

Received: 24.01.2020

Accepted: 29.03.2020

Published: 30.06.2020

Roczniki Administracji i Prawa

Annals of The Administration and Law

2020, XX, z. 2: s. 263-276

ISSN: 1644-9126

DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0014.1792

<https://rocznikiadministracjiiprawa.publisherspanel.com>

Łucja Kobroń-Gąsiorowska*

Nr ORCID: 0000-0002-8669-452X

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST BLOC IN THE ILO DURING THE COLD WAR – SELECTED ISSUES

ROLA PAŃSTW KOMUNISTYCZNYCH W MOP PODCZAS ZIMNEJ WOJNY – WYBRANE ZAGADNIENIA

Summary: In this article, from a multidisciplinary point of view, key questions were raised that defined how the bloc of communist countries had an impact on the International Labor Organization. The author believes that the role of communist countries in the ILO depended not only on the international political, economic and social context of the time, but also on the field of globalized labor history and relations of international organizations. The starting point of this article is the central hypothesis that the concept of protecting employees and the rights of employers has always been presented from the point of view of the „bloc” of capitalist states, without reference to the role of communist states.

Keywords: Cold War, International Labour Organization, communist regimes, European Social Model

Streszczenie: W tym artykule z wielodyscyplinarnego punktu widzenia poruszono kluczowe pytania, które określiły sposób, w jaki wpływ na Międzynarodową Organizację Pracy miał blok państw komunistycznych. Autorka uważa, że rola państw komunistycznych w MOP jest zależna nie tylko od międzynarodowego kontekstu politycznego, gospodarczego, społecznego, ale także od dziedziny (globalizującej) historii pracy i stosunków organizacji międzynarodowych. Punktem wyjścia tego artykułu jest centralna hipoteza, że koncepcja

* dr; Instytut Prawa, Administracji i Ekonomii, Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny w Krakowie. Źródła finansowania publikacji: środki własne autorki; e-mail: l.kobron@nckg.pl

ochrony pracowników i praw „pracodawców” była zawsze prezentowana z punktu widzenia „bloku” państw kapitalistycznych, bez odniesienia do roli państw komunistycznych.

Słowa kluczowe: zimna wojna, Międzynarodowa Organizacja Pracy, państwa komunistyczne, europejski model społeczny

INTRODUCTION

I would like to draw attention to the position in the ILO of the Soviet bloc states and their positions on labor rights and standards. I learned at a recent labor conference in the United States that the concept of developing protection of the rights of employees and employers was consistently presented from the point of view of capitalist states¹, usually without reference to the role of communist states. However, this article aims to present the state of mind about the role and function of countries from the communist bloc in managing their struggle for dominance in the International Labor Organization and the impact of this struggle on the evolution of social rights in Europe. This article is to serve only as a source of inspiration and open polemics in this regard.

A further purpose of this article is to analyze the activities of communist countries in the ILO during the Cold War to formalize knowledge in this area, and to answer the basic question about what we really owe to communist countries that functioned within the ILO in the context of promoting their concepts and practices of labor and social rights in the world. I would like to point out here their contributions to the functioning and operation of the ILO and the role of communist states in embedding their concept of social rights into the global economy.

The current international system, although it still has the main features it obtained when the international legal system emerged from the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, underwent a long transformation process, especially since the end of the 19th century, from a purely state centric system towards a community centered one².

The next stage of the social revolution was the advent of the industrial revolution – along with the social shocks it caused – at the end of the 18th century and at the beginning of the 19th century. It brought new and important transformations. A revolution in science, technology and ideas – these were the driving forces of change, heralding a new wave of globalization. Technical and economic dynamics began to overtake even the states themselves which became more and more visible in the sense that not only small European countries, but also great powers such as Great Britain, no longer constituted an appropriate territorial base for conducting economic activities possibly

¹ The author participated on November 21–22, 2019 in an international scientific conference in Washington DC („Continuing the Struggle The International Labor Organization Centenary and the Future Of Global Worker Rights”) after which she made the conclusions presented in this article.

