

Towards a Social History of International Organisations: The ILO and the Internationalisation of Western Social Expertise (1919–1949)

Sandrine Kott

Having for long been a field of study reserved for political scientists and international relations specialists, international organisations are now attracting growing interest among historians.¹ This increased interest can be explained by the movement to “globalise” the discipline both in terms of its themes and its practices. While no single, accepted definition of global history exists, the majority of authors agree that a “universal” definition of the global should be rejected² and instead global history should be seen as an invitation to explore the connections, circulations, and cross-fertilisations that have so often been neglected within the framework of national case studies.³ International organisations and associations are particularly fertile areas of study in this regard: they represent spaces in which one can reveal the existence of networks of relationships and systems of circulation (*régimes circulatoires*) and explore the

S. Kott (✉)
University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
e-mail: sandrine.kott@unige.ch

© The Author(s) 2018
M.B. Jerónimo and J.P. Monteiro (eds.), *Internationalism, Imperialism and the Formation of the Contemporary World*, Palgrave Macmillan
Transnational History Series, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60693-4_2

connections between the local, the national, and the global and, indeed, the process of internationalisation itself.⁴

To this end, it is important, however, to move beyond the debate between realists and functionalists which has dominated the study of international organisations, the crux of the argument being whether international organisations can be considered as international actors in their own right.⁵ The emergence and development of international organisations in the second half of the nineteenth century in Europe were, in fact, contemporaneous to the spread of the nation-state model and the nationalisation of European societies.⁶ The dissolution of empires on the European continent after the First World War and the accompanying proliferation of nation-states made it necessary, according to the realists, to create permanent institutions capable of regulating conflicts. International organisations, they argue, were structurally dependent on the states that both financed them and set the rules of their functioning and thus became powerless spectators to the balance of power between states. This fact, realists claim, is demonstrated by the “failure” of the League of Nations (LoN) in the face of the imperialist ambitions of certain states and, more recently, by the powerlessness of the UN.

This pessimistic observation is based on an understanding of the international organisation as a diplomatic forum dominated by state and national interests. However, if one examines the organisations “from the inside” then one discovers a social space populated by a diverse array of actors: diplomats, of course, but also functionaries and experts whose identity was defined not only by their national origin but also by their participation in a number of international and national networks. By examining their activities and their trajectories, one can demonstrate how these actors participated in the international circulation of knowledge and expertise.⁷ These circulations highlight the existence of international networks, of course, but they were only possible thanks to the existence of specific groups and milieus within different national and/or local societies. It is at the intersection of these different levels that international organisations become sites where “the international” is produced. As such, international organisations are, I would argue, not so much *actors* in global governance as they are *sites* of internationalisation.

Studying this “mechanism of internationalisation” requires a methodological shift. Besides the study of grand plenary conferences, moments which favoured national antagonisms, it is important to re-evaluate the

work of the secretariats, commissions, and technical agencies and to make use of documents or archives produced by the functionaries and experts who worked in them. Using archival documents in preference to the profusion of official documents published by international organisations has two main advantages: it tells us about the gradual and often conflict-ridden processes that lay behind internationalisation and it allows us to pinpoint the diverse actors involved in this process.

When viewed from the perspective of their secretariats and expert committees, international organisations are revealed as spaces structured by the relations between individuals and groups of actors. But these relationships only make sense if we carefully contextualise them within the shifting geographical, institutional, and historical spaces in which they took place. The personnel files of functionaries and experts conserved in the archives of the International Labour Office or of the League of Nations (other organisations do not always grant access to such files) are, in this respect, a valuable resource. They provide information on the social and cultural profiles of the functionaries and experts and on the networks to which they belonged. This allows us to understand how a professional group is made up and how this group, at the intersection between different national social scenes and spaces, could develop and disseminate an international normativity.

In this article, the heuristic advantages of this methodological approach will be demonstrated on the basis of research undertaken in the archives of the International Labour Organisation (henceforth ILO). I will proceed in four stages. Firstly, I will address the question of the truly international character of the ILO, studying it as a site where numerous non-governmental, liberal Western European networks coalesced.⁸ I will then approach the nature of international organisation through the national/international dialectic, demonstrating, by using the German example, that it was on the basis of national expertise that international normativity was developed. Following this German example, I will then study how the German Third Reich developed its own alternative, brown internationalism, developing a social imperialism, and how it conflicted with liberal internationalism. Finally, in contrast to Nazi imperialism, I will look at the mechanisms through which the liberal social normativity was exported to “peripheral” spaces and, in the process, re-appropriated. For each of these points I will highlight the decisive role of the International Labour Office (henceforth Office)—or permanent

secretariat—by examining the correspondence and reports produced by its functionaries and experts.⁹

FROM REFORMIST NETWORKS TO THE TRANSNATIONAL SPACE OF SOCIAL REFORM

Reconstructing the origins of international organisations allows us to go beyond an “idealist” standpoint and to understand the processes and social and political networks that allowed the former to emerge. In different fields, the decades before and after First World War, and around the pivotal date of 1900 and the Paris Universal Exhibition, were a crucial moment in the gradual institutionalisation of these networks.¹⁰ The field of social reform provides a good illustration of this process. In major industrial countries, reformist networks¹¹ were formed at the end of the nineteenth century by representatives holding public office, professors, employers, and trade unionists. They gave rise to diverse international associations,¹² among them the International Association for Labour Legislation (henceforth IALL), founded in 1900. The latter brought together social reformers and experts on social questions, who were organised into national associations that were powerful in Germany, the United States, and France but weaker in Great Britain. From 1901 onwards, this association had a library and a permanent secretariat, under the leadership of the Austrian economist Stefan Bauer, in the Swiss city of Basel.¹³ This centre became the seedbed for what would subsequently become the International Labour Organisation.¹⁴ Several individuals embodied the continuity between the old current of social reform, particularly the International Association for Labour Legislation, and the new international organisation. The director of the new organisation, Albert Thomas, a French social reformer, was himself a member of the French branch of the IALL. Sophy Sanger, an eminent member of the British branch, took charge of the legislative section of the ILO, becoming the only female head of section. She was assisted in the task by Eduard Schlupe and Edouard Thommen, who had both been employed by the IALL in Basel.

