THE MAKING OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION AS A REIFICATION OF THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF SECURITY

Valentin FILIP*

Abstract:

The current debates focusing on a deeper and wider understanding of the security concept seem to revolve around theoretical and factual developments starting with 1945 and especially with 1989. The historical approach proposed by this paper attempts to expand the time horizon to an older peace arrangement: the Versailles Treaty. Taking into account empirical evidence and approaching conceptual debates, it argues that the security's conceptual rationale – peace and conflict – was long ago treated from a social perspective. The origins of the social dimension of the security concept may thus be traced back to the International Labor Organization and the process that led to its inclusion in the Versailles Treaty.

Keywords: *social dimension of the security concept, social security, Paris Peace Conference, Versailles Treaty, International Labor Organization, Progressivism, Wilsonianism.*

Introduction

During the past decades, an ever-growing community of scholars, experts, policy-makers and representatives of the civil society developed, shared, agreed and promoted the idea that security is not just about the state, as a referent object, and military, as the overwhelming subject matter. A distinctive set of disciplines emerged: (international) security studies, peace research studies and, with it, new security strategies were drafted, marking a conceptual shift that broadened security's limits both vertically, from national to individual and international security, and horizontally, from defense issues to numerous sectors such as societal, economic, social political, environmental

* "Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy, valentin_filip@yahoo.com

and so forth. In fact, the intellectual ferment that led to this outcome was and still is so dynamic that the efforts of redefining security attracted the label of "a cottage industry" (Baldwin, 1997, p. 5).The newly born and spread literature, mainly starting with the 1980s, was indeed inspired and fueled by various works of philosophy, economics, history, sociology, political science and law from the past, but it seldom treated history other than a source of factual evidence. However, as this paper argues, the debate over the conceptualization of security is not a new phenomenon.

The Versailles Treaty and the negotiation process, as well as the conceptual argumentation that led to the creation of the International Labor Organization go beyond the force of exemplification in that they connected social dynamics and economic realities to peacemaking efforts, traditionally built around political and military issues. Social justice and unrest were considered causes of stability and conflict, respectively, at both the national and international levels. Although security was not addressed *per se* as an issue, the simple fact that its main leitmotifs – peace and war – were conceived from a social perspective may be equated to the addition of a social dimension to the security concept. "Freedom from want" and "freedom from fear", in the present UN language (Human Development Report 1994, p. 3), were thus considered two correlated prerequisites of security many decades before. The two idioms were actually first used together by Edward Stettinius, the U.S. Secretary of State, after the San Francisco Conference that led to the creation of the United Nations (1945). Implicitly, national and international security was expanded to include that of the individual, while the military sector was complemented to include basic human social and economic needs.

The hypothesis of this paper is that two conditions were met for this earlier reconceptualization of security and its following stipulation in international law: the existence of an epistemic community that promoted social justice and the presence of an ideological threat – Russian Bolshevism – that impelled a critical (geo) political need and will to address social issues. The latter is quite obvious and does not constitute a research objective for this paper, since there is a vast literature dedicated to the topic. "The Bolshevik revolution helped to work a miraculous change of attitude among the Western ruling classes. The workers, even in the victorious democracies, were restless" (Macmillan, 2003, p. 95) and their demands needed an adequate treatment. Even military leaders, such as Field Admiral Sir Henry Wilson, came to recognize that from 1918 on the enemy would have been "not the Boche but

the Bolshevik" (Read, 2008)[1]. On the other hand, the former condition is a refined, enlarged interpretation of the epistemic community, defined as "a network of professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-area" (Haas, 1992, p. 3). In specific relation to the topic of this paper and to the historical circumstances, the view on this kind of community has a larger scope, encompassing not just professionals from the governmental and academic circles, but social reformers and activists, entrepreneurs and trade-union leaders, as well as educated journalists and (especially left-wing) political leaders. The special combination of these two factors, namely expert knowledge and common awareness, led not just to what we would presently label as a wider interpretation of the concept of security but to its embedment in a normative framework – the International Labor Organization and the subsequent national and international legislative undertakings – that outlived what was considered to be the much appraised creation of the Paris Peace Conference: the League of Nations.

