapter will begin by detailing the historical conditions which precipitated the creation of organized labour movements. I will also briefly summarize the impact trade unions and labour movements had on working conditions prior to World War I with particular attention to the resultant national labour laws and the countries which had the most advanced protection. Then I will continue by examining both the international political and industrial movements in which labour organizations were involved prior to World War I. Domestic labour organizations did not play a prominent role in the establishment of the International Association for Labour Legislation and remained virtually uninvolved in the international forums relating to labour issues prior to the outbreak of World War I. However, domestic labour organizations' views changed after the outbreak of hostilities in 1914. An international organization which dealt exclusively with labour issues was demanded and seemed to be necessary. Further, almost from the outset of World War I, domestic labour organizations and international labour conferences began demanding a place at the Peace Talks. In addition, the labour movement provided some of the prominent proposals for the Paris Peace Talks and contributed several of its proponents to the Commission on International Labour. As a result, the years during the first World War require examination to discover why labour's demands suddenly became more prominent and why labour movements became influential.

The creation of the ILO would not have been possible without the cooperation of domestic labour movements. The general strikes and unrest which were a feature of the

years immediately following World War I indicated the dangerous undercurrents that domestic labour movements could unleash. These potent forces carried enormous weight in the wake of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. The fear of unrest as well as the potential for revolution gave labour movements bargaining power in a world that wanted universal peace. Simply put, universal peace could not be achieved without attention to the hardships imposed by industrialization on workers and therefore domestic labour organizations became extremely influential in the creation of the ILO.

History of Working Conditions and the Growth of Trade Unions

Conditions of labour have always been a source of tension between workers and their employers.[1] One of the major instruments used by workers (both skilled and unskilled) to address poor working conditions has been the formation of trade unions and labour movements. The industrialization of manufacturing in the late 18th and early 19th centuries condemned the small-scale artisan workshops. As a result, working people lost much of the control and influence they had formerly enjoyed over their work conditions. No longer were they skilled craftsmen working in small, understandable establishments that they owned or could influence. Now they were faceless servants of increasingly mechanized factory processes. It was the use of power machinery and the development of the factory system which encouraged the growth of labour movements to protect and fight for workers. The Industrial Revolution was founded on the economic principles of liberalism and individualism in many countries. This meant that individuals had the freedom of work, free competition, free trade and non-intervention of the State.[2] However, when the principles of the Industrial Revolution were coupled with

---

[1] For example, as early as 1387 the London cordwainers tried to form a permanent labour fraternity in rebellion against the "overseers of the trade." Abdul-Karim Tikriti. *Tripartism and the ILO.* (Stockholm:Almqvist and Wiksell, 1982), p.56

[2] Anthony Alcock. *History of the International Labour Organisation.* (London: MacMillan,1971), p.3

the newly mechanized factories tremendous strains were imposed on social relationships, especially for the working class.

Small poor towns developed in many industrialized nations as a result of the inflow of unemployed agricultural workers who were seeking paid factory positions. Furthermore, these formerly agricultural workers became a new class unto themselves who were hired by the capitalist entrepreneurs and completely divorced from the ownership of the means of production.[3] Essentially, this was a new class of inexpensive, unskilled workers who were desperately in need of employment. The labour conditions were deplorable. Working hours were very long. There was widespread use of child labour. Factories were dirty and often brought on "malformation of bones, curvature of the spine, heart diseases, stunted growth, asthma and premature old age."[4] In addition, workers' wages were extremely low for the amount of hours worked. "Great fortunes were made by a privileged few, but the vast majority of working people became, literally, nothing more than slaves to the new machines."[5] The only power the individual worker had was over his freedom to work for a given employer. But this power was very limited in the early 19th century. There were more workers than there were jobs and thus employers did not need to accede to the demands of workers. They could dismiss the disaffected and hire replacements with considerable legal and practical ease. On the whole, labourers were unorganized and forced to accept whatever wage or working conditions employers offered.[6] In the early decades of the Industrial Revolution there

---

[3] Alcock p.4

[4] Alcock p.4

[5] Tikriti p.57

[6] Tikriti p.57

was very little that workers could do to improve their condition. Trade unions were prohibited in most industrialized nations until the 19th century.

The first permanent form of labour organization was the local trade club in Britain. These were founded by 18th century skilled artisans in various trades including carpentry, bricklaying and printing.[7] However, by the end of the 18th century in Britain economic liberalism had been embraced and the government enacted laws which outlawed combinations within the trades.[8] Britain's first true step towards legal trade unionism was the Law of 1824 which legalized trade union activity. Almost immediately there was trade union growth in a variety of trades including shipwrights, joiners and miners.[9] Britain was the first nation to permit trade unionism to flourish as it was the leading economic and trading nation in the world. The growth of trade unionism in Britain was a result of a policy allowing for more freedom of association by workers so that they could attain their own reforms through collective bargaining.[10] Trade unionism continued to grow in Britain throughout the 19th century and the influence of trade unions was felt within the House of Commons.[11] But trade unions did not really have an impact on the deplorable working conditions characteristic of 19th century factories.

---

[7] Tikriti p.62

[8] The Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800 made all combinations of any kind whatsoever illegal. The legislation initiated a period of savage repression of trade union activity. During the 19th century there were nearly 40 separate pieces of legislation enacted to outlaw trade combinations in Britain. While the intent of the legislation clearly was to prevent workers from resisting the low level of their living standards, it did not succeed in killing trade union impulses. (Tikriti p.62)

[9] Tikriti p.63

[10] John W. Follows. *Antecedents of the International Labor Organization.* (Oxford:Clarendon Press, 1951), p.1

[11] Two trade unionists were elected to the House of Commons in the 1874 election and in 1875 the new government passed two measures conceding to trade union demands and resulting in official recognition of trade unions and the right to collective bargaining. However, there was no official Labour party in Britain until 1900. (Tikriti p.66)

Britain was not the only nation in Europe to experience the growth of trade unions in the 19th century. Switzerland, Germany and France all encountered a growth in labour movements during the 19th century depending on their national laws. For example, it is interesting to note that unions were illegal in France until 1884 and strikes were considered a criminal offense as late as 1864.[12] Essentially, organized labour movements and trade unions began as a way for workers to improve their conditions of employment, although the trade unions only had a limited impact in most industrialized nations during the 19th century.

The Impact of Domestic Labour Laws on Working Conditions Prior to World War I

International labour laws were not a substitute for domestic labour legislation. Domestic labour laws simply had a more limited scope. Not surprisingly, the first countries to implement national labour laws were those which were the first to experience the problems associated with industrialization. However, the reasons for adopting labour laws is the same for both national and international laws.

> All of them[labour laws] represent a strengthening of the public
> conscience, since they impose compulsory regulations, prohibitions,
> and restrictions on the private interests of manufacturers, in the
> interest of what are regarded as higher considerations: the life, health,
> safety, morals, and liberty of the workers... The need for legislation
> arises from the union of two social postulates-- the requirements of
> public morality and the administrative necessity for compulsion.[13]

---

[12] Sellier, Francois. "The French Workers' Movement and Political Unionism," *The International Movement in Transition*. (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1973), p.79

[13] James T. Shotwell ed. *The Origins of the International Labour Organization* vol.1. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), p.13

The countries which were most advanced in the protection of their domestic workers were Britain, France and Germany. The highly industrialized countries who lagged behind in early 20th century in terms of domestic labour legislation were Belgium and the U.S.

I will highlight the key domestic labour laws in Britain, France and Germany as well as briefly detail the significant U.S. labour laws. The first labour legislation passed in Britain occurred in 1802 which was an Act to protect the health and morality of children working in factories. The Act was the result of public outrage towards the horrific working conditions of "apprentices" in Lancashire.[14] Britain was the first to implement domestic labour laws. Both Britain and France attempted to redress the problems associated with the Industrial system using domestic labour laws. During the 19th century, there was continuous evolution of Britain's labour laws. The bulk of Britain's 19th century labour legislation related to child labour and the regulation of factory conditions.[15] It is important to keep in mind that the 19th century was a period of immense democratization in Britain which was achieved through various reform acts beginning in 1833. Britain's labour laws were reflective of the enfranchisement of various segments of society. The bulk of Britain's pre-war labour laws were enacted between 1900 and 1914. Old age pensions were established in 1908 in order to eliminate "pauperism" among the increasing numbers of elder workers.[16] The British parliament addressed the problem of unemployment in 1909 by creating labour exchanges to improve labour mobility.[17] However, the most important piece of social legislation

---

[14] Shotwell vol.1 p.12

[15] Charles W. Pipkin. *Social Politics and Modern Democracies* volume I. (New York: MacMillan, 1931), p.11

[16] Thomas William Heyck. *The Peoples of the British Isles: A New History, From 1870 to the Present* volume III. (Belmont:Wadsworth Publishing, 1992), p.92

[17] Heyck volume III, p.92

passed in Britain prior to World War I was the National Insurance Act of 1911. This act provided the first protection for workers outside of the antiquated 19th century Poor Law system against sickness and unemployment in major industries.[18] Britain's body of labour law basically attempted to ameliorate the worst problems of industrial British society but did not really address the roots of the problems.

It was not until 1841 that France began to limit the hours of work for children aged eight to twelve years to eight hours per day and for children aged twelve to sixteen to twelve hours. However, there was no administrative system of inspection until 1883.[19] It is interesting to note that the French government did not establish a general eight hour working day law until 1923 and did so to recognize the loyalty of workers during the difficult War years.[20] The bulk of France's domestic labour laws were passed between 1880 and 1906. "The years from 1880 to 1900 were characterized by the firm establishment of the doctrine of state intervention and the enactment of substantial and extensive social legislation."[21] Social legislation passed during this period included; the legalization of trade union organization, organization of systematic factory inspections, and regulation of the conditions in which individuals worked. The years from 1900 to 1906 were occupied by the development of the administrative mechanisms to enforce France's domestic labour laws. Specifically, in 1900 the Labour Office was established and in 1906 the Ministry of Labour was created.[22] France's first general minimum wage law was not enacted until 1915 and it applied to; garment-workers, women and men,

---

[18] Heyck, volume III,p.92

[19] David J. Saposs. *The Labor Movement in Post-War France.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), p. 229

[20] Pipkin volume II, p.135

[21] Saposs p.227

[22] Saposs p.227

natives and aliens.[23]   Finally, the French government also enacted national old-age pensions in 1910 after significant agitation by French trade unions and the general populace.[24] France had a fairly advanced domestic labour law system prior to the First World War, but did not have a very advanced social insurance system until after the War concluded.

Germany had the best social insurance system of any European country. Bismarck instituted a system of social insurance in the 1880's which provided German workers with governmental protection. Germany had protection against unemployment, illness, accident, disability and old age before 1900.[25] The adoption of laws on health insurance and pensions in Germany, between 1883 and 1891, constitute the first real social legislation in Europe.[26] Interestingly, German labour movements were reluctant to support Bismarck's social legislation because of the underlying motive which was decidedly anti-Labour.[27] Germany was a pioneer of the modern welfare state.

As a comparison to Britain, France and Germany, it is relevant to examine the underdeveloped domestic labour laws in the United States. U.S. labour laws were mainly enacted after World War I as the U.S. government was most interested in anti-Trust laws during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The only noteworthy domestic labour legislation was at the state level. In 1903, laws were enacted in most states to regulate

[23] This minimum wage law was extended in 1916 to also include domestic makers of paper, confectionary, gloves, buttons, embroidery and feathers. (Saposs p.238)

[24] Saposs p.261

[25] Alcock p.8

[26] Ghebali, " From philanthrophy to foundation: The roots of the ILO", *The World of Work: The Magazine of the ILO*. (no.8, June 1994), p.9

[27] Stefan Berger. *The British Labour Party and the German Social Democrats, 1900-1931.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), p.31

child labour.[28] At the federal level, the Department of Labour was created in 1913. Apart from these two events, U.S. labour law was in its infancy despite a fairly well developed trade union movement.

Political Movements

As this study is focused on the creation of the ILO, it is important to understand the development of international action to achieve protection for labour, which seemed to be a natural outgrowth of the domestic system of labour protection. Although it was the trade union movement which eventually demanded during World War I that an international code for workers' protection be established, the roots of international action focusing on labour protection can be traced to the international socialist movement.

The socialist agenda set out by Marx and Engels was international in scope from its inception. In the context of such an agenda it seems quite natural that protection for workers should be viewed as an international problem rather than a national issue. The First International[29], which was founded in London in 1864, held international protection of labour as one of its aims.[30] Its creators argued that although Europe had witnessed an unprecedented development in trade and industry, the workers' living standards had declined.[31] The conclusions drawn by the socialist movement within the First International were twofold. First, since capitalism would use its political power to defend

---

[28] Thomas J. Knock. *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p.90

[29] The First International was initially known as the International Working Men's Association and Marx was one of its main figure-heads. The First International was a small organization throughout its brief life and its foremost purpose was to act as a conduit of communication between the affiliated working class associations. Alejandro Colás. "Putting Cosmospolitanism into Practice: the Case of Socialist Internationalism." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* (vol.23, no.3, 1994), p.521

[30] Francis Graham Wilson. *Labor in the League System*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1934), p.30

[31] Alcock p.7

the existing economic system of laissez-faire liberalism, the only possible remedy to the miseries of the masses was for the working classes to gain political power. Secondly, the workers in different countries needed to stand together to achieve better conditions and to ensure that the Governments would not engage in unnecessary imperialistic wars.[32]   The main tasks the movement identified were to establish close relations between workers in various countries and trades, to collect relevant statistics, to discuss common issues, to coordinate actions in various countries in the case of international crises and to publish regular reports.[33]   While the concept of the First International had merit, its goals were unmet and utopian.