The creation of the ILO took place, however, in the specific context of the peace settlement established after the First World War. The statutes of the new international organisation were defined by Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles, its objective expressed in the following

terms: “universal peace...can be established only if it is based on social justice”, which in turn had to be rooted in “sentiments of justice and humanity.”¹⁵ This threefold aim—peace, justice and humanity—led to the compromise passed in 1919 between the representatives of governments, the reformist labour movement, and liberal social reformers.¹⁶ This compromise pursued an objective of social (re)conciliation embodied in the tripartite structure of the organisation: as such it represented a clear counter-model to the Communist project.¹⁷ Universal in ambition, the ILO was in fact the outcome of a liberal, European-based internationalism and it owes its longevity to the groups and associations that shared the aims of this liberal internationalism.

The trade union movement, which found its place within the ILO thanks to the organisation’s tripartite character,¹⁸ became its most natural supporter. During the early years, the trade union international, of social-democratic allegiance, as well as the socialist movement, provided a significant proportion of the functionaries and conference delegates.¹⁹ But this network of the socialist reform movement was soon joined by social Catholicism. The Christian trade unionist Hermann Henseler was recruited in 1921.²⁰ After Albert Thomas’s visit to the Vatican in Rome, the first Jesuit father, Arnou, was appointed as advisor on religious affairs. To this day, a Jesuit has always performed this role for the director general, a reminder of the fact that the Catholic Church is the oldest and a very powerful international organisation.²¹

The functionaries of the Office strove tirelessly, moreover, to surround the organisation with a dense network of international and national associations liable to support its activities. Albert Thomas played a decisive role, for instance, in the creation of the International Association for Social Progress (henceforth IASP), which made it possible to amalgamate the diverse pre-war associations.²² Although autonomous, this association was clearly dominated by the staff of the Office. Albert Thomas and Arthur Fontaine, head of the Governing Body, were members; Louis Varlez, the association’s deputy secretary was also a functionary of the Office, while his secretary, Adeodat Boissard, was a long-time friend of Albert Thomas.²³ During the association’s founding congress in Prague in 1924, the British members Lady Hall and Joseph Cohen fiercely defended the independence of the new association, but Albert Thomas immediately asserted that its mission was to support the action of the ILO.²⁴ At the association’s annual general meeting in 1931, Thomas restated that he expected it to bring the ILO “assistance in propaganda,

and the support of public opinion that you can foster and encourage.”²⁵ Within the IASP there were politicians and high civil servants who played the role of informal intermediaries between the association and their respective national governments and publics, a role encouraged by the association’s organisation into national sections. In the 1920s, moreover, the creation of new sections of the IASP in the Balkans went hand in hand with the extension of the activities of the ILO into these countries.²⁶

The ILO had a particularly desperate need to develop its links to national public opinion and national parliamentary milieus in order to accelerate the ratification process of the international labour conventions. To meet this need, the IASP had inscribed in its statutes that such support was one of its priorities. A commission met regularly to take stock of the state of ratifications.²⁷

The support of associations outside the ILO played a crucial role in the field of social insurance, which was one of the primary fields of ILO intervention.²⁸ Working on insurance made it possible to associate a multitude of actors with the ILO’s activities. The functionaries of the ILO could draw on the vast network of Socialist and, later, Christian Mutuality. This network would provide members and support for the *Association des unions nationales de sociétés de secours mutuels et de caisses d’assurances maladie*,²⁹ currently the *International Social Security Association*, founded by Adrien Tixier and Oswald Stein, both functionaries of the social insurance section of the Office. The new association founded in 1927 aimed to support the normative decisions of the ILO and to counterbalance the influence of the Swiss-based associations of doctors and private insurance companies that were attempting to organise themselves at that time.³⁰ The post of secretary of this international association was first held by the ILO officials Adrien Tixier and Oswald Stein.³¹ After the Second World War, Aladar Métal, a member of the social insurance section of the Office from 1931 to 1949, held the position of secretary general of the International Association of Social Security while another functionary, Flores, became secretary general of the Inter-American Conference on Social Security founded in 1940 with the support of the Office.³² Albert Thomas underlined the importance of these international networks for the legitimacy of the ILO: “our international organisation, our Office, would be nothing but a hollow bureaucratic organisation if we were not surrounded by all the living forces of social life and did not feel around us all the intellectual forces,

trade union forces, insurance systems, in short all those in the world who aspire to a better social life.”³³ For the first director of the organisation, the very legitimacy of the organisation’s activity and its ability to act rested on the constitution of an international public opinion, which he expected to act as a counterweight to the power of governmental priorities.

The ILO, therefore, was very much a site where liberal international/European networks of social reform coalesced. It had in part its own origins in these networks, and it also facilitated and encouraged their organisation and growth. However, this specifically transnational aspect of the International Labour Organisation did not eliminate the role played by national objectives and national actors, just as it did not weaken the resonance of the national frame of reference in the construction of international normativity. The truly international dimension of this organisation was, in reality, based on its constant negotiation back and forth with national societies (and not only with national governments) and would therefore conflict with the imperialist views of some of its members.

INTERNATIONAL EXPERTISE OR DENATIONALISED NATIONAL KNOWLEDGE

The actors—the functionaries and experts of international organisations—were trained and socialised in national spaces and many had previously held, or were closely linked to, national offices. In their new international functions, moreover, they mobilised national knowledge and references. The ILO also depended on national governments and administrations for its funding and above all for statistical information and documentation, the collection of which being one of the fundamental missions of the organisation.³⁴ Finally, the support of national public opinions was essential to ILO’s survival. The establishment of national branch offices was an expression of this dependence; these offices played the role of intermediaries and essential interfaces with national societies. Branch offices were opened in Paris, Washington, London, and Rome in 1919–1920, in Berlin in 1921, and in Tokyo in 1924.³⁵ Alongside these national branches, six national correspondents were added in 1930.³⁶ The decision to establish these offices illustrates the real importance of some national spaces for the ILO, mostly located in the Western hemisphere. This importance did not necessarily intersect with their diplomatic importance; it should be noted in particular that the United States,

which did not join the organisation until 1934, had a branch office from 1919 onwards, while Germany, apparently internationally marginalised, had the largest branch office at the end of the 1920s.