This paper is a literature-assessing and historical-evaluative research that proposes a deeper, in a historical sense, and richer examination of the security concept, attempting to debunk the general perception that treats the wider understanding of the security concept as a recent development. However, it is limited to the social dimension of security, although the issues at stake pervade the traditional boundaries and touch upon economic and political areas. Furthermore, it aims at delineating the epistemic community across the Atlantic, especially related to American Progressivism, without neglecting the Europeans' contribution, on the contrary. Finally, while it treats progressive ideas since their inception in the late 19th century, it is chronologically confined to the Paris Peace Conference, closing with the inclusion of labor in the Versailles Treaty. The first part of the paper consists in a brief and selective stock-taking of some high-impact works dedicated to the reconceptualization of security, aiming mainly at its social dimension. The second explains the causes of Progressivism and summarizes the main tenets of the Progressives, with a focus on their "social engineering" effort. Before the concluding remarks, the paper explores the making of Versailles Treaty's Part XIII, which ultimately led to the creation of the International Labor Organization.

[1] "Boche" was an offensive French slang that referred to the Germans.

Modern (re)conceptualizations of security: dimensioning the social sector

In the midst of the debates during the past decades, security has been dubbed as an "ambiguous symbol" (Wolfers, 1952), an "underdeveloped" (Buzan, 1983, p. 3), "contested" (Baylis et al., 2008, p. 230) and even a "neglected concept" (Baldwin, 1997, p. 8). With the advent of a growing number of studies exploring the meaning of security, the scholars dedicating their research to this topic came to form various schools of thought. Buzan *et al* distinguish between the "traditionalists", political realists viewing security from a state-centered and military-oriented perspective, and the others that promote a different perception of security, moving beyond the state and to non-military sectors (Buzan et al., 1988, pp. 2-3) (they may qualify as "non-traditionalists"). Peoples and Vaughan-Williams divide security studies approaches into "traditional" and "critical", based on the same conceptual contradiction (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams, 2010, pp. 4-6). Interestingly, besides the (neo)realists that naturally lie in the former camp, the same authors also view scholars belonging to the liberal family of international relations theories as "traditionalists" since "they all share a common commitment to thinking security within the context of a military agenda" (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams, 2010, pp. 4-6). On the other hand, critics to the traditional conception of security are more heterogeneous and may be loosely mapped into several categories: the Welsh School (normative), the Copenhagen School (analytical), and the Paris School (sociological) (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams, 2010, pp. 9-10). Furthermore, Baylis identifies constructivism as an alternative for explaining how security is conceived: its meaning is not given by some material structure but it is embedded into the shared knowledge of the actors involved and thus results from a social interaction of subjective understandings (Baylis, 2008, p. 234).

Other critical views on security arise from feminist theories, which bring gender issues into the process of rethinking security, or from post-modernist thought, which attempts to supplement the debate regarding the security concept by considering new issues which have been ignored by the traditionalists (Baylis, 2008, p. 236).

Lately, Buzan and Hansen (2009) divided different interpretations of the security concept into: conventional constructivism, focusing on ideational factors such as culture, beliefs and norms; critical constructivism, adopting narrative and sociological methodologies; the Copenhagen School, promoting the constructivist view of securitization; critical security studies, based on

emancipation as the key concept; feminist security studies, raising the awareness regarding gender issues; human security, placing individuals and their needs as the main referent object of security; peace research studies, a more Liberal approach aiming to reduce the use of force and complementing state security with individual security; post-colonial security studies, offering non-Western insights to security theories; poststructuralist security studies, switching the focus from ideas to discourse; strategic studies, presenting the traditionalist views on security; and (neo)realism, adopting a similar stance towards security as strategic studies, albeit more politically-oriented and rationalist (Buzan & Hansen, 2009, pp. 35-38).

Reconceptualizing security brought about various definitions of the term and delineations of its sectors. The latter process led to a compartmentalization of security, taking into account the dimensions to which belonged the values that were to be protected or from which emerged the threats endangering those values. Compartmentalization is not synonymous with fragmentation: most studies agree that security is an organic whole, whose division is necessary for the sake of theory or policy. The social dimension was not always individually considered, either because it was considered an intra-state matter, while security was traditionally confined to the inter-state realm, or because it was engulfed into other dimensions, such as economic and/or political. This benign neglect seems paradoxical, considering the debates at the end of the Great War that pre-date modern developments and the fact that social security/protection programs and policies were generally implemented at the state level due to international and transnational processes, through the work of the International Labor Organization and the sub-state groups that exchanged ideas and plans across territorial boundaries. This is not to say that domestic processes were negligible but that they were greatly stimulated, even altered, due to the Peace Treaties and the epistemic communities forged in Paris and thereafter.

In what is now considered a classical approach, Wolfers proposed a dual perspective on security: objective, when security "measures the absence of threats to acquired values", and subjective, when it relates to the "absence of fear that such values will be attacked" (Wolfers, 1952, p. 485). His emphasis on "acquired values" was significant for the broadening of security's scope, all the more so as shifting the focus on different values and implicitly different threats allows for a multi-dimensional conception of security, not just national and military.