In essence, "the First International was born before its time. It represented an attempt to establish an international organization of workers before the workers had developed solid organizations in their own countries."[34]   There were no national parties comprised of trade unionists throughout the years the First International existed[35] and the core of the First International was made up of well intentioned enthusiasts and intellectuals. As a result, there were distinct splits in views as to the methods to be adopted. Members of the First International agreed that there was a need to promote the formation of trade unions but remained divided on the issue of political action.[36] Since the membership of the First International was divided on such fundamental and important issues, it dissolved in 1872. Nevertheless, the First International was a pioneering

---

[32] Alcock p.7

[33] Tikriti p.42

[34] John J. Price. *The International Labour Movement*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1945), p.7

[35] The First International was formed in 1864 and lasted until 1872.

[36] For example, members of the International from England and Prussia participated in the universal struggle which culminated in the passage of the Representation of the People Act in 1867 that enfranchised the town worker. However, members from France, Italy and Spain had no confidence in their respective parliaments and thus did not advocate parliamentary action by the workers. (Price p.9-10)

international organization as it had a central council which actively undertook the exchange of information, investigation into social conditions and exploration into questions of general interest.[37] In spite of its lack of an organized local or national membership, the First International laid the primitive basis for later international labour organizations.

Although the First International did not survive, labour concerns commanded attention in the succeeding years. The decades of the 1880's and 1890's were a time of enormous growth in labour and socialist parties. Socialist parties were formed in Austria (1888), Switzerland (1888), Sweden (1889), Italy (1892), Holland (1894), Hungary (1894) and Russia (1898).[38] In Great Britain the Independent Labour Party was created in 1893 and the Labour Party as it now exists was formed in 1900. While there had long been scattered socialist groups in France, the French Socialist Party was not formed until the diverse groups unified in 1905.[39] The growth of domestic socialist and labour parties in Europe revived interest in the formation of a new International comprised of working class organizations, as the problems and objectives of workers in their respective countries were perceived to be similar. International cooperation became firmly entrenched among the working classes and the result was the formation of the Second International in 1889. One of the main topics of discussion in the initial Paris Congress of 1889 was protective labour legislation.[40] It was recognized by the delegates that

---

[37] Price p.9

[38] Price p.11

[39] Price p.11

[40] Some delegates to the congress demanded an eight hour work day for young workers, prohibition of night work wherever feasible, special restrictions in dangerous occupations, a weekly rest period, abolition of the sweating system, factory inspections, and prohibition of child labour. (Follows p.116)

labour legislation would best be achieved by enacting international treaties to govern domestic labour laws.[41]

While international protection of labour was one of the key topics discussed within the Second International, other noteworthy issues which were discussed included an international general strike, socialist participation in national government, general theories for the international unification of the working class and actions to be taken by labour in the event of war.[42] Like the First International, the intent of the Second International was directed towards improving the situation of the working classes, but again internal division created trouble. The Second International was fundamentally divided between reformers and revolutionaries. The majority of the Second International was comprised of moderate socialists who preferred reform to revolution. The workers who had been recruited into the socialist political movement believed reform was possible without revolution, as evidenced by the creation of national labour codes[43], but this was in sharp contrast to revolutionary socialists who wholeheartedly subscribed to Marx's theory of the revolution of the proletariat.[44] In spite of the divisions within the Second International, it survived and continued to hold congresses every three years until the outbreak of World War I.

In the years immediately preceding the outbreak of World War I, the Second International gave increased attention to the subject of war. As international tensions,

[41] Follows p.116

[42] Price p.11

[43] Germany was a clear example of social democracy in practice as Bismarck had instituted an unparalleled system of social insurance which provided protection against unemployment, illness, accident, disability and old age. Bismarck wanted the State to protect workers against personal misfortune and for the workers and employers to solve problems such as hours of work and the right to organize. (Alcock p.8)

[44] Follows p.3

great power and the likelihood of war increased, the International became preoccupied with trying to prevent the war and ensuring that the workers took coordinated action against the war. The outbreak of World War I became unavoidable and the workers of various countries were "swept into service of the war machine."[45] It was the initiation of war which suddenly ended the existence of the Second International. The ideals associated with the early political movements that supported the implementation of international treaties on labour protection remained relevant throughout the war.

The First and Second Internationals were political bodies which sought to achieve political power for workers. It is arguable that the Internationals existed before their time. Nevertheless, the Internationals laid the foundations for the organized labour movements' demands for international protection of workers. But it was the trade union movement which ultimately demanded that international treaties on labour protection be established.

Industrial Movements

Even though the Internationals were political, there was an absence of international trade union organizations to give voice to working class industrial issues until the late 19th century. It was not until the end of the 19th century that the international trade union movement was distinguishable from the international socialist movement. Until the 1880's trade unions had been composed of skilled workers only. As a result, many of the unskilled workers who laboured in the industrial factories had no organization whatsoever. However, during the 1880's trade unions began to admit unskilled workers into their membership in order to broaden their support base.[46] The

---

[45] Price p.14

[46] Alcock p.9

evolution of the trade union movement was marked by the formation of two types of organization, specifically the International Trade Secretariats and the International Federation of Trade Unions.

The International Trade Secretariats, such as the International Miners' Federation, developed in the 1870's and 1880's to unite specific crafts and trades of different industrialized countries in an international association of workers.[47] International workers associations were created by workers in various fields including glass, clothing, metal, leather, textile, tobacco and transportation and collectively these groups became known as the International Trade Secretariats.[48] Usually International Trade Secretariats were created by skilled workers. The congresses of the Second International provided meeting places for the members of trade unions from different countries and impressed upon many the need for international organization.[49] In addition, after 1896 the creation of individual trade secretariats was stimulated by trade union growth and "by 1900 there were seventeen international trade secretariats in existence."[50] The principal activities in which the International Trade Secretariats were involved were the exchange of trade information among unions, support of affiliated labour groups, organizing financial aid to workers for support of large strikes, preventing workers of one country from acting as strike-breakers in another and promoting labour organization in areas where it did not exist or where it was weak.[51] The International Trade Secretariats marked a beginning for international cooperation by workers.

---

[47] Tikriti p.77

[48] Price p.15

[49] Lewis L. Lorwin. *The International Labour Movement.* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), p.31

[50] Tikriti p.78

[51] Tikriti p.78

The International Trade Secretariats existed alongside the International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU). There were several efforts prior to 1900 to set up a central international organization to represent trade unions as a whole in their respective countries.[52] However, it was not until 1901 that practical results were achieved and it was possible to hold the first international conference of trade union centers at Copenhagen. This was the first step towards founding the IFTU in 1913.[53] The aims of the IFTU were "to form a permanent link between the trade unions of the different countries; to undertake the exchange of information and documents; to make available translations of legislation and other materials likely to be of international interest; to begin the preparation of uniform trade union statistics; and to arrange the provision of mutual assistance in industrial disputes."[54]

In essence, the IFTU was an international body consisting of national trade union centers or representatives of various industrialized countries who had accepted both the policies and objectives of the IFTU in their rules.[55] The importance of the IFTU was that it promoted unity of the trade unions. Unity was achieved through the IFTU's rules, which provided that only one national center/ trade union could affiliate from each country. In cases where there was more than one national organization, the IFTU had to decide which was most eligible for affiliation.[56] The fundamental goal of the IFTU was the promotion of working class unity globally. This was to be achieved by increasing the

[52] Tikriti p.78

[53] Price p.18

[54] Price p.17

[55] "Statues of the International Federation of Trade Unions", Paris 1935. Quoted in Price p.51

[56] Price p.51

relations between the trade unions of all countries. "The promotion of common trade union interests and activities was naturally provided for, and special reference was made to the promotion of international social legislation and of workers' education. The other main object of the IFTU was to avert war and combat reaction."[57] Despite the lofty objectives the IFTU set out, like the Second International it too was shattered by World War I. Although the war changed the very nature of international relations between all groups, both the IFTU and the International Trade Secretariats reconstituted themselves after the war. There was a lack of unity within the international labour movement both before and after World War I which can partly be attributed to the parallel political and industrial movements that existed.

It is evident that there had been various types of organization in which labour issues had dominated. Yet, labour groups were not unified in one international effort. Instead, international labour movements developed in two parallel but separate bodies, the IFTU and the Socialist International. There were also definite differences in the approaches that the two groups took. The IFTU was a loose federation which had laissez-faire at the heart of its economic doctrine and believed in the philosophy of direct action by employers and employees without interference from the state.[58] The IFTU wanted to act on workers' problems within the existing system of capitalism. The Socialist International was an alliance of the labour groups who wanted to secure political and economic power for workers through the socialization of the means of production, the economy and the state.[59] The Socialist International wanted to radically change both the political and economic system. Neither of these organizations concentrated substantively

---

[57] Price p.52

[58] Shotwell vol.1 p.57

[59] Shotwell vol.1 p.57

on improving the conditions of labour, although both organizations paid lip service to the importance of ameliorating working conditions. World War I fundamentally changed the labour movement. Organized labour moved into a new and more powerful position during the war. "It was evident to all that, through the increased significance and importance of man power, labour might seize the opportunity to benefit concretely from the Peace Conference."[60]

War Years

The enormity of World War I did not stop organized labour activity. Rather, "conventions and congresses of every shade and variety of labour opinion clamoured for a just peace and for a recognition in the peace treaty of the rights of labour."[61] I will not detail every labour conference held during the war and will simply focus on those conferences which produced results which directly affected the Paris Peace Talks. It is important to note that labour demands were not articulated by one unified labour movement. Labour's demands were voiced through various labour congresses held during the war. The congresses were important in crystallizing labour's opinion. However, it was the pressure which domestic labour movements exerted on the national statesmen of individual countries, particularly in Great Britain, that made the labour congresses influential in the creation of the ILO.

The American Federation of Labour (AFL) was the first labour organization to voice proposals for the post-war world. The AFL was the first trade union movement to connect the issue of working conditions and the eventual peace talks. In 1914 at the Philadelphia Convention of the AFL, it was proposed that "a world labour conference

---

[60] Shotwell vol.1 p.57

[61] Shotwell vol.1 p.57

should be held at the same time and place as the Peace Conference."[62] This proposal was not advocating direct participation in the Peace Conference. It simply was that labour should deal with its problems while the politicians worked out their own differences at the War's conclusion. However, this proposal was also endorsed by the French *Confédération Générale du Travail*.[63] It was the French trade union leader, Leon Jouhaux, who proposed that the future peace treaty should include specific clauses relating to labour legislation.[64] Jouhaux was extremely active in organizing discussion by domestic labour organizations on peace aims, and was affiliated with both the IFTU and Socialist International. As a result of his connections, Jouhaux was able to keep in touch with various labour leaders across the world. In April 1916 he gathered certain representatives of the trade union movement together including William A. Appleton, the Secretary of the British General Federation of Trade Unions.[65] Appleton had close relations with Samuel Gompers, head of the AFL, and was invited to join the representatives of French, Belgian and Italian trade unions to discuss the AFL resolution proposing a World Labour Congress. This meeting laid the foundations for the annual meeting of the General Federation of Trade Unions which was set for July 1916 in Leeds.[66]

The Leeds Conference used as its basis a report drafted by Jouhaux and the French *Confédération Générale du Travail* which detailed historical attempts to coordinate international labour laws. The report also included a declaration asserting that

[62] Wilson p.31

[63] Shotwell vol.1 p.58

[64] International Labour Organization. *The ILO in the Service of Social Progress*. (Geneva: International Labour Office, 1969), p.35

[65] Shotwell vol.1 p.59

[66] Shotwell vol.1 p.60

it was necessary to articulate the economic principles which affected labour in the peace treaty as well as labour's demands. Like the IFTU prior to the war, Jouhaux's report did not reject the existing economic system. But the report claimed that reform was needed internationally to protect labour and improve working conditions. The Leeds conference brought together British, French, Italian and Belgian labour representatives who adopted Jouhaux's report and supported the resolutions made by him. The problems of labour crossed national boundaries and the trade union representatives at Leeds saw that treaties on international labour standards of working conditions and worker protection were necessary. The conference demanded recognition in the peace treaty of "the right to work, the regulation of migration by special government commission, social insurance, limitation to a maximum ten-hour day, legislation for provisions of hygiene and safety, and government control of the carrying out of these provisions."[67] Further, the conference called for the appointment of an international commission to ensure that these clauses were implemented and to prepare for future conferences, as well as the creation of an international labour office to coordinate and study labour legislation.[68] The Leeds Conference of 1916 was a watershed event in the path to the creation of the ILO as it marked the beginning of a definite attitude of and action by the labour movement towards international labour treaties. Clearly, the trade union representatives viewed improving working conditions as a priority. Prior to the Leeds Conference, the labour movement had no specific program or aims towards the conclusion of international labour treaties. There were piecemeal attempts to articulate an international approach as evidenced by the IFTU and the Socialist International, but the Leeds program articulated a clear opinion by labour on the specifics of international cooperation.

---

[67] Shotwell vol.1 p.64

[68] Shotwell vol.1 p.64

The program of the Leeds Conference attracted a great deal of publicity and was believed to reflect the opinion of all of the labour world.[69] This was not the case, however, as there was opposition from both the IFTU, as expressed by Carl Legien, who was the President of the IFTU based in Berlin, and the International Socialist Bureau. Legien circulated a counter-proposal prior to the Berne Conference of 1917 which included a detailed criticism of the Leeds program and the counter-proposals went considerably further than the Leeds program.[70] However, the only relevant resolution put forth by Legien called for signatory States to "bind themselves to aid in the realization of the resolutions of these congresses."[71] The Leeds Conference laid the foundations for labour's demands within the Peace Talks. It is important to note that although labour was not a group unto its own at the Peace Talks, many of its key leaders were appointed by their respective countries to the Labour Commission in 1919 and eventually to the ILO. While there were several labour congresses held during the war years by various labour groups, the Leeds Conference had the largest impact for international labour proposals because of the publicity it garnered.