This national/international dialectic is essential for understanding how international social expertise was constructed. During the interwar period, and especially during the 1920s, normative activity (the development of conventions and recommendations) was at the heart of the ILO's activities.³⁷ These norms were intended to regulate industrial and agricultural working conditions in the framework of the capitalist economic system. The legitimacy of the "legislative work" of the ILO was gradually reinforced as the functionaries of the Office were able to demonstrate their social "expertise."³⁸ Conventions were developed and adopted at the end of a preparatory process, the rules of which were stabilised in the course of the 1920s, and which always proceeded, as it still does today, from a skilful negotiation back and forth between the information and recommendations of governments and national actors and the international functionaries. All convention work is prepared through a long process of information gathering for which different nation-states serve as veritable reservoirs of experience. The meticulous nature of this documentary work and above all the fact that it could provide an irrefutable source of evidence was essential both for the chances of success of the conventions and for the long-term survival of the institution as a whole. The widely recognised quality of this documentary work allowed the Office to establish its legitimacy in the eyes of the different governments that financed it, and allowed it to draft conventions which it could hope would attract a greater number of signatories. These activities of information gathering, report writing, and expertise amassing quickly assumed a central place in the work of the Office's staff. In the ILO's early years, a lack of qualified personnel justified the recourse to individuals referred to by officials as "experts." In the early 1920s, the director asserted his right to appoint such experts himself based solely on their abilities: "For questions of a scientific nature," he stated in 1921, "it is desirable that the choice of experts be made based on considerations of individual competence."³⁹

Nevertheless, the appointment of experts soon became a subject of heated discussions within the Governing Body between the director, Albert Thomas, and the government representatives. In 1923, Giuseppe de Michelis,⁴⁰ commissioner general for the Italian government, asserted, moreover, that: "it is our opinion that the foreign government should have its say in the choice of all persons who are to sit on special or

technical committees. Ultimately, we believe that the head of the Office should ask either the government representative or the government concerned for a certain number of names fulfilling the desired conditions, from which the Office will choose the experts appointed to participate in meetings.”⁴¹ By 1925 the governments had managed to assert their control over the nomination of experts. On the correspondence committee for social insurance in the 1920s, the first appointments of this kind were Andreas Grieser for Germany, Walter Kinnear for Great Britain⁴² and Gaston Roussel for France: all three were heads of the insurance departments in their respective governments.

The functionaries of the Office conceded to this kind of haggling because the experts fulfilled an important institutional function and were important intermediaries between the Office and the national level.⁴³ Nevertheless, the national origin of experts was not only linked to “political haggling” between governments and international functionaries, but also bore witness to the capacity of a national space to produce and promote specific expertise. The state of social legislation in different countries, the different ways insurance had been institutionalised, and the varying degrees of state involvement in these institutions therefore all played an important role in the appointment of experts. This explains why Germans were so clearly overrepresented in the experts committee on social insurance.⁴⁴ What has sometimes been interpreted as a kind of hegemony of the German model of social insurance, managed by the employers’ and workers’ representatives at the Office, in fact had its origins in the capacity of this national system to produce competent “specialists” in the eyes of the ILO. German experts thus played an essential role in the insurance conventions of the 1920s and 1930s. Andreas Grieser, head of the social insurance department at the Ministry of Labour in Berlin, sat as an expert on the commission on social insurance in the Office from 1926 and was a member of the German delegation to the labour conferences in 1925 and 1927. He was also the reporting member of the insurance commission at the International Labour Conference of 1927. As such, he exercised considerable influence over the drafting of the convention on sickness insurance, the final version of which was very close, in spirit, to the German sickness insurance law of 1884. In this way, Andreas Grieser made a decisive contribution to the internationalisation of the German social insurance system.⁴⁵

But while experts were specialists from a particular national system, the triumph of one solution or another was also linked to the

international support which it received. As such, the internationalisation of the German social insurance model was not only the result of the effectiveness of German experts but was also linked to the support that this solution received from the social reform movement and the international labour movement, which had adopted it as a model in 1904.⁴⁶ The German social insurance model, managed by the employers and workers, in fact clearly strengthened the position of the trade unions; it represented, moreover, the foundation of a form of social democracy defended, and in some respects embodied, by the ILO. In this way, the ILO helped to universalise the German social insurance model that had already been “denationalised” by the international labour movement.

International expertise was therefore created as the result of a complex process. While the possession of know-how played a role, it was not enough, and international expertise cannot automatically be inferred from the existence of an ideal international “epistemic community.”⁴⁷ On the other hand, even if they were sent by their national governments, international functionaries and experts did not necessarily represent them.⁴⁸ They also belonged to specific social spaces within their national space and they participated in international networks. The functionaries of the Office, meanwhile, sought primarily to strengthen the position of the institution in general, as well as their own place within it. This objective led them to join up with national actors who were best placed to bring about the victory of the normative decisions carried by the ILO.⁴⁹

The selection of experts, clearly driven by a concern for institutional effectiveness, was thus adapted to national and local realities. In 1933, when the Nazis came to power, Andreas Grieser, who embodied German international openness, was relieved of his functions at the Ministry; soon afterwards he was struck off the list of experts. What happened next is also clearly revealing of the contradiction between the liberal international project of the ILO and the “imperial project” of the Third Reich.

THE CHALLENGE OF SOCIAL IMPERIALISM: THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST MODEL

As early as January 1933, the Secretary of State of the German Ministry of Labour (RAM) tried to negotiate a new place for Germany in the ILO, but the national-socialist Labour Front (DAF) adopted from the start a policy of rupture. Its very existence was profoundly contradictory

with the liberal tripartite nature of the organisation and the role played within in the ILO by reformist trade unionism. During his short stay in Geneva as workers representative for the international labour conference in June 1933, Robert Ley made provocative statements about the ILO, which he described as a temple of Marxism, and caused offence to the Latin American delegates.⁵⁰ In return, the president of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Belgian trade unionist Walter Schevenels, questioned whether the German workers' delegation was truly representative, the DAF being, he claimed, the result of the systematic destruction of union freedom in Germany.⁵¹ In protest, the delegation left the conference⁵² and Germany demanded its withdrawal from the ILO in October 1933. The hard line of the DAF had, as such, won out over the softer approach of the RAM. Nevertheless, in press articles, former German functionaries at the ILO who were seconded by the Labour ministry defended the legitimacy of the German withdrawal by casting doubt on the effectiveness of international conventions and calling for the development of bilateral treaties.⁵³ Indeed, since 1933 Germany had signed bilateral treaties on social insurance with Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Denmark which were meant to make it easier for Germany to hire desperately needed labour from these countries.