Ullman also argues against envisaging security "merely, or even primarily, in military terms" (Ullman, 1983, p. 129). His correlation of security

to the nature of threats also bears the possibility of imagining security in social terms. His own words are more than eloquent for that matter, since Ullman was considering threats that were degrading strongly and imminently "the quality of life for the inhabitants of the state" (Ullman, 1983, p. 133). It is also worth mentioning the shift to the individual.

Buzan, perhaps one of the most influential researchers in the field of security studies, managed to pin down the security concept to five sectors (military, political, economic, environmental, and societal) while generally defining it as 'freedom from threat" (Buzan, 1991, p. 32). The social dimension can hardly be correlated with the political and economic sectors, but this can be partly explained by pointing at Buzan's preference for the national level of security: "Security is primarily about the fate of human collectivities, and only secondarily about the personal security of individual human beings. In the contemporary international system, the standard unit of security is thus the sovereign territorial state" (Buzan, 1991, p. 32). However, he explicitly pointed at a social sector of security (Buzan, 1983, p. 11) only that he considered it at the level of the individual, breaking it into factors (life, health, status, wealth, freedom) that he appreciates as "far more complicated, not infrequently contradictory, and plagued by the distinction between objective and subjective evaluation" (Buzan, 1831, p. 18).

Departing from Buzan's view mainly centered on the state, hence too Realist, Booth suggests an interesting concept: emancipation, defined as "the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely chose to do" (Booth, 1991, p. 319). The focus is clearly placed on the human being who moves to the core of security studies from this critical perspective. Inherently, the feeling of security is accomplished not just through protection of the individual from military threats but through the enhancement of all economic, social, environmental conditions that make up for his welfare. Being secured equates being emancipated as an individual: "security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin" (Booth, 1991, p. 319).

The concept of human security is probably the most appropriate in discussing the social dimension of security. Human security is not just multidimensional (including social issues) but it puts the individual and the community as the referent object of security: thus, the individual becomes the end of security, while states become primarily the means. This conception of security generally involves three meanings: one that is concerned with the protection and promotion of basic human rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"; another humanitarian one, mainly related to the

consequence of conflict on human lives; and a final one, the broadest, with "a strong social justice component", dealing with "economic, environmental, social and other forms of harm to the overall livelihood and well-being of individuals" (Hampson, 2008, pp. 230-231), which is generally promoted by the UN, through its Development Programme (UNDP). The UNDP threw the first challenge to the traditionalist view on security in 1993 when it claimed that it "must change from an exclusive stress on national security to a much greater stress on people's security, from security through armaments to security through human development, from territorial security to food, employment, and environmental security" (Human Development Report 1993, p. 2). A year later, the UNDP elaborated more on the concept, pinning it down to seven areas: economic security (against poverty), food security (access to basic food), health security (health care), environmental security (protection from ecological risks), personal security (against physical violence), community security (protection of cultural values and traditions), political security (protection of civil and political rights) (Human Development Report 1994, p. 22-33).

Human security became the trend for the UN approach for years to come. For example, the Secretary General, Kofi Annan, promoted the same idea: "Human security can no longer be understood in purely military terms. Rather, it must encompass economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law" (Annan, 1999, p. 15). Although lacking clarity and being too vast, the human security concept helped nonetheless to the delineation of a branch of security studies (Paris, 2001, pp. 87-102), one that generally understands security in both quantitative terms, as "the satisfaction of basic material needs of all humankind. At the most basic level, food, shelter, education and health care are essential for the survival of human beings" (Thomas, 2000, pp. 6-7), and qualitative ones, as "the achievement of human dignity which incorporate personal autonomy, control over one's live and unhindered participation in the life of the community" (Thomas, 2000, pp. 6-7).

This "pull" approach, from the international level, doubled by a "push" one, from the civil society and the academia, managed to reach to the state level: presently, most national security strategies in the democratic world either refer to issues pertaining to the social dimension of security or even explicitly delineate it. Previously, it was neglected because security was imagined at the inter-state level, while intra-state issues were downgraded to the domestic policies realm. In this respect, "social security was generally

defined as internal security. Its essential function was to ensure the political and economic power of a given ruling class or the survival of the social system and an adequate degree of public security" (Balázs, 1985, p. 146). Moreover, social security was increasingly linked to social justice (Kaufmann, 2013, p. 98), as a constituent of social policies (Kaufmann, 2013, p. 108), which usually deal with unemployment, labor conditions, pensions etc.