² See: C.S. Rhyne, *International Law – The Substance, Processes, Procedures and Institutions for World Peace with Justice*, Washington 1971.

thanks to new measures of production and exchange³. The international literature indicates that the industrial revolution explains the emergence of an international economy based on the growing division of labor and the growing awareness of the need for new international regulations enabling and facilitating the development of activities that swept through countries and beyond, thus creating ties of material interdependence and causing a degree of solidarity. This in turn explains the sporadic emerging cooperation since the second half of the nineteenth century, especially in the field of communications, to respond to global problems caused by the industrial revolution⁴. H. Heller emphasizes that the industrial revolution marked the beginning of a long transition from feudalism to capitalism. This also led to a significant expansion of the global power of the West. Western hegemony over the rest of the world fostered a constant sense of European superiority over non-European nations. In Heller's opinion the period of the industrial revolution was seen as one of economic instability, poverty and exploitation⁵. Although the institutional apparatus of the ILO was founded in 1919 and initially brought together a special constellation of actors – governments, unions and employers – as part of a tripartite revolutionary structure at the time, it should be remembered that it was shaped according to the model presented by the so-called „West”⁶. According to S. Kott, in the interwar years there was a circulation and convergence of economic and social systems, including models of economic and social planning⁷. In my opinion, to understand the differences between Western and Eastern European countries, two models of the concept of tripartite cooperation in the ILO should be considered. Most authors of international literature do not see this as an issue, or they do so by marginalizing the prism of capitalist bloc policy.

SOVIET OR COMMUNIST?

The word „Soviet” is not mentioned in the title of this article. Doing so could lead to the unreasonable conclusion that the issues raised in this study will have

³ P. Temin, *Two Views of the British Industrial Revolution*, „The Journal of Economic History” 1997, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 63-64.

⁴ See: G. Abi Saab, *Wither the International Community*, „European Journal of International Law” 1998, Vol. 9, p. 248; P.M. Dupuy, *International Law: Torn between Coexistence, Cooperation and Globalization. General Conclusion*, „European Journal of International Law” 1998, Vol. 9, p. 279.

⁵ See more: H. Heller, *The industrial revolution: Marxist perspectives*, Pluto Press 2011, p. 176.

⁶ V. Jakovleski, S. Jerbi and T. Biersteker, *The ILO's Role in Global Governance: Limits and Potential*, [in:] *The ILO @ 100*, ed. Ch. Gironde, G. Carbonnier, Brill 2019, pp. 82-103.

⁷ S. Kott, *The Social Engineering Project. Exportation of Capitalist Management Culture to Eastern Europe (1950–1980)*, [in:] *Planning in Cold War Europe*, ed. M. Christian, S. Kott, O. Matějka, De Gruyter 2018, p. 123; J. Bockman, *Markets in the Name of Socialism. The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism*, Stanford, Stanford University Press 2011; G. Eyal, I. Szelenyi, E.R. Townsley, *Making Capitalism Without Capitalists. Class Formation and Elite Struggles in Post-Communist Central Europe*, Londres–New York, Verso, 1998; G. Eyal, *The Origins of Postcommunist Elites. From Prague Spring to the Breakup of Czechoslovakia*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

unique features, i.e. suggesting limiting the meaning and role only to the Soviet Union within the ILO. It would also suggest linking the membership of the Soviet Union in the ILO with the membership of other communist countries in the Soviet bloc. As a result, the analysis would be limited only to the leading role and function of the Soviet Union. I do not deny that the bloc of socialist countries mainly made decisions in the based structures of the Soviet Union vision of work⁸.