From 1939 onwards plans were made to create a German-based ILO to replace what was denounced as a Western European liberal organisation. The RAM proposed to organise a loose association between the states allied with Germany and in particular with Italy with the aim of multiplying bilateral agreements and more generally of sharing information on social policy.⁵⁴ In 1940, Oskar Karstedt, who was chairing the working group on international affairs in the German Labour Ministry, went as far as to state that among the handful of German functionaries who remained in Geneva, some had offered their services to the ministry in the belief that the moribund ILO would soon have a German successor.⁵⁵

None of that came to fruition, but the idea of re-launching a German-based international labour organisation was indeed seriously pursued by the DAF which, beginning in 1935, was developing a veritable international social programme based on the alleged exemplarity of the leisure policy (*Kraft durch Freude*) of the Third Reich.⁵⁶ In 1941 the representatives of the DAF took steps to occupy the ILO's building in Geneva; the Swiss authorities, cautiously, did not follow up this request.⁵⁷ At the end of the same year, Robert Ley intended to transform the central office of *Strength Through Joy*, which he had run since 1933, into a central

office for an international social organisation. From 1941 to 1944 this office published the *Neue internationale Rundschau der Arbeit*, which was meant to replace the old *Internationale Rundschau der Arbeit*, published by the ILO until 1939.⁵⁸ An article by Robert Ley introduced the first issue;⁵⁹ those that followed were written in a triumphal, repetitive, and obscure style.⁶⁰ The message, without much substance, amounted to a virulent attack against the Treaty of Versailles, seen as the origin of an international system founded on grand principles of justice but which in reality allowed the domination by the power of money. The new brown internationalism, on the other hand, would give a fair place to those peoples with the strongest life force, particularly the German people.⁶¹ The European social policy promoted by the DAF clearly sought to protect the German worker and to attract the foreign labour that the new Reich needed.

The international practices and objectives of the RAM were expressed in more sober language, but the European ambitions of the ministry were no less real.⁶² The war opened up new possibilities for German social expertise, and in 1939 Labour minister Seldte proudly stated that the ministry would take charge of the spread of the German model “without needing to make a detour through the International Labour Office.”⁶³ A special *Referat* was created to study the social policies abroad and to advertise the German social realisations. The ministry sought to organise visits for foreign experts to the institutions of German social policy.⁶⁴ From April 1940 to December 1944 this *Referat* published the very rich and extremely well-documented *Sozialpolitische Weltrundschau* in order to keep the Ministry staff informed about social developments worldwide. This strategy of information also rested on the networks and expertise acquired by the RAM officials in the Geneva Office. The advance of the German armies, meanwhile, opened up new spaces for the RAM. It allowed functionaries to introduce, directly or indirectly, the social policies relating to their expertise, facilitating the process of putting occupied populations to work for the Nazi war machine. For RAM officials, the greater German Reich was a new departure in the internationalisation of German social policy⁶⁵; symbolically, a former colonial officer and specialist in African social policy, Oskar Karstedt, was put in charge of this *Referat* for International Affairs. As two functionaries of the Office put it in February 1941, German international social policy, serving the sole aim of European domination, had become totalitarian and needed to be internationally resisted.⁶⁶ As one

of the only remaining liberal international actors, the ILO, which had moved to Montreal in March 1940, entered the war against the Nazi imperial project.

CIRCULATION OR EXPORTATION OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE

During the war, ILO officials multiplied missions in Latin American countries seeking to thwart the propaganda efforts of the Nazi authorities towards a Latin American public opinion assumed to be hostile to the hegemonic power of the United States. The ILO expert Emil Schönbaum, who had been professor of mathematics and head of actuarial and statistical methods at the Czechoslovak General Institute of Pensions and managed to escape from Czechoslovakia in 1939, wrote the social security code for Ecuador and helped the Mexican and Chilean governments to establish a system of social insurance; he was also active in Paraguay and Venezuela and established a miners' pension scheme in Bolivia.⁶⁷ Emil Schönbaum could build on a long expertise since in the interwar years he had been sent as an ILO expert to Eastern European countries to set up social insurance schemes.

Indeed, at the end of the 1920s, the normative framework of the organisation was fixed and social legislation everywhere was threatened by the economic crisis.⁶⁸ The functionaries of the Office went to great efforts to disseminate the social expertise amassed during its first decade, to attempt to adjust national legislation in accordance with international norms, and to increase the number of ratifications. As such, they pursued a twofold aim of disseminating and universalising norms while at the same time working to strengthen the ILO. To this end, they invited representatives of national administrations to Geneva to train them in the diverse techniques of social intervention. Moreover, on the request of governments, they travelled to a wide range of countries on technical missions. Around 60 missions of technical assistance were carried out by the ILO before the establishment of the first major development programme by the United Nations in 1949.⁶⁹

The most experienced functionaries and the handful of experts they recruited became, in a way, the missionaries of the ILO; they exported the technical know-how that they produced in three favoured fields: social insurance, industrial hygiene, and labour legislation. In Europe

itself, the Balkans represented a first testing ground.⁷⁰ In 1929, after the return to power of the liberal Eleftherios Venizelos, Adrien Tixier, head of the social insurance section, travelled to Greece, and during the same year, the section produced a report of 100 pages on the first version of the social insurance law. He then made two study trips to Athens to help the head of the insurance office to complete the drafting of the bill. Emil Schönbaum was then sent by the Office as an expert advisor to the Greek government. He played an important role in the introduction of the 1932 accident and sickness insurance law, which drew heavily on the conventions of the ILO.⁷¹ This law, Adrien Tixier was pleased to note, was “one of the very rare examples of progress in social insurance legislation that we are able to report.”⁷²