American Progressivism: a brief outlook

After the Reconstruction Era that followed the Civil War, America was experiencing a series of transformations that came to be known as the "Gilded Age". Under the guise of economic growth, massive immigration, industrialization, technological progress and urbanization, a different picture was unfolding: that of a country whose political and social landscape was dreadfully altered. The big business was dictating the economic and financial life: the so called "captains of industry", Wall Street tycoons or corporate magnates - Rockefeller, Carnegie, Pierpont Morgan, Vanderbilt - were monopolizing the marketplace. By the late 19th century, one percent of American families, the richest, held almost ninety percent of the currency in the whole U.S. economy (McNeese, 2010, p. 48) and "the rich were getting richer – far richer – than most people" (Nugent, 2010, p. 6). In the same time, corruption was engulfing the political and administrative milieu and "much of it was centered on the practice of patronage" (McNeese, 2010, p. 57). In the 1880s, half of the federal, non-elected jobs were awarded as payoff for those who voted for the political parties that were winning the elections (McNeese, 2010, p. 57). Moreover, these political machineries, as they came to be known, and their bosses, were tainted by graft from the business sector, doing almost nothing against the "merger movement" of big corporations; in fact, it was considered normal: "men who were otherwise honorable saw no conflict in accepting financial rewards, gifts, commissions, or retainers from businesses and individuals whom they assisted" (Jaycox, 2005, p. 78). As such, poverty and misery were the traits of the time: living conditions were awful and labor problems were rising. The social and political dimensions of American life were not keeping up the pace with economic dynamics. A deep sense of unfairness was making havoc among the American society (Nugent, 2010, p. 7). Social division was there, too: "capital versus labor, the interests [n.b. of the few privileged] versus the people" (Nugent, 2010, p. 11).

In the midst of the Long Depression (1873-1896) the social conditions worsened and as a result terrible violent strikes mushroomed all over the

cities: the Great Railroad Strike (1877), the Haymarket Riot (1886), the Homestead Strike (1892), the Pullman Strike (1894) to name but a few of the bloodiest ones that required thousands of state or federal troops to quell (McNeese, 2010, p. 49). At the peak of the depression, when the stock market crashed in 1893, 500 banks and 15,000 businesses went bankrupt, heavily contributing to an already rising unemployment figure (Jaycox, 2005, p. 39). Demographics, although rising, were not helping the social milieu: farmers were displaced, because of a deflation of agricultural prices, while millions of migrants continued to come from abroad – between 1871 and 1914, 25 million migrants arrived in the United States (Link & Link, 2012, p. 6). All of them contributed to the overcrowding of cities: housing was provided in poor tenements contributing to growing slums; sanitary facilities were outbalanced since "sewer lines and garbage disposal were sorely lacking", "fire and police protection was outpaced, schools were inundated, and street maintenance was for all practical purposes nonexistent" (Jaycox, 2005, p. 6). Social change was deemed necessary, it was actually critical.

Against the backdrop of this crisis, at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, voices calling for reform started to rally in a heterogeneous but consistent movement. The Progressives, as they would later be called, were eager "to first identify and then to remedy the problems inherent in an industrializing and increasingly urban society" (Pastorello, 2014, p. 7). They were "religious leaders, businessmen, professionals, civic leaders, settlement women, suffragists, African Americans, civil rights advocates, union members, nativists, immigrants, workers, farmers and politicians" (Pastorello, 2014, p. 12) that, despite the lack of a formal organization, shared the belief in some kind of governmental regulation or involvement in order to solve social, economic, and political problems (Pastorello, 2014, p. 8). Moreover, they shared a faith in science, in that expert knowledge was needed as a reform driver, either directly from academic scholars – especially social scientists – or through the education of political and administrative elites (Pastorello, 2014, p. 7). Altogether, the Progressives "were united by a common anxiety about industrialism and what the new economic system meant for the social and political fabric" (Link & Link, 2012, p. 8). Being aware of the social divisions created by the advent of uncontrolled capitalism, they sought to alleviate the "social consequences of industrial society for immigrants, workers, the poor and especially for children" (Link & Link, 2012, p. 8).