There was clearly a great deal of pressure being exerted by domestic labour movements through the publicity of the international labour congresses. However, this leaves unanswered why governments would consider labour's demands sufficiently important to warrant inclusion into the Peace Treaty. It was relatively sudden that labour became involved in demanding international labour protection within the peace treaty. Only after the outbreak of World War I were domestic labour movements demanding international recognition in the peace treaty. Further, labour was not a unified force at the

---

[69] Shotwell vol.1 p.64

[70] Alcock p.17

[71] Shotwell vol.II p.44-49

outset of World War I. It is interesting, but not surprising, that the initiative for international protection of labour was taken by the leaders of workers' organizations as labour was the group suffering the greatest domestic hardships provoked by the War. The labour movement was the first to call public attention to the need for large scale, international action. It is noteworthy that, prior to the War, governments made their decisions without consulting the workers' organizations, even in cases where the decisions would affect workers. The outbreak of World War I necessitated closer relations between the employers, workers and government on a national level. "The organization of industry for the production of munitions and war supplies and for the maintenance of the essential services of the community involved many questions on which the representatives of employers and workers had to be consulted and their cooperation and agreement obtained."[72] As a result, "the war had shown the Governments the power of these organizations, a power which, properly utilized, might cement the whole economic system and safeguard our well-being and civilization, but which, if neglected, will inevitably become a force overwhelming all others."[73] How had labour become such a powerful force in international relations?

World War I transformed all the societies it touched. Industry had been directed towards wartime production and millions of productive workers volunteered their services to their respective countries. The result of the mobilization of men for armed service left industry with a lack of workers. Therefore the workers who were still employed in their respective countries had more freedom to demand concessions and improvements from their employers. The War years also witnessed a tremendous

[72] Shotwell vol I p.53

[73] J. Oudegeest. "The International Trade Union Movement and the Labour Office," *International Labour Review.* (vol 1, no. 1, 1921), p.42-43

increase in trade union membership.[74] The increase in trade union membership can be attributed in part to more complete statistics as well as a general increase in population. It can be estimated that total trade union membership in the 30 largest countries in 1913 was 16,152,000 and by 1919 it was 42,040,000.[75] This trend is important as it gave the labour movements an ever increasing base of members to draw upon for support and to help influence their respective governments. Furthermore, it became more difficult for governments to ignore such a large segment of their population. Lloyd George expressed this sentiment in his war memoirs:

> Of all the problems which Governments had to handle during the great war, the most delicate and probably perilous were those arising on the home front... In a modern industrial state, the vast bulk of the population consists of wage earners and those dependent on them. Since Britain is the most highly industrialized state in the world, the contentment and cooperation of wage earners was our vital concern and industrial unrest spelt a graver menace to our endurance and ultimate victory than even the military strength of Germany.[76]

The reaction of the respective national governments to labour was of the utmost importance for the entire war effort because organized labour comprised a significantly large segment of the population in all industrialized nations. Furthermore, the governments needed the cooperation of labour in order to 'feed the war machine' or to manufacture munitions as well as to keep the home front free from unrest. As a result of the closer relations between the working classes and the government, reconciliation between the classes developed. "In all the Allied countries the working classes helped towards victory by the work they did in the manufacture of munitions. In recognition of this, promises were made to them by statesmen- by Mr. Lloyd George in Great Britain

---

[74] see Appendix I

[75] "The Growth of Trade Unionism since 1913, *International Labour Review.* (vol. 3, no.1-2, 1921), p.79

[76] Austin van der Slice. *International Labor, Diplomacy and Peace, 1914-1919.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1941), p.258

and by M. Clemenceau in France."[77] The promise was to include some sort of international mechanism to protect labour in the eventual peace talks.

As I have already shown, the organized labour movement influenced government policies using direct action such as strikes or revolutionary movements to achieve its goals. Organized labour also used indirect actions, including placing its members in coalition governments to wield influence. Another indirect action labour used was to attempt to influence public opinion.[78] Trying to get a sense of public opinion is tremendously difficult for this period as polling was not then used consistently. Despite this, the bulk of labour's pressure was concentrated on swaying public opinion. One successful method labour used to appeal to the general public for support was to join with liberal groups in the formation of popular front organizations in order to publicize its peace program.[79] Popular front organizations were mass groups which the political systems had never experienced before World War I. These organizations, like the organized labour movement, were strong supporters of global international organizations to ensure universal peace.[80] In Britain the Union of Democratic Control (UDC) was formed shortly after the outbreak of war in 1914 and was an agency of public opinion. UDC members committed themselves to four 'Cardinal Points' which were related to the coming peace and not the war in progress:

> They stated that there should be no annexations of territory without the consent of the populations concerned; that the British government should commit itself to no treaties or understandings with foreign powers without the consent of parliament; that the 'Balance of Power' in international

[77] Shotwell vol I, p.17

[78] van der Slice p.192

[79] van der Slice p.192

[80] Cecelia Lynch. "E.H. Carr, International Relations Theory, and the Societal Origins of International legal Norms." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* (vol.23, no.3, 1994), p.594

relations should be abandoned in favour of an 'International Council' to resolve disputes between nations; and that there should be all-round disarmament after the war.[81]

The UDC issued pamphlets which, although limited in focus, coincided with labour's peace program. The UDC "called for a statement of peace terms; they denounced economic war after the war and criticized the government for its failure to enter into peace negotiations."[82] The UDC program was directed towards a fair, negotiated peace for all nations. Further, the UDC was very concerned that the European conflict would be continued by economic war, meaning restrictive commercial policies and barriers to trade, after the military conflict ended.[83] The UDC was an integral part of the rise of labour and the radical changes which were implemented.[84] The UDC was compromised of broader forces than organized labour and thus, could appeal to a wider public in furthering its peace program.[85]

The U.S. had a similar organization to the UDC in the People's Council although it was far less influential than its British counterpart. Like the UDC, the People's Council, gained support from labour groups and articulated a definite peace program that included the formation of an international organization for the maintenance of world peace and the need to safeguard labour standards and conditions.[86] France also developed a popular front organization called the Republican Coalition. The Republican Coalition,

---

[81] David Blaazer. *The Popular Front and the Progressive Tradition.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p.94

[82] van der Slice p.197

[83] van der Slice p.194

[84] Martin Swartz. *The Union of Democratic Control in British Politics during the First World War.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p.222

[85] van der Slice p.197

[86] van der Slice p.198 & 199

like its British and American counterparts, drew support from the *Confédération Générale du Travail*, including Léon Jouhaux and Albert Thomas, and had a peace program which paralleled labour's.[87] All three popular front organizations had the same purpose, to mobilize public support for their peace program, which was similar to Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points. The organized labour movement used popular front organizations to influence a broader base of public opinion, primarily through the distribution of pamphlets and information.

The main reason behind labour's new found importance became clearer in 1917. There was an intense fear that the war's conclusion would bring massive industrial unrest and revolution. Some saw the Bolshevik Revolution in October 1917 as evidence that industrial unrest could bring the entire capitalist system crashing down. The growth of trade unionism worried many individuals. The labour organizations had gained an unprecedented prestige in their respective countries and they consciously exercised influence upon their governments.[88] It was the need for labour's cooperation which compelled governments to enter into engagements with the labour movements to remove the "injustice, hardship, and privation," from which workers suffered.[89] The renewal of labour disputes and unrest in the final years of the War, as well as before the conclusion of the Peace talks, convinced governments that labour's demands had to be recognized. Big strikes had already broken out. Troops were mobilized on May Day in Paris in 1919 to control a general strike.[90] In Canada, the Winnipeg General Strike which occurred in the spring of 1919 closed down the city and violent riots ensued. The workers were upset

---

[87] van der Slice p.201 & 202

[88] Albert Thomas. "The International Labour Organization: Its Origins, Development and Future,." *International Labour Review*. (vol.1, no.1, 1921), p.10

[89] Thomas p.9

[90] Tikriti p.123

about post-war inflation, low wages and poor working conditions.[91] Strikes reached an unprecedented level in Britain between 1917-1920.[92] The labour unrest which characterized the immediate post-war months was very disturbing to national governments. Furthermore, Germany and much of Eastern Europe were dangerously close to revolution.[93] The only way to preserve the capitalist system seemed to be to bow to labour's demand for international protection of workers. Reforming the existing system to meet labour's demands was preferable to revolution. It was the justifiable fear of unrest which gave labour its power.

Labour movements did not directly participate in the peace talks at Paris. However, as I have already noted, many of the key leaders within the labour movement were appointed by their respective countries to the International Labour Commission at the Paris Peace Talks, including Samuel Gompers, President of the AFL, Signor Cabrini of Italy, who had been present at Leeds, and Emile Vandervelde of Belgium, who had been active in the Second International. Labour used its influence during the war years to press the statesmen to take international action to protect labour. Trade unions had become strong and more international during the war. Furthermore, the growth in trade union membership made it impossible for national governments to ignore their demands. The fear of labour unrest and widespread social conflict in the months after the armistice, spurred on by the experience of Russia in 1917, was the final impetus for governments to take action to reform the existing conditions. Labour's desire for international protection had to be included in the peace treaty in order for the goal of universal peace to be

[91] R. Douglas Francis, Richard Jones and Donald B. Smith. *Destinies: Canadian History Since Confederation.* (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1988), p.196-198

[92] Heyck volume III, p.190

[93] Edward Phelan. "The Contribution of the I.L.O to Peace," *International Labour Review.* (vol.59, no.6, 1949), p.608

achieved. Therefore, the new prominence that labour gained during the war was highly influential in the creation of the ILO. The ILO could not have been established successfully without the cooperation of organized labour.

The preceding discussion has shown the influential position that the organized labour movement held during World War I which aided in the successful establishment of the ILO in 1919. It is clear that the cooperation and assistance of labour was necessary in the creation of the ILO. However, the prominence of labour during World War I was not sufficient alone in explaining the ILO's creation. The influence of the organized labour movement, although an essential ingredient in the successful establishment of the ILO, was not enough on its own. The force of new ideas, specifically social justice as a governing concept, was the other necessary ingredient in addition to the cooperation of labour needed in the successful creation of the ILO.

CHAPTER 3

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE POST-WORLD WAR I CONSENSUS

The seeds of the ILO had existed nearly a century before it was realized at the Paris Peace Talks. The concept of social justice had long been espoused by utopian and socialist thinkers. The ILO was not established until social justice shifted from a strictly socialistic idea to an element of the post-war consensus on idealism. This acceptance of social justice by liberals was gradually taking place in the late 19th century. Social justice, as an idea, did not change but liberalism was in transition. However, it was not until the cataclysm of the first World War erupted that social justice was inexorably linked to the concept of universal peace. At the conclusion of World War I, the consensus among the Allied nations at the Paris Peace Talks was that universal peace could not be separated from industrial peace. As a result, social justice was adopted as the bedrock of the ILO's constitution.

This chapter will focus on the role of social justice as the governing idea behind the creation of the ILO. First, I will briefly examine the early proponents of social justice and international labour legislation. Specifically, I will explore the ideas of Robert Owen and Daniel Legrand. Further, I will examine the origins of idealism in international relations. Then, I will focus on how and why the concept of social justice was appropriated by liberals beginning in the late 19th century. This is key, as it was not until social justice became a more mainstream idea that it carried any real political weight. I will also explore how World War I helped in bringing social justice into the mainstream of political ideas. In addition, I will examine the ideological consensus among the Allied nations at the conclusion of the war and how there were clear links between the idealism which was dominant at the Paris Peace Talks and the creation of the ILO. Finally, I will show the link between the rise of organized domestic labour movements and the force of

social justice as a governing concept. Essentially, the influence of the idea of social justice meshed well with the dominant intellectual paradigm of idealism present during and after World War I. It was the consensus which existed in this hospitable environment which allowed for the ILO to be created in the Treaty of Versailles.

Early Proponents of the Need for International Treaties relating to Labour Issues

The earliest proponents of international labour laws were industrialists and economists who were concerned with both the living and working conditions of workers and their families. The idea of international labour legislation arose in the early 19th century as a consequence of the economic and ethical disparity between the classes during the Industrial Revolution.[1] Two industrialists, Robert Owen and Daniel Legrand, were particularly vocal in advocating the need for international labour laws. The originator of the idea of international labour treaties was Charles F. Hindley, a British manufacturer and member of parliament, who viewed such labour legislation as necessary in 1833 specifically to protect children.[2] Robert Owen had nearly twenty years earlier posited the idea of labour legislation practiced on an international scale. Owen was an extremely wealthy mill owner who used his manufacturing community of New Lanark to test out his beliefs as a social reformer and idealist. Owen shortened the work hours at his mill and improved the living conditions of his workers by making provisions for their leisure and the education of their children as well as instituting cooperative marketing.[3] Owen took his theories to the Congress of the Holy Alliance in Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818. Owen presented his Two Memorials, in which he proposed that the Congress appoint a

[1] Victor-Yves Ghebali. "From philanthropy to foundation: The roots of the ILO," *World of Work: The Magazine of the ILO.* (no.8 , August 1994), p.8

[2] John W. Follows. *Antecedents of the International Labour Organization.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p.1

[3] Anthony Alcock. *History of the International Labour Organization.* (London: MacMillan, 1971), p.6

Commission to study New Lanark as a model of what needed to be done for the labouring masses, adopt his ideas and thus remove causes "which perpetually generate misery in human society."[4] In spite of the honourable and progressive vision Owen presented, the Congress dismissed him as a political lunatic. However, Owen's vision did not die and was continued by others throughout the 19th century.