This missionary zeal also extended beyond Europe, however, and the action of the ILO was quickly globalised. In 1931 Camille Pône travelled to China to develop the country’s labour laws, and Ferdinand Maurette returned there in 1934 on an educational mission. The director, Harold Butler, twice travelled to Egypt, in 1931 and 1938, to assist in the establishment of hygiene measures and a labour code. But it was above all the countries of Latin America which became the favoured sites of missions: Cuba in 1934, Brazil and Chile in 1936, and in 1938 the Czech actuary Anton Zelenka⁷³ was sent to Venezuela.⁷⁴ In the Venezuelan case, the envoys of the Office were able to collaborate with jurists open to international influences in favour of a context of gradual democratisation of the country’s institutions, and in 1940 Venezuela adopted a social insurance law that took up most of the recommendations of the Zelenka mission; this law even explicitly mentioned the collaboration of the Office and included a list of international conventions on which it was based.⁷⁵ During the Second World War, when the Office had moved to Montreal and financial contributions from European countries had been cut off, these technical aid activities had a commercial objective: the functionaries exchanged their expertise for government contributions. This was the clear impression given by Adrien Tixier when he conducted expert advisory missions to the Mexican and Peruvian labour ministries on the question of social security and the labour code.⁷⁶

Beyond the specific war context, the technical aid missions also pursued a wider political objective because, through the tripartite system of managing social questions, the functionaries of the Office exported a model of democratic society directed against Nazism as well as against Communism. It was on these grounds that Salvador Allende, Chilean

Health Minister in the Popular Front government of Aguirre Cerda, defended the tripartite model of social insurance at the meeting of the Governing Body in New York in October/November 1941.⁷⁷ The Chilean government, moreover, invited the states of the Americas to the Inter-American Social Security Conference in September 1942; in his inaugural address, the Mexican Minister of Labour García Téllez underlined the importance of social security for world democracy.⁷⁸ As such, the functionaries and experts of the ILO were incontestably participating in a process of exporting models of political and social organisation developed in Western Europe to the periphery. But this exportation was only possible insofar these policies met with local actors willing to support them. Thus, in Central Europe, the rapid political developments, and especially the establishment of dictatorial regimes opposed to the forms of self-administration of insurance promoted by the ILO, put an end to its activities in this region of the world in the 1930s.⁷⁹

It would be false, moreover, to believe that the countries that received technical aid were passive recipients. Since the end of the 1920s, the countries of South Eastern Europe and Latin America had been expressing reservations about a policy that contented itself with universalising the norms produced in the West and demanded action better suited to their needs. During the same period, under the influence of representatives of Asian countries, particularly India, the Office had also begun to reflect on the global political inequalities produced by the widening socio-economic gap between different countries. This realisation was closely linked to the preparation of the convention (29) on forced labour, which sought to regulate the use of “native labour.”⁸⁰ By advocating the abolition of forced colonial labour, which, it established, should eventually be replaced by paid work, Convention 29 and the discussions which preceded it implicitly put forward a vision for the reasonable, acceptable exploitation of dependent territories, trying therefore to stabilise the colonial project of Western European.

From 1943 onwards, at a time when the ILO was gradually being marginalised in plans for European reconstruction, the Office returned to this consideration of the social and economic improvement of underdeveloped countries and “dependent territories.”⁸¹ In an article published in the *International Labour Review* in February 1943, Wilfrid Benson, the functionary in charge of colonial questions, put forward a programme of reforms for the colonies which, cautiously, underlined the need to implement a policy of economic and social development

and encouraged the internationalisation of these questions. This opened the way for a series of conventions and recommendations discussed and adopted between 1944 and 1947 during the international conferences in Philadelphia (1944), Paris (1945), and Geneva (1947), which aimed to promote the development of “dependent territories.” Appropriated by local elites, these early development projects therefore provided an argument in favour of demands for independence and the right to choose one’s own path to modernity.⁸² As such, they converged with the demands made in the 1930s by actors in the Balkans, the Middle East, Latin America, and China.⁸³

Just as the production of social knowledge amounted to more than simply the “product” of the functionaries of the ILO, its circulation resulted from more than a simple process of exportation. In order to circulate, this knowledge needed to meet the interest of local social groups and to be appropriated locally by them. In return, this process brought about a shift in the priorities of the organisation.

CONCLUSION

Social historians have been rightly wary of the transnational turn which tends to provide a rather conflict-free image of the circulation of knowledge and expertise and to focus its attention on dominant nations and social groups.⁸⁴ I have attempted to demonstrate in this article how, and within what limits, social historians can use international organisations as a means of escaping this embellished vision of global or transnational history, while at the same time avoiding methodological nationalism.

The International Labour Organisation provides an excellent field of study. It allows us to demonstrate that international organisations were not superimposed over national goals, but that they instead institutionalised existing exchanges and circulations. It confirms, moreover, the importance of international circulations in the development of social policies from the late nineteenth century onwards, an issue that has been obscured by the more vocal claims of national governments, which not only took the sole credit for the policies implemented but also attempted to present themselves as the essential, if not the only, actors in international discussions.

In turn, studying the ILO also highlights the forms of interdependence that cross over between the national and international levels. In return they became spaces of powerful legitimisation for states, as well

as for certain national actors seeking to promote specific solutions that were sometimes opposed within their own countries. In this respect, the study of debates surrounding the choice of ILO experts allows us to “denationalise” social policies. The interwar period saw, through the International Labour Office, the triumph of a “German-style” model of insurance that was redistributive and self-managed. The development of this model benefited from the wealth of expertise from Germany, but its spread depended on the existence of “organised international forces” capable of denationalising this national solution and on the existence of an organisation liable to facilitate its internationalisation.

This internationalisation process conflicted with the imperial project pursued by the Nazis, who were claiming to offer an alternative internationalism grounded in the vitality of the German nation. During the war, the ILO tried to oppose the National Socialist social propaganda, particularly in those parts of the world under a colonial or semi-colonial (Eastern Europe, Latin America) situation. The Nazis argued that the ILO, by exporting the democratic liberal model of social policy, also served “imperial interest.” Nevertheless, the success of such international missions always depended on the national and international contexts within which they were undertaken. The functionaries of the ILO could not always impose the norms developed primarily in Western Europe. In the 1930s, the countries of the Balkans, like those of Latin America, insisted on the need to implement a form of technical aid that was better suited to their specific economic and social needs. Development policies promoted and implemented from the 1930s onwards in part acceded to these demands but also resulted from a desire to address international imbalances and a concern to strengthen the ILO itself. Eventually they would contribute to a shift in priorities and modes of action.

Thus, working on international organisations as social spaces allows us to highlight the fact that “the international” was constructed in a dynamic and complex relationship between a wide range of different individual and collective actors who evolved in interconnected spaces. The social approach makes us wary of a reified and idealised vision and encourages us to take into account the international connections and circulations made by individuals and networks in order to understand local and national realities without, for all that, giving way to the naive optimism of generous cosmopolitanism.