The question may be asked which of the concepts of protection of labor rights presented by the two geopolitical worlds – capitalist and socialist – could defend the interests (also understood as constitutional rights) of employees more strongly. This question is not altered by the fact that statements appear in international literature indicating the dominant role of the block of capitalist states, which is justified by the democratic systems of these states. G. Rodgers, Eddy Lee, Lee Swepston and J. van Daele indicate that a new international organization, which was the ILO, was established, which primarily gave employees and employers equal decision-making power with their governments and introduced new forms of international dialogue in determining social goals, as well as new ways of implementing them. The ILO unfortunately was almost exclusively politically based mainly on the then European democratic political currents, in particular social democracy, Christian democracy and social liberalism. At the same time, the authors – it should be emphasized – indicate that it was the waves of the economic crisis and mass unemployment that led to increased awareness that labor markets are interconnected and that public action is needed to achieve common standards. Most importantly they emphasized above all that the work dominated the political programs of those countries. It should be emphasized that political contradictions appeared not only within capitalism, but also as a cause of the Russian revolution in the early twentieth century⁹.

It is justified to state that the essence of labor law is entirely reduced to „further specifying” the protective functions of labor law. Since the ILO was founded to improve the conditions for providing work through international dialogue, we cannot automatically rule out a positive impact of the concept of protection of labor rights presented by the bloc of communist countries. The above-mentioned purpose of the ILO establishment justifies the claim that, regardless of the political forces represented, the regulations created, i.e. ILO conventions and orders, had to be in line with the most important foundations of the organization, i.e. meeting employment and socio-economic security objectives at all levels and guaranteeing the principle of justice through informed dialogue between representative social players. Protection gives clear answers to the question “what is the ILO for”. The establishment of

⁸ See more: S.F. Cohen, *Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution: A Political Biography, 1888–1938*, Oxford University Press USA 1980, pp. 15-16.

⁹ See more: G. Rodgers, E. Lee, L. Swepston, J. van Daele, *The International Labour Organization and the quest for social justice, 1919–2009*, Geneva 2009, p. 3.

the ILO with its special objectives and functions after the First World War was an important milestone in establishing protection and justice.

SOCIAL JUSTICE – THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF ILO

Three unique characteristics make the ILO a fascinating case study in legal experiments; first of all, its longevity and resistance to adversity and crisis; secondly, its mandate to set standards and an impressive record of existing human rights treaties; and thirdly, being controversial in its action¹⁰.

These characteristics, and especially the third, created a space and the need for an analysis of the functions of communist regimes within the ILO. The above statement is confirmed by the so-called “Right to social justice”, which reminds us of the role that law can play in creating normative acts, shaping stable but flexible rules, managing the organization in times of crisis, resisting shocks and unblocking the impasse among tripartite ingredients through creative thinking. It is argued that ILO activities are often compared to Sisyphean tasks, constantly adapting to new needs and challenges¹¹.

Literature indicates that the idea of social justice itself has never been the subject of theoretical debate within the ILO¹². However, the preamble and general principles of its 1919 constitution, and then in the Declaration of Philadelphia that replaced it in 1944¹³, defined a number of problems of labour issues that constitute the foundations of the Organization e.g. regulation of the hours of work including the establishment of the maximum length of a working day and week; regulation of labour supply, prevention of unemployment and provision of an adequate living wage; protection of the worker against sickness, disease and injury arising out of his employment; protection

¹⁰ B. Simma, A. L. Paulus, *The International Community: Facing the Challenge of Globalization*, European Journal of International Law 1998, Vol. 9, pp. 248-265; See also: C. Carrion-Crespo, *When Labour Law Went Global: The Road to the International Labour Organization, 1871–1919*, “Journal of Agriculture, University of Puerto Rico” 2012, Vol.37, No. 1, p. 129.

¹¹ A.E. Alcock, *History of the International Labour Organisation*, Macmillan UK 1971, pp. 3-17.

¹² S. Kott, *ILO: Social Justice in a Global World? A History in Tension*, <https://journals.openedition.org/poldev/2991>; S. Kott, *OIT, Justice sociale et mondes communistes. Concurrences, émulations, convergences*, in *Le Mouvement social*, [https://www.academia.edu/39257916.Sandrine_Kott_OIT_Justice_sociale_et_mondes_communistes_Concurrences_émulations_convergences_in_Le_Mouvement_social_2018_2_p.139-151](https://www.academia.edu/39257916/Sandrine_Kott_OIT_Justice_sociale_et_mondes_communistes_Concurrences_émulations_convergences_in_Le_Mouvement_social_2018_2_p.139-151) [access: 16.04.2020].