As grassroots phenomenon with initiatives that first reached the local executive and legislative circles and then moved on to the state and finally federal level, Progressivism brought a series of "efforts to alleviate the

dysfunction, or the corruption, or the economic injustice, or the human suffering that had accompanied America's explosion of industrial growth, urbanization, and new ways of life" (Jaycox, 2005, p. VIII). Aiming to revitalize democracy and to establish a fair social system, the Progressives brought "wholesale restructuring of social and political institutions […] and reform became a driving force" (Link & Link, 2012, p. 9). They engineered solutions to the social ills and paid careful attention to "overcrowding and health and safety issues" inherent to industrialization and urbanization processes, addressing labor problems, demanding housing and factory codes, public health and sanitation measures, school reforms and an equitable distribution of taxes (Pastorello, 2014, p. 197). Governmental intervention was rounded by civic activism: a great number of non-governmental organizations that sometimes acted as a quasi-government, the civil society at its best, championed causes such as laborer's and immigrants' rights, civil rights, women's suffrage, child labor, better housing, proper sanitation and even world peace (Pastorello, 2014, p. 200). As opposed to the Europeans, "Americans relied on privatism, volunteerism, and welfare capitalism" to provide social justice (Pastorello, 2014, p. 204).

The spread of the Progressive ideas and actions benefited from the contributions of the muckrakers (investigative journalists) that were raising awareness with regard to issues related to poor living and miserable working conditions, child labor, inequality, corruption and rapacious tycoons; the Social Gospelers that exposed the sins of the urban industrial society and promoted social change following Christian doctrine; social and civic activists that encouraged the spread of reform, through charity or the empowerment of the people; social workers that supported changes in favor of mothers' pensions, health and maternity care, better working conditions, education, citizenship and English classes, housing codes, labor organizing and even sexual hygiene campaigns; experts that demanded and helped the professionalization of fields such as medicine, law, engineering, academia; and finally labor unionists that fought for labor rights or farmers that organized in populist parties demanding agrarian reforms (Pastorello, 2014, p. 57-103). They all wielded a great influence on policy/decision-makers and legislators. In the end, Progressivism arrived in politics, as a bipartisan movement, and many politicians became proponents of the Progressive thought and spirit. A selective, albeit incomplete list, would include: Mayors Hazen Pingree (Detroit), Tom Johnson (Cleveland); Governors Robert LaFollette (Wisconsin), Hiram Johnson (California); Congressmen William Jennings Bryan (Nebraska), Fiorello LaGuardia (New York); statesmen Elihu Root (Secretary of State),

Louis Brandeis (Chief Justice); U.S. Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. They all initiated legislative measures which addressed social, economic and political issues that improved the safety, welfare, democracy, and ultimately the security of the Americans, especially the ordinary citizens. To name but a few: establishing commissioner and manager plans, at city level; adopting secret ballot, initiative, referendum, recall and direct primaries, at state level; Pure Food and Drug Act (obligation to label food ingredients), Meat Inspection Act (requirement for inspection of meat processing factories), Hepburn Act (empowerment the Interstate Commerce Commission to set railroad taxes), Underwood-Simmons Act (tariff reduction), Glass-Owen Act (establishment of the Federal Reserve, which placed the banking sector under governmental control), Sherman and later Clayton Antitrust Acts (reducing, then outlawing monopolies, the latter was dubbed "Labor Magna Charta"), at the federal level. Finally, the Progressives even amended the U.S. Constitution: the 16th (granting Congress the power to tax income), the 17th (requiring direct election of U.S. Senators, thus reducing influence of political machineries), the 18th (alcohol prohibition) and the 19th (providing women suffrage) Amendments.

A special note, for the purpose of this paper, goes to Woodrow Wilson, the U.S. President that brought American Progressivism on the international agenda. Wilson's contribution to the field of international relations is so great that it earned the suffix „-ism" for his ideas. However, Wilsonianism is much more than a sort of ideology applicable to foreign policies. Instead, one should place his thought and action in the Progressive environment from which he emerged. For this matter, Scott Berg shows that Wilson's Progressivism was crystal clear both in his behavior as the Governor of New Jersey, when he freed a state labeled as "the mother of corporations" from "the tyranny of private interests" and addressed labor and health conditions, and in the electoral platform that won him his first mandate at the White House – "The New Freedom", oriented towards enhancing democracy, social justice and economic fairness (Scott, 2013). Throughout both his mandates, he fought on the domestic scene against tariff policies that disrespected the just principles of taxations and transformed government into a tool of private interests, against the banking system that discriminated credits in favor of capital, and against the industrial system that restricted labor freedoms and opportunities. On the other hand, he argued for the need of better laws concerning healthcare, food and working conditions that would provide equality and opportunity for ordinary citizens, with a focus on women and child labor (Scott, 2013). Pestritto explicitly places Wilson's work of rethinking and

reshaping America in connection with his evolution and formation as a Progressive, Liberal scholar and politician (Pestritto, 2005). Moreover, Gottfried examines Wilson's legacy and claims he was trying to emulate domestic reforms on the world stage (Gottfried, 1990, pp. 117-126). The bottom line is that Wilson's behavior, as well as the behavior of the Progressives that he chose to accompany him to the Paris Peace Conference may be assessed as a Progressive stance. American Progressives thus greatly contributed to the inclusion of social issues on the agenda of the "Big Four" and of the Europeans in general during the peace talks.