NOTES

1. It is impossible here to give an account of the wide range of studies of these diverse organisations. On the current state of research see Madeleine Herren, *Geschichte der internationalen Organisation* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2009), currently one of the few overviews of international organisations written by a historian. See also *Journal of Global History* 6, no. 2 (2011), which includes three articles preceded by an introduction by Glenda Sluga, “The Transnational History of International Institutions”, pp. 219–222; the special issue of *Critique Internationale* (2011), “Une autre approche de la globalisation: socio-histoire des organisations internationales (1900–1940)” and Lorenzo Mechi. “Tendenze recenti della storiografia sulle organizzazioni internazionali”, *Contemporanea* (2013), pp. 645–657. To get an idea of the diversity of research in progress, see the website of the History of International Organisations Network, based in Geneva (<http://www.hion.ch/>).
2. On this concept see, for example, Bruce Mazlish, “Comparing Global History to World History”, *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 28, no. 3 (1998), pp. 385–395 and above all Patrick Manning, *Navigating World History: Historians Create a Global Past* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003). The work of world historians, therefore, is “to portray the crossing of boundaries and the linking of systems in the human past” (p. 3).
3. For a presentation of this approach: Pierre-Yves Saunier, “Circulations, connexions et espaces transnationaux”, *Genèses*, 57 (2004), pp. 110–126; more recently: Pierre-Yves Saunier, *Transnational History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). For a reflection on the limits of the circulatory approach see Antoine Vauchez, “Le prisme circulatoire. Retour sur un leitmotiv académique”, *Critique internationale* 59, no. 2 (2013), pp. 9–16.
4. Martin H. Geyer and Johannes Paulmann, *The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Society, and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
5. For a presentation of these different positions see the special issue of *International Organization*, Vol. 52, no. 4 (1998), particularly, for the realist position, Robert Jervis, “Realism in the Study of World Politics”, pp. 971–991; and for the functionalist position, Lisa L. Martin and Beth A. Simmons, “Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions”, pp. 729–757 and Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change”, pp. 887–917.
6. See the converging perspectives of Madeleine Herren, *Geschichte der internationalen Organisation* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft,

- 2009); Bob Reinalda, *Routledge History of International Organizations: From 1815 to the Present Day* (London: Routledge, 2009); Marie-Claude Smouts, *Les organisations internationales* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1995).
7. On the importance of bureaucracies see the institutionalist approach of Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore, *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics* (Ithaca N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004).
 8. The term “transnational” can also be employed in the sense of “non-governmental.” For this use see *International Organization*, Vol. 25, no. 3 (1971), particularly the articles by Joseph Nye and Robert S. Keohane, “Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction”, pp. 329–349; and James A. Field, “Transnationalism and the New Tribe”, pp. 353–372. See also the special issue of *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 14 (2005), particularly the introduction by Patricia Clavin, “Defining Transnationalism”, pp. 421–439; and her article with Jens-Wilhelm Wessels, “Transnationalism and the League of Nations”, pp. 465–492.
 9. The history of the ILO has given rise to a rich array of publications in recent years, particularly Jasmien Van Daele et al., eds., *ILO Histories: Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World during the Twentieth Century* (Bern/New York: Peter Lang, 2010) and Isabelle Lespinet-Moret and Vincent Viet, eds., *L'organisation internationale du travail. Origine-Développement-Avenir* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2011); Sandrine Kott and Joëlle Droux, eds., *Globalizing Social Rights: The International Labour Organization and Beyond* (London; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). These works contain references to older works on the subject.
 10. On 1900, see Anne Rasmussen, “Tournant, inflexions, ruptures: le moment internationaliste”, *Mil Neuf Cent. Cahiers Georges Sorel. Revue d'histoire intellectuelle* 19 (2001), pp. 27–41.
 11. This expression refers back to the work edited by Christian Topalov, *Laboratoires du nouveau siècle. La nébuleuse réformatrice et ses réseaux en France, 1880–1914* (Paris: Éditions de l'EHESS, 1999).
 12. Rainer Gregarek, “Le mirage de l'Europe sociale. Associations internationales de Politique sociale au tournant du xx siècle”, *Vingtième Siècle* 48 (1995), pp. 103–118.
 13. On Stefan Bauer (1865–1934), see Matthias von Bergen, *Nationalökonomie und Weltbürgertum. Ein Beitrag zur Biographie des internationalen Sozialpolitikers Stephan Bauer* (Bern: Lizentiatsarbeit, 1990).
 14. Jasmien Van Daele, “Engineering Social Peace: Networks, Ideas, and the Founding of the International Labour Organization”, *International*

- Review for Social History* 50 (2005), pp. 435–466; Madeleine Herren, *Internationale Sozialpolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg. Die Anfänge europäischer Kooperation aus der Sicht Frankreichs* (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1993); Sandrine Kott, “From Transnational Reformist Network to International Organization: the International Association for Labour Legislation and the International Labour Organization (1900–1930s)”, in *Shaping the Transnational Sphere*, eds. Davide Rodogno, Bernhard Struck, and Jakob Vogel (New York: Berghahn Books, 2014), pp. 383–418.
15. See the preamble to the ILO constitution: http://www.ilo.org/global/About_the_ILO/Origins_and_history/Constitution/lang--en/index.htm
 16. Carol Rigelman, “War-Time Trade Union and Socialist Proposals” in *The Origins of the International Labor Organization*, vol. 1: *History*, ed. T. J. Shotwell (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), pp. 55–79 and Reiner Tosstorff, “The International Trade-Union Movement and the Founding of the International Labour Organization”, *International Review of Social History* 50, no. 3 (2005), pp. 399–433.
 17. James T. Shotwell, “The International Labor Organization as an Alternative to Violent Revolution”, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 166 (1933), pp. 18–25.
 18. The ILO is a tripartite organisation. During the annual international labour conferences (the parliament of the organisation) every country sends a delegation composed of two government representatives: one representative of the employers and one representative of the workers (the trade unions). The Governing Body, the executive of the organisation, is also composed in a tripartite manner.
 19. Geert Van Goethem, *The Amsterdam International: The World of the International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU), 1913–1945* (Aldershot and Burlington: VT, 2006).
 20. Archives of the International Labour Office (henceforth ILOA), p 738.
 21. Maurice Barbier, “Les relations entre l’Eglise catholique et l’Organisation internationale du travail”, *Politique étrangère* 37, no. 3 (1972), pp. 351–387; Charles S. J. Gallagher, “The Roman Catholic Church, the ILO and the Quest for Social Justice”; Liosa Azara, “The Holy See and the ILO. The Origins of a Special Relationship” in *Christian Democrat Internationalism. Its Action in Europe and Worldwide from Post World War II until the 1990s. Volume II. The Development (1945–1979)*, ed. Jean-Dominique Durand (Peter Lang, 2013) pp. 335–42 and pp. 42–57.
 22. Denis Guérin, *Albert Thomas au BIT 1920–1932. De l’internationalisme à l’Europe* (Geneva: Institut Européen de l’Université de Genève,