The first resolute advocate of international labour laws was Daniel Legrand, who was a manufacturer from the Alsace region of France. Like Owen, Legrand was very concerned by the hardships which the Industrial Revolution had caused workers in the 19th century. From 1840 until his death in 1859, Legrand appealed to Swiss, German, French and British statesmen and civil servants for action. Legrand argued that a State's prosperity was directly tied to the physical and emotional health and morality of its workers, and thus, governments should address the abuses common in industrial countries.[5] Legrand was the first formally to realize that labour problems transcended national boundaries. Legrand pleaded with European governments to implement national and international laws "to protect the working classes against premature and excessive labour, the first and major cause of physical decay and the moral brutishness of the working masses, and the principal reason why they are unable to enjoy the blessing of family life."[6] However, Legrand's calls also fell on deaf ears. Nevertheless, others continued the work of Legrand and Owen.[7]

---

[4] Follows p.3-4

[5] Alcock p.6

[6] International Labour Organization. *The ILO in the Service of Social Progress.* (Geneva: International Labour Office, 1969), p.30

[7] There were many including Jerome-Adolphe Blanqui, Louis-Rene Villerme and Daniel Blanque who influenced the idea of international labour legislation but Legrand and Owen were the first proponents of the idea of international labour legislation to address the hardships of workers in the Industrial Revolution.

The motivations of these individuals in promoting this idea were threefold. The first motivation was humanitarian, in that these men were genuinely concerned about workers' lives and wanted to improve the conditions in which they lived and laboured.[8] As I discussed in the preceding chapter on the labour movement, working and living conditions which were exacerbated by the Industrial Revolution left workers to suffer in deplorable conditions. However, during the 19th century, the attitude which prevailed within the governments of industrialized countries was that their role was strictly to ensure freedom for industry and trade. Labour was viewed as a commodity like any other raw material. In addition, workers were powerless to take action against poor and/or abusive treatment as I have already noted.

The second motivation was political, in that these idealistic individuals tried to establish a linkage between the protection of workers and social peace. Legrand warned European governments that the inordinate attention which was paid to the wealthy industrialists to reinforce the laissez-faire system would eventually lead an enormous mass of their populace to become hostile to the nation's institutions and reject the existing system.[9] This was around the same time that Marx was writing his own critique of capitalism. International regulation of working conditions would have the virtue of preventing the social upheavals that would otherwise occur once the working masses refused to tolerate the societal status of outcasts.[10] The emphasis was on the importance of strengthening social peace in the industrialized countries and the avoidance of social turbulence.

---

[8] Victor-Yves Ghebali. *The International Labour Organization: A Case Study on the Evolution of the U.N. Specialised Agencies.* (Netherland: Martinus Nijhoff, 1989), p.2

[9] Alcock p.6

[10] Ghebali *The International Labour Organization* p.3

Finally, the third motivation was economic, as international laws were the only way to redress national differences in working conditions. The inequity of working conditions was bound to jeopardize the competitive position of socially advanced countries, in that any country which implemented national laws aimed at the protection of its workers would expose itself to potentially devastating economic consequences.[11] Economic disadvantage in international trade was viewed as the cost of implementing progressive social policies. Therefore, it was believed that international regulation would allow for the equalization of conditions and give all countries a level playing field. These motivations form the basis of the concept of social justice upon which the ILO was created.

Theoretically, social justice can be understood as a principle which requires in its most general sense that "each individual have what is due to him."[12] However, justice inherently contains another component which is "the setting right of wrong."[13] The early proponents of international labour laws viewed the extreme inequities of 19th century working conditions as essentially wrong. Further, these same individuals believed that the issue was so serious it needed to be rectified by the governments of industrialized countries. To completely understand social justice as the overriding idea behind the creation of the ILO, it is necessary to work with a full definition of the principles that comprise social justice. "The principle of social justice requires that all men should have a claim to an equal share in all those advantages which are commonly desired and

[11] Ghebali *The International Labour Organization* p.3

[12] William Outhwaite and Tom Boltomore. eds. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social Thought.* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993), p.304

[13] Julius Gould and William L. Kolb. eds. *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences.* (New York: MacMillan, 1964), p.363

conduce to human well-being."[14] But this does not mean that this principle is the same as the demand for equal treatment for all men. Rather, social justice is predicated upon preferential treatment for the under privileged, who do not possess the same advantages as many others within society. The principal of social justice when applied is intended to secure for all people two advantages in life: that their reasonable expectations will be fulfilled and their dignity respected.[15] The overriding problem of the 19th century was that there was an intense adherence to the laissez-faire system, to the point that many at the lower levels of society could barely make enough to survive. Furthermore, the wretched working and living conditions were not conducive to human well-being or respect for human dignity. It is not surprising that well-intentioned intellectuals and industrialists embraced the idea of social justice as a way of combating the social problems brought on by the Industrial Revolution.

Origins of Idealism in International Relations

The principle of social justice, which was embodied in the proposals for international labour laws, was viewed for many years as highly idealistic. It was not until idealism became the dominant intellectual/theoretical paradigm after World War I that social justice was truly embraced as a plausible idea. Therefore, it is necessary to briefly trace the origins of idealism in international relations.

Idealism is difficult to define and has been widely debated in international relations. Idealism has been a highly elastic term in the study of international relations as theories from liberalism to Marxism to utopianism have been described as idealistic in

---

[14] A.M. Honore "Social Justice," in *Essays in Legal Philosophy*. Robert S. Summers ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p.94

[15] Honore p.94

nature at some juncture in history.[16] The modern school of idealism can be traced back to the break-up of the medieval system, which assumed the existence of a universal ethic and a universal political system founded on divine authority.[17] However, it was not until the 18th century that modern idealism was firmly established. At its most basic level modern idealism was essentially individualistic, as human conscience was considered the final court of appeal in moral questions. It was also essentially rationalist as the human conscience was identified with the voice of reason.[18] Idealism was also associated with Jeremy Bentham's contribution of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number."[19] Nineteenth century idealism was comprised of three general principles, which were that "the pursuit of the good was a matter of right reasoning, that the spread of knowledge would soon make it possible for everyone to reason rightly on this important subject and that anyone who reasoned rightly on it would necessarily act rightly."[20] Idealist theory stresses the concepts of justice, morality, reason and ethics.

Naturally, these principles of idealism were applied to international relations. Areas of inquiry within the discipline of international relations that developed from idealist theory were peace research and the creation of international organizations. For example, Abbe Saint-Pierre proposed one of the earliest models for a League of Nations and "was so confident in the reasonableness of his projects that he believed that, if they were fairly considered, the ruling powers could not fail to adopt them."[21] Another area of

[16] David Long and Peter Wilson. eds. *Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis: Inter-War Idealism Reassessed.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p.4-6

[17] E.H. Carr. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations.* (London: MacMillan, 1939), p.22

[18] Carr p.23

[19] Carr p.23

[20] Carr p.24-25

[21] Carr p.25

international relations which received tremendous attention from idealistic writers was the use of war. "Both Rousseau and Kant argued that, since wars were waged by princes in their own interest and not in that of their peoples, there would be no wars under a republican form of government. In this sense, they anticipated the view that public opinion, if allowed to make itself effective, would suffice to prevent war."[22] The 19th century was an age of heightened intellectualism and reason, thus idealism became increasingly acceptable. Governments and statesmen attempted to use reason, morality and understanding to avoid the use of warfare. "Reason could demonstrate the absurdity of the international anarchy; and with increasing knowledge, enough people would be rationally convinced of its absurdity to put an end to it."[23] Although idealism was present in 19th century international relations, the zenith of idealism did not occur until Woodrow Wilson's unique brand of liberalism became the dominant approach in the final years of World War I.

In essence, the core characteristic of post-World War I idealism was an unshakable belief in conscious, progressive change.[24] Idealism can be equated with many concepts which were characteristic of the world after World War I, including universalism, humanism, optimism, liberalism, socialism, pacifism, anarchism, and internationalism.[25] The implication of this is that all progressive reform is idealistic. John H. Herz aptly illustrates the realist-idealist dichotomy which exists within the field of international relations.

---

[22] Carr p.25

[23] Carr p.26

[24] Long p.13

[25] John H. Herz. "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," *World Politics.* (vol.2, no.2, 1950), p.157-158

> Political realism recognizes the phenomena which are connected with the urge for security and the competition for power, and takes their consequences into consideration. Political idealism, on the other hand, usually starts from a more 'rationalistic' assumption, namely, that a harmony exists, or may eventually be realized, between the individual concern and the general good, between interests, rights and duties of men and groups in society; further, that power is something easily to be channeled, diffused, utilized for the common good, and that it can ultimately be eliminated altogether from political relationships.[26]

Idealism has a long history in the field of international relations. Never was idealism as powerful as a governing premise as during the inter-war years, which I will discuss later in this chapter.

The Transformation of Social Justice to a Mainstream Liberal Principle

Attempting to pinpoint exactly when social justice made the transformation from a radical idealist concept to a mainstream liberal idea is difficult. It is equally difficult to determine why mainstream liberal political movements and their leaders adopted the principles of social justice. The idea of social justice, as it was articulated in the early 19th century, was antithetical to the system of laissez-faire. The first organized political movement to adopt the principles of social justice was the Socialist International. As I discussed in chapter two, the First and Second Internationals believed that protection of workers needed to take place on an international level because of the dismaying conditions of life and labour for most workers in industrialized countries. It is not surprising that the Socialist Internationals were the first movements to adopt the principles of social justice, as they were highly idealistic movements in other ways.

It was in the 1870's that social justice became a more mainstream liberal idea. It is not a coincidence that liberalism was making a transition. In the late 19th century and

---

[26] Herz p.158

early 20th century liberalism underwent a transformation. Until the late 19th century liberalism embodied a separation of politics and economics, a minimal role for the state in the economy and protection of private property constitutionally.[27] The economy was self-regulating and government regulation of the economy was viewed as unnecessary. However, the economic crises of the 1870's and 1880's convinced many liberal theorists that some regulation of the economy was necessary to provide humane conditions for all individuals in society. Liberalism transformed in the late 19th century to embody the principles of social justice as an attempt to resolve the difficulties inherent within the laissez-faire liberalism of earlier decades. Liberalism of the 20th century did not discard all of the early tenets but recognized that there was an intrinsic link between politics and economics as the earlier form of liberal economic philosophy brought years of poverty and unemployment to large segments of civil society.

This 'new' liberalism embraced social reform and economic welfare, which became as important as political and civil rights.[28] World War I did not create a crisis for liberalism. Rather the crisis for liberalism occurred in the mid-19th century. However, World War I "swept away" the old structures and existing systems, so that social justice and the transformed liberalism of the 20th century was the guide upon which the economic and political structure of post-World War I society was remoulded. The post-World War I world was established using liberal internationalism as its foundation.

Liberal internationalism incorporates the reformed liberal economic theory of the 20th century, which includes social justice within its principles. However, liberal internationalists believe that international governance "can create widespread and long-

---

[27] Long p.315

[28] Long p.316

lasting prosperity."[29] Furthermore, liberal internationalists also contend that the larger European markets of the 1890's and throughout the entire capitalist world after World War I were, coupled with the newly implemented system of global governance, responsible for the unprecedented economic growth witnessed in the post-World War I years.[30] In essence, liberal internationalism views international governmental organizations (IGO's) as the key to the foundation and maintenance of global peace and prosperity.

A clear example of the transformation of social justice to the liberal mainstream in the late 19th century occurred in Britain. Britain was the first country where social justice took hold at the national level. William Gladstone, leader of the Liberal Party, became prime minister in 1868 and his approach to politics was grounded in moralism. Gladstone felt that "Britain should always act as a moral force for good in the World."[31] Yet, Gladstone was committed to the existing economic system and, despite the difficulties that Britain was experiencing at the time, did not want to drastically change the liberal economic system. One of the impressive changes that Gladstone implemented was to legalize trade unionism in Britain.[32] Gladstone's approach to politics was criticized by many in the upper classes, but it was the first step towards the incorporation of social justice within a mainstream political movement. Gladstone's moralistic and rational approach to politics and foreign policy was one of the inspirations for Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points.[33] Perhaps it is not surprising that Gladstone was able to

[29] Craig N. Murphy. *International Organization and Industrial Change: Global Governance since 1850.* (New York: Oxford Univerity Press, 1994), p.7

[30] Murphy p.9

[31] Thomas William Heyck. *The Peoples of the British Isles: A New History, From 1870 to the Present* Volume III. (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing, 1992), p.81

[32] Heyck volume III p.80

[33] Carr p.27

incorporate some of the principles of social justice in the early 1870's, as the Victorian era was characterized by an intense interest in morality and reason, which is not disconnected from social justice.

Another sign in the late 19th century that social justice had crossed over into the mainstream was the case of Germany. Between 1883 and 1891, the German government adopted the first social legislation in Europe, including laws on health insurance, work-related accidents and pensions.[34] While Bismarck's motives were more focused on neutralizing the threat of socialism, he also integrated the principles of social justice into the national fabric of a growing industrial power. Bismarck instituted this unparalleled and historic social insurance system, which included protection against unemployment, accidents and illnesses as well as disability, in order for the German state to protect workers against personal misfortune. In return Bismarck expected that workers and employers would amicably solve their problems, such as those related to hours of work and worker organization.[35]

These two examples from the two most powerful nations of the late 19th century illustrate the fact that social justice was beginning to be accepted and incorporated into the political mainstream. However, the transformation of social justice was slow and piecemeal. Industrial democracies were generally committed to the concept of non-intervention by the state into the lives of individuals and a hands-off policy towards the economy.