¹³ This fundamental principle was subsequently clarified in the second Statutory Act of the Organization, the Philadelphia Declaration, adopted in 1944. The Declaration remains the basis for all ILO activities and includes the following principles: Work is not a commodity; Freedom of expression and association is the basis for sustainable progress; Poverty, wherever it exists, is a danger to the well-being of all; All human beings, irrespective of race, creed or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity; The text of the declaration can be found at https://www.ilo.org/ilc/LCSessions/108/reports/texts-adopted/WCMS_711674/lang--en/index.htm and the working translation into Polish [access: 16.04.2020].

of working children, young persons and women; provision for old age and injury; protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own; recognition of the principle of equal remuneration for work of equal value ("equal pay for equal work"); recognition of the principle of freedom of association; and, organization of vocational and technical education and other measures¹⁴.

The term „social justice” was seen by the UN as a substitute for the protection of human rights. Few know that it appeared for the first time in UN documents in the second half of the 1960s primarily on the initiative of the Soviet Union with the support of developing countries. The term was used in the Declaration on Social Progress and Development which was adopted in 1969. The intent was to express a protest against what was seen as capitalist labor exploitation with a focal point of developing measures to improve the human condition¹⁵.

ILO – A TRIPARTITE ORGANIZATION

First, I would like to provide some background on the nature and purpose of the ILO. The International Labor Organization was founded in 1919 after World War I. The intent of its formation was to help foster peace among its members. Its mandate was basically to advance social justice and promote decent work conditions by setting international labor policies and standards. It is a unique tripartite organization in that it brought together three distinct types of participants: governments, employers and employees. There are now approximately 187 member states in the ILO. During the Cold War it was even more unique in that it had communist country members with divergent views on labor rights and the treatment of workers. Communist countries were very critical of capitalist countries like France, for example, for disallowing communist labor unions. Thus, the ILO sometimes became a platform for international political discourse¹⁶. The establishment of the ILO in 1919, after World War I, opened a completely new and significant stage in the structural evolution of international labor law. As I have already indicated, there were few common international cooperation platforms up to that time. The ILO's great novelty was that it introduced a new type or genre of cooperation law and a new generation of international organizations, constituting an institutional element based on shared values. The ILO was established to promote social justice,

¹⁴ S. Kott, *ILO: Social Justice (...)*, op. cit.

¹⁵ L. F. Vosko, *Decent Work: The Shifting Role of the ILO and the Struggle for Global Social Justice*, "Global Social Policy" 2002, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.19-46, See also: C. Brölmann, *ILO Convention practice mixed methods in norm setting for Social Justice*, "Amsterdam Law School Legal Studies Research Paper" No. 2019-37.

¹⁶ See more widely on this subject, i.a., B. Simma, A.L. Paulus, *The International Community: Facing the Challenge of Globalization*, "European Journal of European Law" 1998, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 268.

dignity of work and tripartite dialogue¹⁷. This combined structure of governmental and non-governmental components has proved to be very stable because it has remained unchanged to this day.

The ILO was founded as the first specialized agency in the League of Nations. But unlike the League, the organization survived World War II and became part of the United Nations. The ILO constitution indicates that universal and lasting peace can only be built on the principles of social justice. This fundamental principle was subsequently clarified in the second Statutory Act of the Organization, the Philadelphia Declaration, adopted in 1944.

The roles played by representatives of workers and employers differ markedly. For workers, the ILO is a major instrument to pursue their goals. On the other hand, employers frequently play the role of the „brake” on initiatives put forward both by the workers, the ILO staff and its Director-General. However, one should not forget about the dominant function of this special international organization, which is the ILO, i.e. the concept of the so-called protective function. In this view, Arkadiusz Sobczyk exhibits two flagship slogans or statements. The first statement, taken from the founding acts of the ILO, that „work is not a commodity”¹⁸ The second is the statement that labor law protects the „weaker” from the „stronger”. In his opinion, labor law primarily fulfills a protective function, protecting employee rights and the employee’s protective function is in any case the dominant function. This statement leads to the following conclusion: notwithstanding the other functions of the ILO mentioned above, the organization discourages dialogue between states which sometimes presents conflicting interests¹⁹.