- 1996), pp. 57–58 and Martine Fine, “Un instrument pour la réforme: l’Association française pour le progrès social (1927–1929)”, *Le Mouvement social* 94 (1976), pp. 3–29. ILOA, AIP 237, A. Thomas’s speech in 1924 at the International Congress for Social Reform in Prague, *Congrès international de politique sociale. Compte rendu des séances et rapports* (Paris: 1924), pp. 75–76.
23. *L’Avenir du travail* (AdT) (1928), p. 136.
 24. ILOA RL 01/4/52, exchange of letters between Stefan Bauer and Albert Thomas 21, 23 February 1922.
 25. AdT (1932), p. 24.
 26. AdT (1929), p. 148.
 27. AdT (1923), p. 119.
 28. Between 1919 and 1935 social insurance featured in one way or another almost every year in the discussions of the International Labour Conference. For a general inventory see BIT, International Labour Organisation. *International Labour Organisation and Social Insurance*. Studies and Reports. NO. 12. Geneva, 1936. For a detailed list of the conventions, recommendations and texts see the excellent website: http://www.ilo.org/global/What_we_do/InternationalLabourStandards/lang--fr/index.htm
 29. It became the CIMAS (*confédération internationale des mutuelles et des assurances sociales*) in 1937 and subsequently the *International Association for Social Security* in 1947. On the constitution of the CIMAS from a French perspective, see Michel Dreyfus, “Mutualité et organisations politiques et sociales internationales (1889–1939)”, *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d’histoire* 48 (1995), pp. 92–102
 30. ILOA, SI 22/1/1 report by Stein to Maurette, 10 December 1926.
 31. ILOA, SI 22/1/1 report by Tixier to Thomas, 5 October 1927.
 32. ILOA SI 1000 0.
 33. Speech by Albert Thomas at the opening of the conference of the *Union internationale des caisses maladie* held in Vienna, 10–14 September 1925. ILOA SI/1000/11/2.
 34. According to the terms of article 396 of the peace treaty, this documentary work was explicitly part of the Office’s mission, continuing the work of the Labour Office in Basel which, since 1901, had played the role of a European library on social issues. Alongside the rapidly growing library, the social insurance section soon also had a small documentation centre at its disposal, in which the legislation of different states was collected and which allowed it to answer requests for information from different national administrations (having first translated this information into the two official languages).

35. Bureau international du travail, 1931. International Labour Organisation. *International Labour Organisation; the First Decade* (London: 1931), p. 415.
36. ILOA D 700/110/1 1929. Correspondence offices committee meeting of December 1929 Geneva. In 1930, there were correspondents in Vienna, Brussels, Madrid, Budapest, Warsaw, and Prague.
37. On norm-setting at the ILO: Jean-Michel Bonvin, *L'Organisation internationale du travail: étude sur une agence productrice de normes* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998).
38. From the 1930s onwards, the International Labour Office increasingly tended to view itself as a kind of technical agency of “the social.”
39. A. Thomas, *Minutes of the Governing Body of the International Labor Office (GB)*, 9, 1921, p. 13.
40. On the ambiguous position of the Fascists towards the ILO, see Stefano Gallo, “Dictatorship and International Organisations: The ILO as a “Testground” for Fascism” in *Universalizing Social Rights: A History of the International Labour Organization and Beyond*, eds. Sandrine Kott and Joëlle Droux (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2013), pp. 153–172. On de Michelis and immigration at the Office, see Paul-André Rosental, “Géopolitique et État-providence. Le BIT et la politique mondiale des migrations dans l’entre deux guerres”, *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 61, no. 1 (2006), pp. 99–134.
41. ILOA, D600/206, letter of 16 July 1923.
42. *International Labour Conference*, ILO, 1927, pp. LXX ff.
43. ILOA, SI 1/0. Letter from Tixier to Thomas, 1930.
44. Aurin, Manes, Freund, Zahn and Moldenhauer. Grieser replaced Aurin in 1925.
45. Sandrine Kott, “Dynamiques de l’internationalisation: l’Allemagne et l’Organisation internationale du travail (1919–1940)”, *Critique internationale* 52, no. 3 (2011), pp. 69–84.
46. *Congrès socialiste international d’Amsterdam (14–20 août 1904)*, vol. 14. (Geneva: Minkoff Reprint, 1980), pp. 134–135. *Congrès socialiste international, Copenhague, 1910* (Geneva: Minkoff Reprint, 1981), p. 481.
47. For a definition of such epistemic communities, see Emmanuel Adler and Peter M. Haas, “Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program”, *International Organization* 46, no. 1 (1992), pp. 367–390. A critical analysis is to be found in Yves Viltard, “L’étrange carrière du concept foucauldien d’épistémè en science politique”, *Raisons politiques* 23 (2006), pp. 193–202 and Sandrine Kott, “Une ‘communauté épistémique’ du social?”, *Genèses. Sciences sociales et histoire* 71, no. 2 (2008), pp. 26–46.
48. The situation is, of course, different for the delegates to the Governing Body or to the International Labour Conference.