---

[34] Victor-Yves Ghebali. "From philanthropy to foundation: The roots of the ILO," *World of Work: The Magazine of the ILO*. (no.8, June 1994), p.9

[35] Alcock p.8

The expression of social justice at an international level was initially considered in March 1890 at the Berlin conference.[36] This conference was convened by Bismarck, on the instruction of Kaiser Wilhelm II and included representatives of the French, British, Belgian and Swiss governments. The aim of the conference was to "bring about an international agreement on the possibility of giving satisfaction to the needs and desires of the workers which had found expression in strikes and in other forms of unrest."[37] It was the first international attempt at any sort of international regulation of labour conditions or any of the principles of social justice. The Berlin conference of March 1890 was the first time that governments considered the impact of social consequences since the Industrial Revolution commenced. The drawback was that the governments present at the conference did not make the decisions reached at the Berlin conference binding and simply expressed wishes and suggested international standards.[38] Thus, there were no practical results of this conference other than pious intent.[39] Although the conference in Berlin yielded no concrete results, it set in motion the creation of the precursor organization to the ILO, the International Association for Labour Legislation.

The International Association for Labour Legislation was a significant step in the transformation of social justice to the political mainstream, as the organization was

---

[36] However, the Swiss government of Emil Frey had proposed in 1880 holding a conference of European countries on the adoption of a treaty relating to factory legislation. (International Labour Organization p.32)

[37] Margaret Stewart. *Britain and the ILO: The Story of 50 Years*. (London: H.M.S.O., 1969), p.2

[38] The specific elements which the respective governments agreed upon were: that children under the age of twelve should not be allowed to work, children over the age of twelve should be allowed to work but not have to work at night or for longer than six hours consecutively, and women in addition to children under the age of fourteen should not be employed in mines. Further, the issues of mandatory weekly rest, accident insurance and standards for workers' health and safety in their places of work were also discussed. (International Labour Organization p.32)

[39] Stewart p.3

predicated upon the principles of social justice. Furthermore, it was a concrete achievement of international cooperation in the field of social concerns even though its decisions carried no real force. While social justice was not recognized by all the industrial powers as part of mainstream liberal ideology, the domestic government support for the International Association for Labour Legislation, in the form of monetary support and representatives, demonstrated a recognition of the necessity for attention to the concept of social justice.

Social justice had become the governing force in one of the world's largest multinational corporations by the early years of the 20th century. Lever Brothers and Unilever Limited[40], with subsidiaries worldwide, was the largest corporation outside the U.S. and one of the half-dozen largest corporations in the world. As a result of Unilever's wide base of operations it encountered most of the social and political problems which plagued the world. From the time he became an employer the first Chairman of Unilever, William Hesketh Lever, had pondered the problems of labour, management and capital. The conclusion he came to was that "Adam Smith is largely responsible for the antagonism of Labour toward Capital through his statement that Labour is the source of all wealth... Labour itself can never produce wealth... but if labour is well directed, if the fairy of good management appears on the scene... Labour can and does produce wealth beyond the dreams of avarice."[41] Although Lever himself never termed his actions towards his worker anything in particular, they clearly demonstrate the commitment that Unilever had to the concept of social justice. An illustration of Unilever's unique approach toward labour was that in Britain years before the outbreak of World War I,

---

[40] From this point forward Lever Brothers and Unilever Ltd. will simply be referred to as Unilever, the generally accepted short form of the company's official name. Lever Brothers and Unilever Ltd. *Ourselves as others see us*. (London: Lever Brothers and Unilever Ltd., 1948), p.6

[41] Lever Brothers and Unilever Ltd. p.12

Unilever was supportive of the eight-hour working day implementing it in their facilities. Unilever also tried unsuccessfully to implement a six-hour working day.[42] Lever also built a model village at Port Sunlight for his employees in 1890 which included beautiful brick houses, a library, a church, a recreation hall and an art gallery.[43] Unilever was concerned about the conditions of work and life of their labourers and made every attempt possible to improve the conditions before any other company in the world had considered the idea. Lever went so far to be equitable with his employees that he shared some of the considerable company dividends with qualified employees, who became known as 'copartners'.[44] Lever, himself, was somewhat like a Robert Owen but on a far larger scale. The intentions of Unilever clearly had a strong moral justification and show Lever's personal commitment to social justice.

The International Association for Labour Legislation had some minor success prior to the outbreak of World War I in having international labour conventions adopted.[45] However, the outbreak of war in 1914 radically altered the existing international system. As the war progressed and continued far longer than anyone expected, many began to fear another war, an economic war, or the revolt of labour. Social justice became linked with the cause of peace. In addition, the Russian Revolutions of 1917, particularly the Bolshevik revolution of October 1917, made many industrialists and governments aware that action needed to be taken to thwart any labour

---

[42] ibid p.12

[43] ibid p.10 & 12

[44] ibid p.12

[45] The International Association for Labour Legislation succeeded in having two conventions adopted by most member nations in 1905. One of the conventions forbade the night work of women in industry and the other outlawed the use of white phorsphorus in the manufacturing of matches because it was poisonous and led to necrosis of the jaw in the workers who handled the substance. (International Labour Organization p.33)

unrest. For example, John D. Rockerfeller, Jr. stated his belief in the need to adhere to the "Golden Rule" where labour conditions were involved. According to Rockerfeller,

> the soundest industrial policy is that which has constantly in mind the welfare of the employees as well as the making of profit, and which, when human considerations demand it, subordinates profits to welfare. It is therefore the duty of everyone intrusted with industrial leadership to do all in his power to improve the conditions under which men work and/ live.... In the light of the present, every thoughtful man must concede that the purpose of industry is quite as much the advancement of social well-being as the accumulation of wealth.[46]

As one of the most powerful industrialists in the U.S. during World War I, Rockerfeller's belief carried tremendous weight and demonstrates the shift in ideas, whereby social justice was becoming increasingly influential within the mainstream of political and intellectual thought. Social justice became a more mainstream idea during World War I which culminated in the ILO's creation within the Treaty of Versailles.

The Importance of World War I in the Acceptance of Social Justice Internationally

Social justice had been accepted as a mainstream principle in different industrialized countries at different times. It was somewhat related to how industrialized a country had become. But it was also related to the political culture of each individual country. Social justice did not really become a recognized principle of mainstream liberal thought which the industrialized nations were committed to until World War I. The First World War was a cataclysmic event which broke apart the optimism of the prewar laissez faire system. "There was a growing recognition of the need for some form of international regulation to maintain a liberal trading order."[47] The liberal trading order could not be maintained as it had existed and thus governments began seriously to examine idealist principles which had not been considered prior to the outbreak of World

---

[46] "Golden Rule His Remedy." *New York Times*, April 4, 1918, p.6

[47] Long p.308

War I. It was after the cataclysm of World War I that the principle of the balance of power, as instituted in the Congress of Vienna of 1815, was questioned. "Only after such a total breakdown was the international situation sufficiently fluid to induce leaders and supporting publics of dominant nations to join seriously in the task of reorganizing international society to avoid a repetition of the terrible events just experienced."[48] Liberal internationalism was a direct response to the cataclysm of the First World War and its core hypotheses were embedded in the institutions created in the aftermath of the War.

As I have already noted World War I was a crisis for liberal internationalism. "The simmering conflicts of inter-imperial rivalry that dated from the creation of the German empire in 1871 came to a head in 1914 and precipitated a cataclysm the like of which few had expected."[49] Many individuals, in particular liberals, were surprised by the outbreak of war in 1914 as well as its ferocity. They had believed that the conciliatory nature of civilized society had made war between advanced Western societies unlikely and that wars would tend to be more limited.[50] The First World War shattered the pre-existing beliefs about peace and internationalism at a time when discontent with laissez-faire liberalism was increasing. Therefore, it is no surprise that the principles of social justice gained prominence and became part of the reformed liberal agenda at the conclusion of the War.

---

[48] R.A. Falk. *The Status of Law in International Society*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), p.500

[49] Long p.313

[50] Long p.313

Post-World War I Ideological Consensus

The most ardent proponent of the liberal internationalist approach to international relations during and after World War I was U.S. president Woodrow Wilson. Wilson, like the organized labour movements, was swayed by idealism and was also free from commitments and obligations to European diplomacy.[51] Therefore, Wilson was able to offer an "ideal" program for the post-war peace that he expressed in his Fourteen Points and had nothing to gain from an imperialistic peace. The post-war world had been irrevocably changed by the 1917 Bolshevik revolution in Russia which served to remind world statesmen that the conclusion of World War I required new and different solutions to achieve peace and prosperity. Wilson articulated a broad, idealistic platform for world peace shortly after the U.S. entered the war. On January 8, 1918, Wilson stated America's reasons for entering the war:

> What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealings by the other peoples of the world, as against force and selfish aggression. All of the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us.[52]

Wilson did not want to go to war but did so to ensure peace and justice were properly restored to the entire world. Moreover, Wilson had a specific and idealistic peace in mind which encompassed the principles of social justice.

Wilson's program for world peace after the war was predicated upon the Fourteen Points. The key points which Wilson stated were the first and fourteenth that called for

---

[51] Austin van der Slice. *International Labor, Diplomacy and Peace, 1914-1919.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1941), p.2

[52] Woodrow Wilson. "America's Terms of Settlement: An address by President Wilson to the Congress of the United States, January 8, 1918." *International Conciliation*, (no.123, January 1918), p.81

open diplomacy and the establishment of international organizations to keep the peace.[53] Wilson's program was a highly idealistic one which was built on the tenets of liberal internationalism and social justice. Wilson's peace program was highly popular and enjoyed substantial public support both in the U.S. and abroad.[54] Furthermore, Germany had consented to the Armistice based on the Fourteen Points and all the Allied Powers had accepted the Fourteen Points as the foundation of the eventual Peace Talks.[55]

Wilson's program was closely paralleled by the organized labour movement's program for the post-World War I peace.[56] It seemed to both Labour and Socialist movements that finally a world statesman would work in the interest of humanity during the Peace negotiations. Soon after the Armistice, The *New Statesman* proclaimed that "there is no fear now that the [U.S.] Congress which ends this war will, as its predecessors have done, ignore both the root causes of war and the fundamental aspirations of men, both as human beings and as members of nations, and barter and bargain with an eye solely on dynastic interests, imperialistic ambitions, and unstable balances of power. The lesson has been learnt."[57]

Even though the populace of various countries welcomed Wilson's program for peace, in England and in France both Lloyd George and Clemenceau had run victorious electoral campaigns on platforms contrary to Wilsonian liberalism.[58] Yet, Lloyd George

[53] Wilson p.81-84

[54] E.M. Hugh-Jones. *Woodrow Wilson and American Liberalism.* (New York: MacMillan, 1949), p.244

[55] Kenneth E. Miller. *Socialism and Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice in Britain to 1931.* (Hague:Martinus Nijhoff, 1967), p.86

[56] van der Slice p.2

[57] "The Peace to End War." *New Statesman,* (vol.12, November 16, 1918), p.123

[58] Hugh-Jones p.244-245

was sensitive to the public pressure for social reform. His government was forced to cope with massive industrial unrest both during the final phases of the War and after the Armistice.[59] Despite contrary views, Wilsonian liberalism and idealism in general became the dominant paradigm in the post-World War I era. Wilson had a firm and unshakable belief in the power of reason. On his way to Paris Wilson stated, "Unless the Conference is prepared to follow the opinions of mankind, and to express the will of the people rather than that of the leaders of the Conference, we should be involved in another break-up of the world."[60] Wilson's idealism was closely tied to the belief that public opinion would prevail and it was the voice of reason.[61] Wilson aimed to internationally guarantee morality and economic freedom within the framework set out in the Fourteen Points. The other powerful world statesmen concurred with Wilson because of fear and public pressure.