At this point, attention should be made regarding the conflict of interests that undoubtedly existed between representatives of two different visions of employee rights and social justice, ignoring the political context which was obvious at that time. I see the above reasoning as correct. B. Simma and A. L. Paulus emphasize that the division of powers between various states is inevitable, which is an important element of international politics, but the constant struggle to maximize one’s own power and minimize the power of others seems pointless. In their view, the “international community” understood as a whole, regardless of time and political context, the need for a set of common values. Another important aspect of these considerations is the question whether a diverse society is unable to reach agreement on common interests when they are fundamental to human rights. No one

¹⁷ G. Abi Saab, *Wither* (...) op. cit., p. 26.

¹⁸ See more: A. Świątkowski, *Praca towarem?*, „Polityka Społeczna” 1992, No. 4, p. 18; *W kierunku ustawowej dyferencjacji praw i obowiązków pracowniczych zatrudnionych*, „Palestra” 2015, No. 1-2, p. 79.

¹⁹ See more: A. Sobczyk, *Różnicowanie praw (ochrony) zatrudnionych – wybrane kryteria i ich ocena*, [in:] M. Bosak (ed.), *Funkcja ochronna prawa pracy a wyzwania współczesności*, Warszawa 2014, p. 1; T. Liszcz, *Prawo pracy*, Lublin 2008, p. 27; A.M. Świątkowski, *Polskie prawo pracy*, Warszawa 2010, p. 32.

now argues that labor rights are human rights²⁰. Simma and Paulus point to cultural diversity, which leads to a different understanding of the value and role of law. In the context of their study, they had to deal with political differences within the ILO. I express the view that despite so many differences between two opposing political blocks, many common values have been paraded. It is difficult to understand the development of at least such common values as decent work or social solidarity through the prism of only the position of capitalist states.

The main challenge of the ILO during the Cold War was that the ILO concept of work was based on the foundations of the capitalist vision of work which included dialogue between employees and employers with respect to worker rights and conditions. Consequently, there was a struggle within the ILO during the Cold War between communist and capitalist visions of worker's rights. Since its inception, the ILO has adopted 190 conventions, 6 protocols and 206 recommendations that cover a wide range of issues, from minimum wages and working conditions to discrimination and social security. Setting international labor standards is an essential function of the organization. The literature indicates that depending on the context, history, etc., such standards can have a significant impact on the exercise of social and economic rights²¹. Another important aspect of the communist position relates to the definition of the tripartite relationship which was brought about by Communist so-called employer participation in the ILO. No one is currently questioning the political element that accompanied the ILO during the Cold War. J. P. Windmuller rightly points out that political contention was not unfamiliar during the work of the ILO, which repeatedly struggled with political issues²². The most important of course was the problem of the definition of "employer". This concept was understood in a completely different way by communist and capitalist states. This was one of the problems that is exposed in the literature. This prospect would be correct without indicating the role and attitude towards the United States in the ILO. This, however, is not a subject of this article. Freedom of association was one of those very²³ controversial questions which crystallized extremely conflicting debates. On the merits, these refer to two profoundly divergent visions of the role and place of the participants: it is seen as an employee representative and a social dialogue facilitator under capitalism²⁴.

²⁰ B. Simma, A.L. Paulus, *The International Community*, p. 268.

²¹ O. Chinedu Okafor, T. Adebola, B. Al-Alami, *Viewing the International Labour Organization's Social Justice Praxis Through a Third World Approaches to International Law Lens: Some Preliminary Insights*, [in:] *ILO100 for law social justice*, ed. G.P. Politakis, T. Kohiyama, T.Lieby, Warszawa 2007, pp. 101-123.

²² J.P. Windmuller, *Soviet employers in the ILO: The experience of the 1930's*, "International Review of Social History" 1961, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 355.