49. Editors' note: on this topic, see Daniel Laqua's article in this volume.
50. See the full file with the press cuttings compiled by the information department, ILOA DADG 10-4.
51. See all the documents in *Procès verbal de la Conférence Internationale du Travail* (henceforth CIT), 1933, pp. 486–490.
52. CIT 1933, 17, pp. 486–490.
53. ILOA XH 7/24/2.
54. Bundesarchiv R3901/20653, Note RAM, Berlin 28 Dez 1939. I wish to thank Amélie Nucq, who pointed out this document to me.
55. Reichsarbeitsblatt, V, (RAB) 1940, 21, p. 362. Around 20 functionaries of the ILO remained in Geneva under the leadership of the Frenchman Marius Viple.
56. Karl Heinz Roth, *Intelligenz und Sozialpolitik im "Dritten Reich": eine methodisch-historische Studie am Beispiel des Arbeitswissenschaftlichen Instituts der deutschen Arbeitsfront* (München/New Providence: KGSaur, 1993) and Karsten Linne, "Die Deutsche Arbeitsfront und die internationale Freizeit- und Sozialpolitik 1935 bis 1945", *Sozialgeschichte* 1999 10, no. 1 (1995), pp. 65–81.
57. ILOA PWRI-24 and Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (AAA), Berlin, Gesandtschaft Bern, 2844, Brief Krauel, 12 September 1941.
58. On the international efforts of the DAF, as seen by the Office, see ILOA, PWRI-24.
59. Robert Ley, "Die Überwindung des Geistes von 1789", *Neue Internationale Rundschau der Arbeit* 1 (1941), pp. 1–9.
60. This was also the point of view of Marius Viple in ILOA Z1/11.
61. Editors' note: On the theme of the multiplicity of internationalist imperialisms and particularly its articulation with social policies, see the text of Miguel Bandeira Jerónimo in this volume.
62. See especially Roth, "Die Sozialpolitik des "europäischen Großraumes" im Spannungsfeld von Okkupation und Kollaboration (1938–1945)", in *Okkupation und Kollaboration (1938–1945): Beiträge zu Konzepten und Praxis der Kollaboration in der deutschen Okkupationspolitik* (Berlin-Heidelberg: Hüthig, 1994), pp. 509–512.
63. Franz Seldte, *Sozialpolitik im Dritten Reich, 1933–1938* (München: 1939), p. 267.
64. "Ausländer sehen das Soziale Deutschland", RAB, Teil V, Soziales Deutschland, 25 January 1940, pp. 46–47.
65. Friedrich Sitzler, "Sozialpolitik im neuen Europa", *Soziale Praxis* 49, no. 16 (1940).
66. P. Waelbroeck and I. Bessling (International Labour Office). "Some Aspects of German Social Policy under the National-Socialist Regime", *International Labour Review* XLIII, no. 2 (1941), pp. 127–152.

67. On the period of the Second World War, see Sandrine Kott, “Fighting the War or Preparing for Peace? The ILO during the Second World War”, *Journal of Modern European History* 12, no. 3 (2014), pp. 359–376.
68. See the speeches of the Directors General (Thomas, then Butler) to the ILC throughout this period.
69. Véronique Plata, *Une voiesociale pour le développement. Le Bureau internationale du travail et les débuts de la coopération technique (1919–1949)*, thèse Genève, 2016. See also Anthony Alcock, *History of the International Labour Organisation* (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), pp. 209–220.
70. ILOA, CAT 1/30/1/3. See, on this idea, the speech by Albert Thomas to the Alliance Française in Sofia, 26 February 1930.
71. ILOA SI 2/26/3.
72. ILOA, SI 2/26/3, note by Tixier, 16 January 1933.
73. Anton Zelenka, trained in Prague by Emil Schoenbaum, became the head of the social insurance department in the 1950s.
74. Charles Bergquist, *Labor in Latin America: comparative essays on Chile, Argentina, Venezuela, and Colombia* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1986).
75. Véronique Plata, “La difusión de las normas internacionales del trabajo en Venezuela, 1936–1939: una práctica de cooperación técnica internacional en la OIT” in *América Latina y la Organización Internacional del Trabajo: redes, cooperación técnica e institucionalidad social, 1919–1950*, coords. Fabián Herrera León and Patricio Herrera González (Morelia, Michoacán, México: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, 2013), pp. 127–160. Morelia: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas de la Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo; Centro de Estudios Históricos de la Universidad de Monterrey; Programa de Pós-graduação em História da Universidade Federal Fluminense.
76. ILOA Z 1/1/1/9 Correspondence between Phelan and Tixier 1940–1944.
77. M GB, 1941, 90.
78. “L’œuvre de la conférence interaméricaine de sécurité sociale de Santiago du Chili”, *Revue Internationale du Travail* (1942), pp. 746–778.
79. See in this respect the very pertinent article of Karl Pribram, “The ILO: Present Functions and Future Tasks”, *Foreign Affairs; American Quarterly Review* 21, no. 1/4 (1942/1943), p. 158.
80. On this issue see Daniel Maul, *Human Rights, Development, and Decolonization: the International Labour Organization, 1940–70* (New York; Geneva: Palgrave Macmillan; International Labour Office, 2012), translation of *Menschenrechte, Sozialpolitik und Dekolonisation: Die Internationale Arbeitsorganisation (IAO) 1940–1970* (Essen: Klartext, 2007), here, pp. 39–43; Luis Rodríguez-Piñero, *Indigenous Peoples, Postcolonialism, and International Law: The ILO Regime, 1919–1989*

- (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), particularly pp. 30–35; Susan Zimmermann, “‘Special circumstances in Geneva’: the ILO and the World of Non-Metropolitan Labour in the Interwar Period” in *ILO Histories: Essays on the International Labour Organization and its Impact on the World during the Twentieth Century*, eds. Jasmien Van Daele et al. (Bern, New York: Peter Lang, 2010), pp. 221–250 and James P. Daughton, “ILO Expertise and Colonial Violence in the Interwar Years” in *Globalizing*, eds. Kott and Droux, pp. 85–97.
81. On all this see Maul, *Human Rights, Development, and Decolonization*, here pp. 89–121.
 82. On this see Frederick Cooper, “Modernizing Bureaucrats, Backward Africans, and the Development Concept” in *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*, eds. Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard Randall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), pp. 64–93.
 83. See the specific case of China in Margherita Zanasi, “Exporting Development: The League of Nations and Republican China”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49, no. 1 (2007), pp. 143–169.
 84. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, “Une nouvelle sensibilité: la perspective ‘transnationale’”, *Cahiers Jaurès* 200, no. 2 (2011), pp. 173–180.



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-60692-7>

Internationalism, Imperialism and the Formation of the
Contemporary World

The Pasts of the Present

Jerónimo, M.B.; Monteiro, J.P. (Eds.)

2018, XVII, 365 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-60692-7