The Relationship between the creation of the ILO and Wilsonian Liberalism

Wilson did not directly address the issue of labour unrest and industrial peace in the Fourteen Points. However, there was a natural parallel between Wilson's ideas and the program of the organized labour movements. By the opening of the Paris Peace Talks in early 1919, most industrialized countries had become persuaded that the idea of an international organization to regulate labour was necessary. As I have described earlier in this study, the three Great Powers, the U.S., Britain and France, were preoccupied with the dangerous post-war situation in which revolutionary fervor was widespread. For example, Lloyd George supported the move to incorporate a permanent international labour machinery within the Peace Treaty because of both a fear of and desire to contain

---

[59] Stewart p.5

[60] Carr p.33

[61] Carr p. 34

civil and industrial unrest as well as growing public desire for a peaceful settlement of labour troubles.[62] The decision to give labour matters a prominent place within the Peace Treaty was a reflection of this preoccupation, and the Peace Conference accepted the proposals of the Labour Commission without much concern for the generalizations of the Preamble or for the details of the proposed organization.[63] Specifically, the mandate given to the Labour Commission was "to inquire into the conditions of employment from the international aspect and to consider the international means necessary to secure common action on matters affecting conditions of employment and to recommend the form of a permanent agency to continue such inquiry and consideration with and under the direction of the League of Nations."[64]

Part of the reason that the Labour Commission was formed at the Paris Peace Talks stemmed from the linkage of the principles of social justice to the cause of peace. Since idealism was the dominant intellectual paradigm, it is not surprising that there was tremendous concern over the potential for civil unrest after World War I. Consequently, many believed that "injustice in the social field endangered peace in the world and that, therefore, action against such injustice serves the cause of peace."[65] Therefore, many felt that without some recognition of social justice the objectives set out by Wilson's Fourteen Points of world peace were not attainable. The Preamble of the Constitution of the International Labour Organization within the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 contained several references to the attainment of peace and its relationship to social justice. There

---

[62] Stewart p.5

[63] Phelan p.608-609

[64] George N. Barnes. *History of the International Labour Office.* (London: Williams and Norgate Ltd.,1926), p.38

[65] N. Valticos and G. von Potobsky. *International Labour Law* 2nd ed. (Boston: Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers, 1995), p.24

are three specific sections of the preamble which are salient. The Preamble begins "Whereas the League of Nations has for its object the establishment of universal peace, and such a peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice."[66] The Preamble continues "And whereas conditions of labour exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled; and an improvement of those conditions is urgently required."[67] Finally, the Preamble concludes "The High Contracting Parties moved by sentiments of justice and humanity, as well as by the desire to secure the permanent peace of the world, agree to the following...."[68] The Preamble suggests that social justice must be achieved to consolidate world peace, but also that world peace is necessary to achieve social justice. It is as if peace and social justice cannot be divorced but are interlinked. The Constitution of the ILO confers the mandate of the promotion of "Lasting Peace Through Social Justice," which could only be attained through action to ameliorate the conditions of life and labour of workers.[69] The Labour Commission at the Paris Peace Talks did pioneering work to draft the constitution of an international organization which had no parallel to draw from in the history of international relations between sovereign states. In the words of David A. Morse, Director-General of the ILO from 1948 to 1970, "its[the ILO's] ultimate purpose was to contribute to rebuilding a world peace which would develop not only in material prosperity but also in respect for human dignity and spiritual values."[70]

---

[66] James T. Shotwell, ed. *The Origins of the International Labor Organization* vol.1. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), p.424

[67] Shotwell vol 1, p.424

[68] Shotwell vol.1 p.425

[69] David A. Morse. *The Origins and Evolution of the ILO*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), p.9

[70] Morse p.10

Social justice was a major force behind the creation of the ILO and remains one of the major objectives of the ILO. When the ILO was created, social justice was considered by Albert Thomas, the first Director-General of the ILO, as meaning "much more than the removal of social injustice. It meant a possible policy through which the individual might attain his political, economic and moral rights."[71] However, the meaning of social justice is far broader today. Social justice is not a static concept and its meaning is constantly evolving. "The notion of social justice [has] developed to mean, at the international level, that the world community is not responsible only for the maintenance of peace and good relations between states, but also for an active contribution to the welfare of mankind."[72] Therefore, one of the founding ideas of the ILO still remains important today and the concern for the humane treatment of workers' is still significant.

In the introductory chapter of *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*, Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane argue that, "Ideas help to order the world. By ordering world, ideas may shape agendas, which can profoundly shape outcomes."[73] Similarly, social justice shaped the agendas and outcomes of the post-World War I world. Even though, social justice began to gain acceptance in mainstream liberal political ideology in the late 19th century, it took the cataclysm of World War I to bring about consensus on the necessity of the institutionalization of the idea of social justice. Social justice was an extremely important idea which was embedded in the rules and norms of the post-World War I institutions. Social justice influenced the very design of the ILO and this is reflective of the power that ideas can

---

[71] Edward Phelan. *Yes and Albert Thomas* 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p.242

[72] Valticos p.26

[73] Robert O. Keohane and Judith Goldstein. *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p.12

have. Furthermore, Goldstein and Keohane in their close exploration of how ideas help to elucidate political outcomes also suggest that, "Ideas that become institutionalized play a role in generalizing rules and linking issue areas."[74] Social justice as an idea became influential in formation of the ILO's structure, but has remained important in generating conventions since the ILO's inception. Clearly, social justice had an impact on the political outcomes of the post-World War I world, but it took the shock to the international political system of World War I to change the long-standing beliefs of leaders and the public.   Finally, social justice was not only a principled belief[75] but also a causal belief[76], as the achievement of universal peace was directly linked to the achievement and institutionalization of social justice. Social justice became an important idea because World War I was an exogenous shock to the international system which eventually undermined the existing order and brought about a radical theoretical paradigm shift which promoted liberal internationalism. An underlying change in conditions of the world allowed for the transformation and rise of influence of social justice as a governing idea.

The Linkage of Social Justice and the Rise of Organized Labour

One cannot solely attribute the ILO's creation to the acceptance of social justice by the mainstream of society as well as by the political and intellectual elites. Chapter Two focused on the important role that the organized labour movement had in the ILO's establishment. It is the linkage of both the rise of the organized labour movement and the acceptance of social justice as a guiding idea that was fundamentally responsible. How

---

[74] Keohane p.23

[75] Keohane and Goldstein define a principled belief as consisting of normative ideas that specify the criteria for distinguishing right from wrong and just from unjust. (Keohane p.9)

[76] Causal beliefs are beliefs about cause-effect relationships which derive authority from the shared consensus of recognized elites. (Keohane p.10)

were the organized labour movement and the idea of social justice associated in the successful creation of the ILO?

Essentially, the rising influence of the organized labour movement can be credited with championing the idea of social justice among both the political statesmen of Allied Europe and the general populace. As I have already shown, social justice as a principle existed long before the ILO and certainly was becoming more accepted while the ILO's precursor, the International Association for Labour Legislation, existed. But no attempt to a establish a formal international organization or regime based on social justice was successful until it had a powerful advocate within society. Labour, albeit unknowingly, was the champion of social justice. The ideas which the organized labour movement expounded were those of social justice, even though Labour did not term their conference proposals as social justice. It was the influence that the labour movement gained during World War I which allowed the concept of social justice to gain publicity in the form of the conference proposals which paralleled Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points. Therefore, both the influence of the organized labour movement and the acceptance of social justice as a governing principle were complementary factors in the creation of the ILO.

Social justice was nothing more than an idea, but the preceding discussion shows the weight that an idea can have if it is accepted by political statesmen, the intellectual elite and the general public. The acceptance of social justice as an idea was a necessary condition to the successful creation of the ILO in 1919. However, the acceptance of social justice alone is insufficient to explain why the ILO was established. As I noted in the conclusion to chapter two, the influence of the organized labour movement during World War I was the other necessary ingredient. Social justice as an idea was a complementary factor to the role of the labour movement. It is clear that these two factors were both necessary and sufficient in the establishment of the ILO. Neither social

justice, nor the organized labour movement on their own could be responsible for the ILO's creation.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION: LOOKING BACK AND FORWARD

The International Labour Organization is one of the oldest international organizations in existence. While it was created as an autonomous institution, associated with, but separate from, the League of Nations, the ILO has survived another world war, the establishment of the United Nations, the Cold War and the so-called "new" world order of the Gulf War. It is the only institution originating from the League of Nations structure which was incorporated into the United Nations framework after World War II.

The examination in this paper has focused on why the ILO was created in 1919 and what the most influential factors were in the establishment of the ILO. Although the ILO has been studied from many different viewpoints, most commentators have accounted for the ILO's creation using a single explanation. However, the analyses of these commentators is of limited utility as no single explanation can fully account for the ILO's establishment in 1919. Furthermore, the history leading up to the foundation of the ILO strongly suggests that there were multiple forces influencing its creation.

This study has examined the two paramount factors in the establishment of the ILO in 1919; the growth in power and importance of organized labour movements during World War I, and the post-war consensus on liberal internationalism which embodied the principles of social justice. As I have discussed, the idea of international labour laws had been suggested almost a decade before the ILO was created. The first attempt to create an international organization which was dedicated to the promotion of international labour standards in 1900 lacked practical results. The International Association for Labour Legislation, which was the precursor and model for the ILO, ultimately failed as, although the governments of continental Europe had participated in international

conferences, the governments involved were not bound by the Association to implement the obligations to which they had agreed after the governmental conferences concluded. Thus the Association was essentially voluntary with no effective enforcement mechanisms whatsoever. Further, the International Association for Labour Legislation did not have a permanent organization to continue formal research and education and put pressure on national governments between conferences.[1] In addition, neither the domestic trade unions, nor any transnational labour movements were active participants in the International Association for Labour Legislation. The Association's voluntary nature, which had no compliance mechanisms, coupled with its varied, but relatively unrepresentative structure, haunted the Association throughout its existence and contributed to its demise during World War I.

Conditions were present when the ILO was created which had not existed prior to World War I. Organized labour movements at the national level became more powerful during World War I, principally because of the shortages of workers created by increased requirements for industrial output and the necessity for manpower to be conscripted for service in the armed forces. Furthermore, during the war workers began to voice their long-standing demands for improved working and living conditions. Since the war effort depleted the domestic labour forces of productive workers, the dependence of employers and governments on the existing, highly unionized labour pool forced them to consider the demands of workers seriously or risk the shut-down of war industries by strikes. The organized labour groups also gathered at domestic and international labour conferences to discuss the eventual peace and the role of labour or its representatives within those negotiations. The international labour conferences held during the war garnered ample media coverage which the labour movements used to put pressure on their respective

[1] George N. Barnes. *History of the International Labour Office.* (London: Williams and Norgate Ltd., 1926), p.33

governments. Finally, the size of organized labour movements grew tremendously during the first World War. A significant percentage of the domestic populace were represented by the more influential trade unions. Both politically and practically, in most industrialized countries they could not be ignored by governments. The power of labour cannot be understated in the creation of the ILO, although labour did not occupy an official place at the Paris Peace Talks. The labour clauses of the Treaty of Versailles are evidence of the influence that the organized labour movement had gained. The international conferences held by labour groups during World War I were where the eventual program for the ILO was developed. However, the organization of the labour movement and its rise to power were not entirely responsible for the establishment of the ILO at the conclusion of World War I.

The evolution of reformed liberalism was also an essential ingredient in the creation of the ILO. This evolution allowed the idea of social justice to permeate the political mainstream and gain public acceptance. Idealism and more specifically the principles of social justice were adopted by governments, both domestically and internationally, during and after World War I. The transformation of social justice to a mainstream idea coincided with a crisis of liberalism generated by rampant unemployment and poverty in industrialized countries. Liberal internationalism, meaning participation in international governmental institutions to ensure peace and prosperity as well as adherence to reform liberal philosophy, was adopted by many states after World War I because of the problems inherent within strict adherence to laissez-faire. Thus social justice gained prominence internationally.

Reforming the old liberal economic system using the principles of social justice was viewed as preferable to the potential collapse of the entire economic system since, it was believed, the needs of the socially disadvantaged would be addressed and a

revolutionary situation would be less likely to occur. Furthermore, many statesmen, politicians and academics viewed the principles of social justice as a way of avoiding industrial and civil unrest which had characterized the years preceding and months succeeding World War I. The transformation of social justice to an accepted and mainstream concept coupled with the evolution of liberal economic theory was an important condition in the creation of the ILO. It set the very basis of the ILO's organizational structure and philosophy. Moreover, the acceptance of social justice was intimately linked to the war-time peace programs of both organized labour and Woodrow Wilson. These parallel peace programs were replete with idealistic policies that incorporated social justice. The cooperation of organized labour movements in industrial countries in addition to the acceptance of social justice as a governing idea in the new world consensus were equally influential in the establishment of the ILO in 1919.

The ILO's creation cannot be attributed solely to either the rise of the organized labour movement or the acceptance of social justice as a governing idea. Each of these two factors complemented the other. Together the rise in importance of the organized labour movement and the acceptance of social justice within the mainstream of society were necessary in order for the ILO to be successfully established. The two factors are intrinsically linked. The influence of the organized labour movement was used to advocate the necessity of and labour's desire for the institutionalization of social justice within some sort of organization created within the peace treaty. Even though labour did not identify its proposals as drawn from the concept of social justice, it is evident that the idea they wanted internationally institutionalized was that of social justice. Consequently, the rise of organized labour movements and the acceptance of social justice were complementary factors in the ILO's successful creation.

There were several significant social consequences of World War I. One of those was the creation of the ILO. However, the two other social consequences of the War were that the importance of organized labour was recognized and the contribution and role of women during World War I was also recognized. It is interesting that two of the most influential and powerful groups of the 20th century both achieved recognition of their roles in society during and after World War I. Even though labour had the right to organize in most industrialized nations prior to the first World War, it grew in size, stature and importance during World War I. Labour and women both became more important during the war as a consequence of their respective contributions to the war effort on the homefront, especially in the munitions industry. Without these contributions World War I might well have had a different ending. Another similarity between both labour and women was that each became a new political class which stretched beyond national boundaries. This internationalization of issues that had previously viewed as purely domestic was a new phenomenon facing the world's statesmen in the aftermath of an event which altered the international system profoundly. Women received the right to vote in most of the industrialized states between 1917 and 1921 while, roughly in or about the same period, labour won recognition of the injustices in the conditions in which workers lived and worked. The International Labour Organization stands as a monument to the powerful, if indirect, influence of organized labour movements in their active campaign to shape the political peace settlement.[2] The social consequences of World War I were unprecedented.