American Progressivism in Paris: social security and the birth of the ILO

The famous "Fourteen Points", which actually became the framework for the peace negotiations in Paris, represented a Wilsonian version of a truly Progressive document. On the political and economic dimension, the promotion of free trade, the emphasis on public opinion, the guarantees for self-determination, as a democratic expression of the will of the people, and the establishment of the League of Nations, a lesser government that was inspired by the Progressive belief in the role of the government, were all inspired by the Progressive spirit and even formulated in a Progressive language. With regard to social issues and more specifically the advancement of a multidimensional security concept, the Progressive influence was visible in the role played by the Americans when addressing capital-labor relations, particularly working conditions. In this regard, besides the other Progressives that Wilson appointed in the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, Samuel Gompers played an important contribution. As the leader of the American Federation of Labor (AFL), an organization that took on a Progressive agenda, Gompers was designated by the U.S. President as a member of the Council of National Defense and tasked to ensure labor support for the war effort. In this position, he closely worked with Wilson for a labor policy which offered governmental support for independent trade unions. Due to this fruitful collaboration, Gompers was nominated to participate as the American delegate to the Commission on International Labor Legislation at the Peace Conference. Moreover, he was elected as the chair of this Commission.

The joint forces of government and trade unions (especially the AFL) led to "the flowering of Progressivism": an unprecedented centralization of industrial production coordination, the modernization of the national

transportation system, an increase of the wages, war bonds were issued and new taxes established so as to provide financial resources for the war effort (Knock, 1992, pp. 130-131). Simultaneously, the federal government recognized for the first time labor's right to organize and collectively bargain (Knock, 1992, pp. 131). Social reforms surpassed even the most optimistic expectations: a minimum wage and the eight-hour day were set in most industries, while labor disputes were habitually settled in favor of the workers (Knock, 1992, pp. 131).

Wilson went even further by supporting the inclusion of a section dedicated to labor in the Covenant of the League of Nations. While in Europe, he maintained that "there are many ameliorations of labor conditions which can be effected by conference and discussion […] there will be a very great usefulness in the Bureau of Labor which is contemplated to be set up by the League. Men and women and children who work have been in the background through long ages […] while the thought of statesmen has been about structural action and the larger transactions of commerce and of finance" (Powell & Hodgins, 1919, p. 165). His personal annotations on the debated text of Covenant, the so called First and Second Paris Drafts, called for an obligation of all signatories "to establish and maintain fair hours and humane conditions of labor" and for the establishment of basic rights for working people around the world (Knock, 1992, pp. 205-207).

On his part, Gompers and the AFL demanded, long before the end of the war and when the U.S. was still neutral (1914), that "the international trade-union movement have an important say in structuring the postwar order" and therefore asked for a parallel conference (Tosstorff, 2005, p. 402). Later on, Gompers admitted that "American labor did not leave the Peace Conference in Paris with all it felt it ought, in justice, to have secured, but it left with all it was possible to get" (Gompers, 1921, p. 319). He laid the charge for this outcome at the door of selfishness of Conservatives or radicalism of Socialists present in the Commission, many of whom were not even representatives of the labor, but of political parties. This was the reason why Gompers considered "the contest against reaction and misunderstanding and willfulness and utopian foolishness" as the most difficult of his life (Gompers, 1921, p. 323). However, he considered the final outcome, the labor section of the treaty, as "guided by the thought of the American labor" and a comparison of the agreed version with the one drafted by the American delegation seems to give him satisfaction (Gompers, 1921, p. 328-329). In the same time, the cables he exchanged with the President, through the Department of State, demonstrate Wilson's commitment to approaching social justice in the text of the Covenant (Gompers, 1921, p. 330-333).

This division among members of the Commission was natural, given their different experiences and labor philosophies. Unlike Gompers, a true trade-unionist, the three European leaders, Vandervelde (Belgium), Thomas (France), and Henderson (United Kingdom), were all politically affiliated to the Socialist, respectively, Labor parties. As such, they represented political interests and wanted to express them in the framework of the Conference, while the American desired a politically-free agenda (Van Daele, 2005, p. 441). The Europeans were also willing to entrust their governments and administrations with the task of improving social welfare, starting from the premise that all decisions at the Conference required implementation by governments (Van Daele, 2005, p. 455). This was again a sharp distinction against Gompers' view and his focus on privatism.