²³ See more: „On November 1, 1977, President Jimmy Carter issued a statement terminating United States membership in the International Labour Organization (ILO)”, B.L. Rockwook, Human Rights and Wrongs: The United States and the I.L.O.--A Modern Morality Play, <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1991&context=jil> [access: 16.04.2020].

²⁴ P.E. Masters, *The International Labor Organization: America's Withdrawal and Reentry*, "International Social Science Review" 1996, Vol. 71, No. 3-4, pp. 14-26; David A. Wirth emphasized that Lenin's statements about the role of trade unions in a post-revolutionary workers state were ambiguous. Lenin

The impact of the communist concept of worker's and employer's rights on the policies of international organizations, and on the norms promulgated by them, has received very little academic attention in post-communist countries – like Poland. This leads me to a crucial question: what in particular was the participation of the communist countries in the work of the ILO?

First, I would like to present two main accusations of the capitalist world – the world fighting against communism and its impression of employee protection. To better understand the situation, we need to remember the communist perception of the League of Nations: „The League of Nations, which is really just an association of criminals and imperialists summoned to Washington and then to Paris, is an amusing conference on ‘international labor protection’, in which two-thirds of the votes belonged to the bourgeoisie, and one-third to their agents, who still have the courage to qualify as employee representatives”²⁵. Second a complaint concerning the attacks on free world institutions by the communist world²⁶. The literature indicates that communism, despite its cold war era propaganda, was not uniform in the scope of its positions on worker rights. This presented various positions and significant diversity of views within the ILO. It is important to point out that eventually communism underwent transformations in the scope of its vision of protecting employee rights²⁷.

First, before World War II, the International Communist Movement primarily demonstrated strong hostility toward the ILO, accusing it of a liberal concept of social justice. Secondly, sociological institutionalism, including world-policy theory, argues that organizations that perceive themselves as belonging to the same ideological field tend to develop in a similar direction, resulting in organisational isomorphism. Moreover, the written laws and constitutions of communist regimes were, as a rule, interpreted literally, not according to their meaning for communist theory or praxis. A. Hedin rightly emphasizes that in retrospect, one can of course ask the question why the ILO, which was created on the basis of the vision of capitalist states, tolerated member states in which political systems forbade freedom of expression and freedom of association. Should participation of the communist vision of the world of work be treated as justified and relevant to the experience of Western

did not agree that the state would take over the entire role of the trade unions, but at the same time he felt that they should not be completely independent. Instead, he adopted a compromise view that identified the unions as a link between the state and the masses. The unions were to act as a tool to resolve employee complaints, although they would also be involved in supervising production standards and enforcing labor discipline. The author indicates that in practice the behavior of official trade unions in Poland and other Soviet bloc countries was far from this indirect doctrinal position; <https://lawdigital-commons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1902&context=lsfp> [access: 16.04.2020].

²⁵ J. Degras, *The Communist International 1919–1943: documents*, “The Royal Institute of International Affairs” 1920, Vol. 1, p. 89.

²⁶ See more: historical narrative proposed by the ILO itself, <https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/history/langen/index.htm> [access: 16.04.2020].

²⁷ S. Kott, *OIT...*, op. cit.

Europe, despite the grim record of communist regimes in this respect? Until the end of the Cold War, these two opposing visions collaborated together and side by side²⁸.

However, authorities of the young Soviet State, obliged to take into account the international diplomatic balances, gradually adopted an attitude less extreme than that of the Bolsheviks or the European communist parties. Contacts existed from 1920 and materialized by exchanges of publications which developed until the entry of the USSR into the ILO in 1934, after it membership in the League of Nations. Initially, the ILO was condemned by communists who accused it of betraying the basic interests of the working class under the guise of reforming capitalism and consistently until 1934. So, initially the Soviet Union refused to join the ILO. However, in 1934 as mentioned before it did join. In view of its economic importance and size, the Soviet union automatically became by right a member of the board of directors, where it was represented from 1934 to 1939 by the economist Boris Markus. The Soviet delegation then used the International Labor Conference to promote the communist model of the workers' state, in which the right to work would be guaranteed. The Soviet workers with power vested to them via the communist party would have broad social rights. Women workers would participate, like men, as promulgated by the new State. Eugenie Egorova who led the delegation of Soviet workers in 1937, was the only woman in this position. Stressing that in the Soviet Union, equality between men and women was practiced, it inspired the ongoing debate within the ILO of the role of women in the world of work²⁹. The issue of equality between men and women achieved through work, as well as the right to work, continued moreover until the end of the 1980s as a popular and widespread propaganda argument of the communist states, claiming this was proof of the excellence of their social model³⁰.