In his Presidential address to the International Studies Association on March 27, 1993 Charles W. Kegley Jr. noted the close relationship between ideas and global change: "Ideas have often had less impact on global change than global change has had on

---

[2] Austin van der Slice. *International Labor, Diplomacy and Peace, 1914-1919.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1941), p.375

perceptions of the relevance and validity of ideas."[3] The Paris Peace Conference signaled a change in people's perception of the importance of certain ideas, particularly ideas relating to universal peace and humanitarian concerns. A shock to the international system like that experienced during the first World War changes society profoundly and it is not surprising that the dominant intellectual paradigm prior to the war broke down. There was a theoretical revolution after World War I. The old balance of power system which had existed since the Concert of Vienna in 1815 was destroyed by the war. No one wanted to repeat the horrific events of 1914 to 1918, and this desire convinced people and groups that a change and reorganization of the international system was necessary. While the idea of social justice is not completely incompatible with a balance of power system, the focus in a balance of power system tends towards realist power considerations.

The creation of the ILO was influenced by the times in which it was founded, which explains the heavy emphasis on social justice. There is abundant evidence to suggest that theoretical reorientations which help to transform international circumstances tend to occur during and after cataclysmic events or international crises.[4] World War I was no exception. The labour movement, and the dominant statesmen such as Woodrow Wilson led the movement to revive idealism in international relations. These examples seem to suggest that seismic shifts in world politics are a necessary pre-condition to the changes to the perception of ideas which drive the reorganization of the international system and to regime formation. The formation of the ILO was best achieved after the

---

[3] Charles W. Kegley. "The Neoidealist Moment in International Studies? Realist Myths and the New International Realities." *International Studies Quarterly*, (vol.37, no. 2, 1993), p.132

[4] Example of paradigm shifts is illustrated by the resurgent realism put forth by Prince von Metternich and Karl von Clausewitz following the Napoleonic Wars (1792-1815) and the resurrected realism of the post-World War II era articulated by George Kennan, Hans J. Morgenthau, E.H. Carr and others. (Kegley p.132)

cataclysm of World War I wiped away the pre-existing domestic and international structures.

Useful parallels can be drawn between the events that followed World War I and the present day. The international system has been rocked by a seismic shift in world politics since the end of the Cold War in 1989. The collapse of the Soviet Union was a turbulent event. It was unlike a conventional war, but it has had a similar result to the end of the first World War. It has brought about a reevaluation of the neo-realist theoretical paradigm which governed international relations since the end of the second World War. It may be possible that the international system is open to accept the idea of international cooperation and change along the lines of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points.[5] Unlike the international system in 1919, the world of 1996 is highly interdependent economically and politically. Perhaps the time is ripe to translate the experience of cooperation found in the ILO to other international social and economic issues, such as the environment, development and feminism.

A justification for creating the ILO in 1919 was an argument of economic competition. The older industrial nations, like Britain and France, no longer had the lock on the world markets that once had been theirs.[6] Nations such as Britain, which was on the decline economically, needed to justify the internationalization of the labour laws and standards. The justification was that it had become a necessity to safeguard the high living standards enjoyed by the advanced industrialized nations. Countries, like China and Japan, which had formerly supplied raw materials to the advanced industrialized nations, had engaged in building up their own industries. These industries were

[5] This idea that the international system is open to change along the lines of "neoidealism" has been written about by both Charles W. Kegley Jr. and David Long.

[6] Barnes p.35

competing with the older industrial nations by using extremely cheap labour and materials employed under often deplorable conditions, thereby undercutting the prices charged by the older economies. In response, the older industrial nations had begun to erect tariff barriers against others, particularly Britain.[7] The advanced industrialized nations wanted to "level the playing field" with the conclusion of international treaties on labour standards.

In 1996, this same issue and argument have relevance. It is no longer Britain and Europe who are the dominant protagonists. The United States is complaining about the labour standards and competitive practices of the newly industrialized countries such as Japan, Mexico and the nations of South America and the Pacific Rim. In 1996, there is still a need for international labour standards and thus, the ILO is still needed to address the problems which exist in less developed countries. Conditions could be ripe for change as states seem to be more interested in using international cooperation to solve their problems, much like the period of liberal internationalism after World War I.

There are lessons to be learned from the establishment of the ILO for those interested in creating similar international regimes today. It appears that at least two factors are necessary conditions in the formation of new regimes. First, the existence of an underlying idea seems to help in the creation of a regime. The acceptance of a new underlying idea may arise from a transition or evolution of the dominant ideological paradigm. Second, if a new regime is being formed on a social or economic issue it seems that inclusion of the views and aspirations of all relevant groups, including political elites and social movements, who have power within society is prudent.

---

[7] Barnes p.35

This study has shown that in the creation of the ILO the most influential forces were the rising power of organized labour movements during World War I and their efforts to ensure that the worlds' statesmen addressed their concerns at the Paris Peace Talks, and a paradigm shift to idealism which embraced the principles of social justice upon which the ILO was conceived and formed. These factors were the important causal factors, but as I noted at the outset of this study, both factors can be explained by World War I. World War I transformed the international system in such a way as to foster regime formation. The cataclysm actually helped to usher in new perceptions of the ideas around which the international system was reorganized. These new perceptions were embedded in the institutions that were founded, like the ILO.

The study of international governance has been primarily interested in interstate relations. However, it is important to assess the potential impact on the international arena of other actors who have traditionally been relegated to the margins of the international relations discipline. The current interest in the role of social movements in international relations is forcing the traditionally statist approach to recognize the significance of social movements as an influential dimension of global politics. This examination of the ILO is more than an interesting historical case study. Since this study has examined the conditions necessary to create an international regime or organization with particular attention to an international social issue, it provides valuable lessons for the transnational social movements of today.

The experience of the organized labour movement in 1919 is instructive for transnational social movements in 1996. "Men and women organized and acted politically across national, ethnic and religious boundaries by virtue of their allegiance to

the international working class."[8] While the transnational social movements of today are not necessarily class-based, they draw strength from divergent groups in society. As this study has attempted to demonstrate social movements can be both a source of new ideas in addition to a champion of those ideas. This is where there is utility in exploring the historical case study, in order to see the relationship between the politics of the international working class and, for example, the politics of gender or the environment in 1996.

The international political environment of 1996 has some similarities to the conditions of 1919. The role of international organizations, particularly the UN., in the preservation of peace has returned to a position of prominence. The U.N. sponsored missions to Bosnia, Somalia and Kuwait have demonstrated a renewed commitment to collective security which mirror the League of Nations aims of 1919. Further, there has been a reinvigoration of concern over human rights. Despite these similarities to 1919, the conditions which existed in 1919 do not appear to exist today. The transnational social movements of 1996, such as environmental, feminist, and peace movements still espouse new ideas and continue to champion the idea of social justice for their specific issue area. However, the world community and, in particular, powerful political statesmen do not seem to be wedded to the concept of social justice or to reforming the existing system. There seems to be limited political will amongst political elites to institute and establish new forms of international governance and regulation. Further, the transnational social movements of 1996 have neither the influence of the organized labour movement during World War I, nor the public support of a large segment of their domestic populace to try to influence the political elites. Therefore, it appears there is a lack of political will, or at the least a preoccupation with other issues, such as economic

[8] Alejandro Colás. "Putting Cosmopolitanism into Practice: the Case of Socialist Interntionalism," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* (vol.23, no.3, 1994), p.583

and trade policies, on the part of political elites. Consequently the apparent lack of the appropriate conditions currently suggests that the possibilities for establishing new forms of international regulation of specific social issues are limited.

There is a strong relationship between ideas and movements. The movements support and foster new ideas. But movements must have sufficient support from the public to influence the political elite. Ideas cannot be translated into action, no matter how well intentioned, unless there is the political will to do so. The conditions which existed in 1919 do not seem to exist to the same extent in 1996 and thus the potential for the transnational social movements of today to introduce new forms of international regulation are limited.

The International Labour Organization has been in existence nearly 80 years and has survived in spite of a range of shifts in the dominant ideological paradigm that have occurred. It has proved that it can endure. The ILO has also proved that it can change its focus to meet new challenges and adapt to contemporary needs. Currently, there are 171 ILO member states. This shows that there is tremendous acceptance globally for the values and goals at the heart of the ILO or, at least, that nations must be involved in the evolution of those values and goals. The ILO membership is even more impressive if one considers that there are approximately 185 United Nations members. Therefore, it could be said that the values that the ILO embodies are almost universally recognized in today's international system. International regimes, like the ILO, are created to solve problems within the international community and strive to "establish mutually beneficial arrangements."[9] The ILO has been successful in its mandate and as a result it should serve as a model of the needed conditions for regime formation.

---

[9] Robert O. Keohane. "The Analysis of International Regimes: Towards a European-American Research Programme." in Volker Rittberger ed. *Regime Theory and International Relations*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p.35

The starting point for the ILO was an idea. The ILO is the embodiment of the idea of social justice. Social justice is embedded in the constitution of the ILO. Even though working conditions in most of the advanced nations have been significantly ameliorated since 1900, the ILO remains relevant in today's international system as a standard setting body and a source of technical assistance. Furthermore, the ILO has retained its organizational structure in spite of immense changes in the climate of the international system. The ILO is still governed by the same principles as it adopted in 1919. Woodrow Wilson once stated, "ideas live, men die."[10] It appears that underlying ideas may be the most important component in the formation of new international regimes. It is the ideas which live on, and not the men who make the bargains at the diplomatic conferences. However, it is difficult to get an idea accepted unless the climate of world opinion is hospitable. Furthermore, an idea needs someone or a group with influence to champion it to the rest of the international community.

The historical case of the creation of the International Labour Organization provided an excellent model of regime formation and its necessary components. The key to creating an enduring regime is exemplified by its underlying idea. The principles of social justice are as important today as they were in 1919, and the concept of social justice is sufficiently malleable to allow for global change without the ILO becoming redundant or useless. However, an international regime could not be established without the right environment in world politics. I have shown that it was not until a shift in the dominant paradigm from realism to idealism after World War I that the idea of social justice was truly accepted in the international system. It appears that a shock to the international system helps to bring about massive reorganization which may also change

---

[10] E.M. Hugh-Jones. *Woodrow Wilson and American Liberalism*. (New York: MacMillan, 1949), p.284

the perception of many ideas. The world was ripe in 1919, after four years of war, for a change to the dominant intellectual paradigm and therefore it is not surprising that new international organizations were created, based upon new paradigms. The acceptance of idealism as the dominant theoretical paradigm helped to secure approval for social justice within the international community. The organized labour movement used its increased stature within society to communicate its platform, grounded upon social justice, to the international community. The organized labour movement was a champion of the idea of social justice which, as a result of the influential position labour had gained, could not be ignored by the political elite.

Currently, the potential for the creation of new international regimes is in question, as this is a time of turbulence and change in the international system, and with change may come a hospitable environment for new ideas and for new groups to gain influence, as well as an opportunity for recognition to be granted to a given issue. However, the scope of this study is limited. More research still needs to be done into the field of international regime formation in this time of growing interdependence, globalization and fluctuation and to the issues that may affect or be affected by such formation.

87

APPENDIX 1

Total Trade Union Membership in the Thirty Largest
Industrialized Countries for 1913, 1919, & 1920

Countries	1913	1919	1920
Argentine	(1)	476,000	750,000
Australia	498,000	628,000	684,000
Austria	260,000	803,000	830,000 *
Belgium	200,000	715,000 *	920,000
Bulgaria	30,000 *	36,000	36,000 X
Canada	176,000	378,000	374,000
Czecho-Slovakia	(1)	1,301,000	2,000,000 *
Denmark	152,000	360,000	400,000
Finland	28,000	41,000	59,000
France	1,027,000	2,500,000	2,500,000 X
Germany	4,513,000	11,900,000	13,000,000 *
Greece	(1)	170,000	170,000 X
Hungary	115,000 *	212,000	343,000 *
India	None	500,000 *	500,000
Italy	972,000	1,800,000	3,100,000
Japan	None	247,000	247,000 X
Netherlands	189,000	457,000	683,000 *
New Zealand	72,000	83,000	83,000 X
Norway	64,000	144,000	142,000
Poland	(1)	350,000 *	947,000 *
Portugal	(1)	100,000	100,000 X
Roumania (former area)	10,000	75,000 *	90,000
Russia	None	3,639,000	5,220,000
Serbia (old)	9,000	20,000	20,000 X
South Africa	5,000	60,000	60,000 X
Spain	(1)	876,000	876,000
Sweden	136,000	338,000	400,000 *
Switzerland	95,000 *	200,000 *	292,000
United Kingdom	4173000	8,024,000	8,024,000 X
United States	2,722,000	5,607,000	5,179,000
Estimated total for the above 30 countries	16,152,000 *	42,040,000	48,029,000

(1) Figures not available

X Figures for 1919

* Estimates based on partial information

Source: "The Growth of Trade Unionism Since 1913," International Labour Review (Vol. s, No. 1-2, 1921), p. 79

EMPIRICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

Adelman, Paul. *The Rise of the Labour Party 1880-1945* 2nd edition. London: Longman, 1986.

Alcock, Anthony. *History of the International Labour Organisation.* London: Macmillan, 1971.

Ameri, Houshang. *Politics and Process in the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations.* Great Britain: Gower, 1982.

Barnes, George N. *From Workshop to War Cabinet.* London: Herbert Jenkins Limited, 1924.

Barnes, George N. *History of the International Labour Office.* London: Williams and Norgate Ltd., 1926.

Berger, Stefan. *The British Labour Party and the German Social Democrats, 1900-1931.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994

Blaazer, David. *The Popular Front and the Progressive Tradition: Socialists, Liberals and the Quest for Unity, 1884-1939.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992

Burgwyn, H. James. *The legend of mutilated victory: Italy, the Great War and the Paris Peace Conference, 1915-1919.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1993.

Busch, G.K. *The Political Role of International Trade Unions.* London: Macmillan, 1983.