A number of authors attempt to determine the responsibility for the birth of the ILO. Shotwell, a leading member of the U.S. delegation, ascribes it to the leaders of state and/or government (Tosstorff, 2005, p. 400). Van Daele identifies members of political parties and scholars concerned with social issues; he even explicitly mentions the role of epistemic communities, in a narrower Haas' sense, that politicians and social reformists from the academia formed long before the Peace Conference (Van Daele, 2005). Tosstorff (2005) shifts the focus toward the already existing international trade-union movements and their previous work consisting of a plethora of conferences and meetings, including the Berne Conference that was held simultaneously with the Peace Conference. This paper takes a distinct approach in this matter: it focuses on what was actually obtained from a security studies perspective and considers all the above mentioned parties as constituents of the larger epistemic community that made the creation of ILO possible and thus added the social dimension to the security concept. Commonalities do matter more than divergences from this perspective, and the final outcome would not have been possible without this fortunate combination of factors: the already existing knowledge, shared and channeled through the trade-union movements, and the will of the actual decision-makers.

In this respect, the following preamble to the ILO, Part XIII of the Versailles Treaty, was read and adopted in the plenary session of the Peace Conference: "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" (ILO Official Bulletin, vol. I, 1923, p. 332). The connection of the two dimensions could not have been expressed clearer: social issues are an integral part of security, since social "injustice, hardship and privation" produce instability that endangers world peace. Even the necessary measures

are specified and they evidently pertain to social security: regulating working hours and labor supply, preventing unemployment, providing adequate wages, healthcare, labor protection and pensions, organizing vocational and technical education, as well as respecting the freedom of association (ILO Official Bulletin, vol. I, 1923, p. 332).

Moreover, the signatories emphasized the importance of the workers' wellbeing, in an all-encompassing sense: intellectual, moral and physical, as well as their status: "not merely commodities of commerce" (ILO Official Bulletin, vol. I, 1923, p. 332). Furthermore, the principles delineating all discussions and potential regulations in the framework of the ILO are stipulated as follows: (1) labor is not a commodity of commerce; (2) both employees and employers have the right of association; (3) wages should allow for reasonable quality of life; (4) the working day is set to eight hours, while the week to 48 hours; (5) a day off is required per week, Sunday whenever possible; (6) child labor is outlawed, while young persons' labor should be framed to allow their continuous educational and physical development; (7) men and women are paid equally for the same work; (8) native and migrant workers benefit from equal treatment; (9) a monitoring system, overseeing the enforcement of social protection plans, is recommended (ILO Official Bulletin, vol. I, 1923, p. 345-347). Listing these principles is eloquent since they constituted the basis and frame for the initiation of social protection and justice policies and legislations among a great number of countries, including Romania. The consequence was thus profound not just conceptually, but also factually.

Final considerations

This paper argued for the role played by the epistemic community, in a broader sense, particularly American Progressivism, in adding a social dimension to individual, national and international security. "Freedom from want" joined to "freedom from fear" in a more comprehensive understanding of the security concept almost a century ago, within the larger framework of the League of Nations, the precursor of the United Nations, through the International Labor Organization. Social needs may have been refined, or indeed changed, in the last decades, but they still play an important part in the security sector, especially when considered in connection with economics and politics. Greece is an eloquent example.

The rallying of politicians, trade-unionists, scholars and activists produced an outcome which induced deep social changes among human

communities. It is almost a truism to acknowledge that history repeats itself, but the similarities are striking. By the late 1800s, economies around the world were shifting from predominantly agrarian to industrial ones – today we are entering a post-industrial era. Migration flows were having the same social impact then and now. The role of the state was rethought back then, in the midst of the depression, and such is the case today, when we are going through times of economic and financial crisis. Unemployment is on the rise once again, as was in late 19th century. Even our political system, within the EU, is scrutinized in terms of its democratic extent and nature. The need for Progressivism is back, a fact that is clearly demonstrated when examining the discourses on the American political scene.

Likewise, we are rethinking the security concept. Needless to say, considering the dangers of securitization, as suggested by the Copenhagen School, there are many challenges to designing effective security strategies but it is a fact that the deepening and broadening of the concept is taking place. However, paying careful attention is a must, in order to avoid them. In an age of globalization and post-modernity, when territoriality gained a different status, social issues cannot be conceived in purely domestic terms. The work left undone or compromised at Versailles should be taken into account once again. We may have a more vibrant civil society and equally educated scholars, but who is going to be the next Wilson or Lloyd George, the next politicians able to integrate all creative and constructive forces in order to think and act across cultural or interest gaps?

Acknowledgement: This paper is made and published under the aegis of the Research Institute for the Quality of Life, Romanian Academy, as part of the programme co-funded by the European Union within the Operational Sectorial Programme for Human Resources Development through the project "Pluri and interdisciplinary in doctoral and post-doctoral programmes". Project Code: POSDRU/159/1.5/S/141086.

References:

1. Annan Kofi, (1999) *Towards a Culture of Peace*, in Mayor Federico (ed.), *Letters to Future Generations*, UNESCO Publishing, Paris.
2. Balázs József, (1985) *A Note on the Interpretation of Security*, in *Development and Peace*, no. 6.
3. Baldwin David A., (1997) *The Concept of Security*, in *Review of International Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1.

4. Baylis John, (2008) *International and Global Security*, in Baylis John, Smith Steve, Owens Patricia (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations* (fourth edition), Oxford University Press, Oxford.
5. Booth Ken, (1991) *Security and Emancipation*, in *Review of International Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4.
6. Buzan Barry, Hansen Lene, (2009) *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
7. Buzan Barry, Wæver Ole, de Wilde Jaap, (1998) *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London.
8. Buzan Barry, (1991) *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London.
9. Buzan Barry, (1983) *People, States, and Fear. The National Security Problem in International Relations*, Wheatsheaf Books, a member of the Harvester Press Group, Brighton.
10. Gompers Samuel, (1921) *The Labor Clauses of the Treaty*, in House Edward Mandell, Seymour Charles (eds.), *What Really Happened at Paris. The Story of the Peace Conference, 1918-1919, by American Delegates*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
11. Gottfried Paul, (1990) *Wilsonianism: The Legacy that Won't Die*, in *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, vol. IX, no.2.
12. Haas Peter M., (1992) *Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, in *International Organization*, vol. 46, no. 1.
13. Hampson Fen Osler, (2008) *Human Security*, in Williams Paul D. (ed.), *Security Studies. An Introduction*, Routledge, New York.
14. International Labor Office, (1923) *Official Bulletin*, vol. I, April 1919 – August 1920, Geneva.
15. Jaycox Faith, (2005) *The Progressive Era*, Facts on File, New York.
16. Kaufmann Franz-Xaver, (2013) *Thinking about Social Policy. The German Tradition*, Springer, Berlin.
17. Knock Thomas J., (1992) *To End All Wars. Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
18. Link William A., Link Susannah J., (2012) *The Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, Wiley Blackwell, Malden.
19. Macmillan Margaret, (2003) *Paris 1919. Six Months that Changed the World*, Random House, New York.
20. Mcneese Tim, (2010) *The Gilded Age and Progressivism. 1891-1923*, Chelsea House, an imprint of Infobase Publishing, New York.
21. Nugent Walter, (2010) *Progressivism. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, New York.
22. Paris Roland, (2001) *Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?*, in *International Security*, vol. 26, no. 2.
23. Pastorello Karen, (2014) *The Progressives. Activism and Reform in American Society, 1893-1917*, Wiley Blackwell, Malden.

24. Peoples Columba, Vaughan-Williams Nick, (2010) *Critical Security Studies. An Introduction*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, New York.
25. Pestritto Ronald, (2005) *Woodrow Wilson and the Roots of Modern Liberalism (American Intellectual Culture)*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham.
26. Powell Lyman P., Hodgins Fred B. (eds.), (1919) *America and the League of Nations. Addresses in Europe, Woodrow Wilson*, Rand McNally and Co, Chicago.
27. Read Antony, (2008) *The World on Fire: 1919 and the Battle with Bolshevism*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York.
28. Scott BERG Andrew, (2013) *Wilson*, Putnam's Sons, New York.
29. Thomas Caroline, (2000) *Global Governance, Development and Human Security*, Pluto Press, London. Tosstorff Reiner, (2005) *The International Trade-Union Movement and the Founding of the International Labour Organization*, in *International Review of Social History*, no. 50.
30. Ullman Richard, (1983) *Redefining Security*, in *International Security*, vol. 8, no. 1.
31. United Nations Development Program, *Human Development Report 1993*, available online http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/222/hdr_1993_en_complete_nostats.pdf, last accessed 01.06.2015.
32. United Nations Development Program, *Human Development Report 1994*, available online http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf, last accessed 01.06.2015.
33. Van Daele Jasmien, (2005) *Engineering Social Peace: Networks, Ideas, and the Founding of the International Labor Organization*, in *International Review of Social History*, no. 50.
34. Wolfers Arnold, (1952) *National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol*, in *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 67, no. 4.