Falk, R.A. *The Status of Law in International Society.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Follows, John W. *Antecedents of the International Labour Organization.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Foreman-Peck, James. *A History of the World Economy:International Economic Relations since 1850.* Totowa: Barnes and Noble, 1983.

Foster, William. *Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement.* New York: International Publishers, 1956.

Francis, R. Douglas, Richard Jones and Donald B. Smith. *Destinies: Canadian History Since Confederation.* Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1988.

Galenson, Walter. *The ILO. An American View*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981.

Ghebali, Victor-Yves. *The International Labour Organisation: A Case Study on the Evolution of U.N. Specialised Agencies*. Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1989.

Goldstein, Erik. *Winning the peace: British diplomatic strategy, peace planning and the Paris Peace Conference, 1916-1920*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Haas, Ernst B. *Beyond the Nation-State. Functionalism and International Organization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Heyck, Thomas William. *The Peoples of the British Isles: A New History, From 1870 to the Present* Volume III. Belmont, Calfornia: Wadsworth Publishing, 1992.

Hugh-Jones, E.M. *Woodrow Wilson and American Liberalism*. New York: Macmillan, 1949

International Labour Organization. *The ILO in the Service of Social Progress*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1969.

Jacobson, Harold K. *Networks of Interdependence: International Organizations and The Global Political System* 2nd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Jenks, C. Wilfred. *The International Protection of Trade Union Freedom*. London: Stevens, 1957.

Jenks, C. Wilfred. *Human Rights and International Labour Standards*. London: Stevens, 1960.

Jenks, C. Wilfred. *Human Rights, Social Justice and Peace. The Broader Significance of the ILO Experience*. Geneva, ILO, 1967.

Jenks, C. Wilfred. *Social Justice in the Law Nations: The ILO Impact after Fifty Years*. London: Oxford, University Press, 1970.

Johnston, G.A. *The International Labour Organization. Its Work for Social and Economic Progress*. London: Europa Publications, 1970.

Jones, Thomas. *Lloyd George*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Kenwood, A.G. and A.L. Lougheed. *The Growth of the International Economy 1820-1990* 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Knepper, Alvin. *John Gilbert Winant and International Social Justice*. New York: New York University Press, 1955.

Knock, Thomas J. *To End all Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992

Landelius, Torsten. *Workers, Employers and Governments. A Comparative Study of Delegations and Groups at the International Labour Conference. 1919-1964*. Stockholm: Nordstedt and Söner, 1965.

Landy, E.A. *The Effectiveness of International Supervision. Thirty Years of I.L.O. Experience*. London: Stevens, 1966.

Lever Brothers & Unilever Ltd. *Ourselves as others see us*. London: Lever Brothers & Unilever Ltd., 1948.

Lorwin, Lewis L. *The International Labor Movement: History, Policies, Outlook*. Harper, New York, 1953.

Lowe, Boutelle Ellsworth. *The International Protection of Labor: International Labor Organization, History and Law*. New York: MacMillan, 1935.

McNair, Arnold Duncan. *The Expansion of International Law*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1962.

Miller, Kenneth E. *Socialism and Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice in Britain to 1931*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967

Miller, Spencer., ed. *What the International Labor Organization Means to America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Morse, David A. *The Origin and Evolution of the ILO and its Role in the World Community*. Ithaca, New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labour Relations, Cornell University, 1969.

Mortished, R.J.P. *The World Parliament of Labour: A Study of the ILO*. London: Fabian Publications, 1946.

Novak, Karl F. *Versailles*. NewYork: Payson and Clarke, 1929.

Périgord, Paul. *The International Labour Organization: A Study of Labour and Capital in Cooperation*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1926.

Phelan, Edward J. *The International Labour Organization: Its Ideals and Results.* Geneva: International Labour Office, 1925.

Phelan, Edward J. *Yes and Albert Thomas* 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Pipkin, Charles W. *The Idea of Social Justice.* New York: MacMillan, 1927.

Pipkin, Charles W. *Social Politics and Modern Democracies* 2 vols. New York: MacMillan, 1931.

Price, John J. *The International Labour Movement.* London: Oxford University Press, 1945.

Price, John. *ILO: Fifty Years On.* London: Fabian Society, 1969.

Saposs, David J. *The Labor Movement in Post-War France.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1931.

Schevenels, Walther. *International Federation of Trade Unions: Forty-Five Years, 1901-1945.* Brussels: IFTU, 1956.

Scoville, G. and Adolf Sturmthal. *The International Labour Movement in Transition.* London: University of Illinois Press, 1973.

Sharp, Alan. *The Versailles Settlement.* Hampshire: MacMillan, 1991.

Shotwell, James T., ed. *The Origins of the International Labor Organization.* 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

Simpson, Bill. *Labour: The Unions and the Party, A Study of the Trade Unions and the British Labour Movement.* London: George Allen & Unwin, 1973.

Solano, E. John., ed. *Labour As An International Problem.* London: MacMillan, 1920.

Stansky, Peter, ed. *The Left and War: The British Labour Party and World War I.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Stewart, Margaret. *Britain and ILO. The Story of Fifty Years.* London: H.M.S.O., 1969

Stubbs, Richard and Geoffrey R.D. Underhill eds. *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1994

Swartz, Marvin. *The Union of Democratic Control in British Politics During the First World War.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971

Temperley, Harold William Vazeille. *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris.* London: H. Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton, 1920-24.

Tikriti, Abdul-Karim. *Tripartism and the ILO. A Study of the Legal Concept: its Origins, Function and Evolution in the Law of Nations.* Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1982.

Tipton, John B. *Participation of the United States in the ILO.* University of Illinois, 1959.

Valticos, N. and G. von Potobsky. *International Labour Law* 2nd ed. Boston: Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers, 1995.

van der Slice, Austin. *International Labor, Diplomacy and Peace, 1914-1919.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1941

Walworth, Arthur. *Wilson and his peacemakers: American diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919.* New York: Norton, 1986.

Wilson, Francis Graham. *Labor in the League System.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1934.

Windmuller, John P. *International Trade Union Movement.* Deventer: Kluwer, 1980.

Wolman, Leo. *The Growth of American Trade Unions, 1880-1923.* New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1924.

Articles:

Charnovitz, Steve. "The Influence of international labour standards on the World Trading Regime: a historical overview." *International Labour Review,* vol.126, no.5, September-October 1987, p.565-585.

Cox, Robert W. "ILO:Limited Monarchy", in *The Anatomy of Influence. Decision-Making in International Organization.* Edited by Robert W. Cox and Harold K. Jacobson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974, p.102-139.

Cox, Robert W. "Labor and Hegemony". *International Organization,* vol 31, no.3, Summer 1977, P.385-424.

Dahl, Karl N. "The Role of ILO Standards in Global Integration Process". *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. V, No. 4, 1968, p.309-351.

Fine, Martin. "Albert Thomas: A Reformer's Vision of Modernization, 1914-1932". *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol.12, no. 3, July 1977, P545-564.

Ghebali, Victor-Yves. "From philathrophy to foundation: The roots of the ILO." *World of Work: The Magazine of the ILO*, no.8, June 1994, p.8-11.

Ghebali, Victor-Yves. "The Politicisation of UN Specialized Agencies: A Preliminary Framework". *Millennium*, vol. 14, no.3, December 1985, p.317-334.

Hansenne, Michael. "Promoting social justice in the New Global Economy." *Monthly Labor Review*, vol.117, no.9, September 1994, p.3-5.

Hartwell, Matilda. "The ILO: History and Priorities." *Employment Gazette*, vol.102, no.9, September 1994, p.320-322

Jenks, C. Wilfred. "The Relation between Membership of the League of Nations and Membership of the International Labour Organization". *British Yearbook of International Law*, vol. XVI, 1935, p.79-83.

Jenks, C. Wilfred. "Universality and Ideology in the ILO". *Annals of International Studies*, vol. 1, 1970, p.45-64.

McMahon, J.F. "The International Labour Organization". *The Evolution of International Organizations*. Edited by David Evan Luard, London, Thames and Hudson, 1966, p.177-199.

Morgenstern, Felice. "Wilfred Jenks in the ILO". *British Yearbook of International Law*, vol.46, 1972-1973, p. xvi-xxx.

Ostrower, Gary B. "The American Decision to join the ILO". *Labor History*, vol. 16, no.4, Fall 1975, p.495-504.

Oudegeest, J. "The International Trade Union Movement and the Labour Office." *International Labour Review*, vol.1, no.1, January 1921, p.41-44.

Panteleymonov, R. "The ILO in a Crisis". *International Affairs* (Moscow), no. 10, October 1984, 49-56.

Phelan, Edward. "The Contribution of the ILO to Peace." *International Labour Review*, vol. 59, no.6, June 1949, p.607-632.

Simpson, William R. "The ILO and Tripartism: some reflections." *Monthly Labor Review*, vol.117, no.9, September 1994, p.40-46.

Strang, David and Patricia Mei Yin Chang."The International Labor Organization and the welfare state: institutional effects on national welfare spending, 1960-1980". *International Organization*, vol. 47, no.2, Spring 1993, p.235-262.

Swinnerton, Kenneth A. "Labor standards in the context of a Global Economy." *Monthly Labor Review*, vol.117, no.9, September 1994, p.52-59.

Thomas, Albert. "The International Labour Organisation: Its Origins, Development and Future." *International Labour Review*, vol.1, no.1, January 1921, p.5-22.

Valticos, Nicolas. "Fifty Years of Standard Setting Activities by the International Labour Organisation". *International Labour Review*, vol.100, no.3, September 1969, p.201-238.

Wilson, Woodrow. "America's Terms of Settlement: An address by President Wilson tothe Congress of the United States, January 8, 1918." *International Conciliation*, no.123, January 1918, p.77-85.

"The Growth of Trade Unionism since 1913." *International Labour Review*, vol.3, no.1-2, July-August 1921, p.78-109.

"Golden Rule His Remedy." *New York Times*, April 4, 1918, p.6

"The Peace to End War." *New Statesman*, vol.12, November 16, 1918, p.123

THEORETICAL AND FRAMEWORK BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

Ackerman, Bruce A. *Social Justice in the Liberal State*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980

Carr, E.H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1939.

Goldstein, Judith and Robert O. Keohane. eds. *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993

Gould, Julius and William L. Kolb. eds. *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*. New York: MacMillan, 1964.

Kegley, Charles W. *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the NeoLiberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

Krasner, Stephen D. ed. *International Regimes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Long, David and Peter Wilson. eds. *Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis: Inter-War Idealism Reassessed*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995

Murphy, Craig N. *International Organization and Industrial Change: Global Governance since 1850*. Cambridge:Polity, 1994

Outhwaite, William and Tom Boltomore. eds. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social Thought*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993.

Young, Oran R. and Gail Osherenko, eds. *Polar Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Articles:

Baldwin, David A. "Interdependence and Power: A Conceptual Analysis". *International Organization*, vol.34, no.4, Autumn 1980, p.471-506.

Colás, Alejandro. "Putting Cosmospolitanism into Practice: the Case of Socialist Internationalism." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, vol.23, no.3, Winter 1994, p.513-534.

Cox, Robert W. "Multilateralism and World Order". *Review of International Studies*, vol. 18, no.2, April 1992, p.141-180.

Cox, Robert W. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond Interantional Relations Theory". *Millennium:Journal of International Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, Summer 1981, p.126-155.

Hagggard, Stephen and Beth A. Simmons. "Theories of International Regimes". *International Organization*, vol. 41, no.3, Summer 1987, p. 491-517.

Herz, John H. "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma." *World Politics*, vol.2, no.2, January 1950, p.157-180.

Honoré, A.M. "Social Justice". in *Essays in Legal Philosophy*, Robert S. Summers ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968, p.61-94

Kegley, Charles W. "The Neoidealist Moment in International Studies? Realist Myths and New International Realities." *International Studies Quarterly*, vol.37, no.2, June 1993, p.131-146.

Keohane, Robert O. "The Analysis of International Regimes". *Regime Theory and International Relations*, edited by Volker Rittberger. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Lynch, Cecelia. "E.H. Carr, International Relations Theory, and the Societal Origins of International Legal Norms." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, vol.23, no.3, Winter 1994, p.589-619.

Magnusson, Warren. "Social Movements and the Global City". *Millennium:Journal of International Studies*, vol. 23, no.3, Winter 1994, p.621-645.

Pagnucco, Ron and David Atwood. "Global Strategies for Peace and Justice". *Peace Review*, vol. 6, no.4, Winter 1994, p.411-418.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. "Ideas do not float freely: transnational coalitions, domestic structures and the end of the cold war." *International Organization*, vol.48, no.2, Spring 1994, p.185-214

Ruggie, John Gerard. "International regimes, transactions and change: embedded liberalism in the postwar economic order". *International Organization*, vol. 36, no.2, Spring 1982, p.379-415.

Ruggie, John Gerard. "Trade, protectionism and the Future of Welfare Capitalism".
Journal of International Affairs, vol. 48, no. 1, Summer 1994, p.1-11.

Young, Oran R. and Gail Osherenko. "Testing Theories of Regime Formation". *Regime
Theory and International Relations*, edited by Volker Rittberger. Oxford: Clarendon
Press, 1993.

Walker, R.B.J. "Social Movements/ World Politics." *Millennium: Journal of
International Studies*, vol.23, no.3, Winter 1994, p.669-700.

Webber, Michael J. "Challenges to Transnational Social Movements". *Peace Review*, vol.
6, no. 4, Winter 1994, p.395-401.

"Social Movements and World Politics: Editors Note." *Millennium: Journal of
International Studies*, vol.23,no.3, Winter 1994, p.511-512.