Looking back, starting from 1934, and especially after the Second World War, representatives of socialist countries advocated broad social rights and thus advocated the creation of a reform social project. Literature indicates that productivity convergence³¹ ultimately undermined the very idea of social justice. I would absolutely not like to reject this point of view at this point. However, I emphasize once again that it is certainly one of many misperceptions of the communist world which presented a different model of employee protection³².

²⁸ See more: A. Heidin, *Cold war isomorphism: communist regimes and the West European model of worker participation*, "Journal European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology" 2016, Vol. 3, No. 2–3, pp. 202–232.

²⁹ See also: N. Berkovitch, *Women's alternative path to citizenship. An examination of global employment policy*, [in:] C.L. McNeely, *Public Rights, Public Rules: Constituting Citizens in the World Polity and National Policy*, London–New York, pp. 81–107.

³⁰ See more: A.Z. Rubinstein, *Soviet foreign policy since World War II: Imperial and global*, Boston 1985; A.Z. Ru-binstein, *Moscow's third world strategy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1988.

³¹ The conception which makes social rights dependent on economic success; See more: S. Kott, *OIT...*, p. 148–149.

³² J. Van Daele, *The International Labour Organization (ILO) in Past and Present Research*, https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/FADBC7A7DC66CB-9225745DE537D176B8/S0020859008003568a.pdf/international_labour_organization_ilo_in_past_and_present_research.pdf [access: 16.04.2020].

In 1952, during the ILO general session, when the ILO Recommendation R94 was adopted, with typical Cold War rhetoric, the Polish government delegate, Mr. Chajn, threw down the gauntlet to West European governments, claiming they were trying to rob the workers of their rights. In particular, Mr. Chajn attacked the French government's recent legal repression of the communist trade union CGT, and questioned the intentions of the new West German works council reform, the 1952 Betriebsverfassungsgesetz. The Polish delegate said that in West Germany, the Adenauer Government, on the basis of the proposed law concerning the structure of factories (Betriebsverfassungs Gesetz), strived to deprive work councils of all their importance, submitting them to the wishes and whims of employers. In France, he claimed, the Government tried to intimidate the working class, and the police brutally, under a provocative pretext of alleged espionage, broke into the headquarters of the General Confederation of Labour which counted in its ranks the overwhelming majority of the French workers. These examples, of course, do not exhaust a long list of attempts to rob the workers in the capitalist countries of their achievements and rights³³.

Between 1948 and 1970, the ILO was headed by David Morse, a US official from the Franklin Roosevelt administration in the USA. During this period, all countries of the Eastern bloc, except the GDR (East Germany) and China, became members of the ILO. David Morse traveled to Eastern Europe several times. In 1949, he went to Poland and Czechoslovakia, then in 1958, he visited the Soviet Union. Finally in 1960 and 1968 he visited Romania. His reports show a marked interest in certain social achievements in these socialist countries, in particular in the areas of unemployment and women's work. But beyond these visits, the presence of a communist discourse opened a discussion on the definition of social justice³⁴.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, positive elements of the participation of the communist bloc in the work of the ILO should be pointed out, which brought attention to the problems of employees and employers in capitalist countries. Of course, I agree that although these comments relate to the protection of employees and employers in a political context, they should not, however, be overlooked in a uniform negative framework.

CONCLUSIONS

What were the possible consequences of the rhetoric of the Soviet bloc countries within the ILO for Western European capitalist states? In effect, In my opinion the evolution of the current European Social Model was, in part, a product of the com-

³³ International Labour Conference. (1952b). Record of proceedings: Discussion of the director general's report. International Labour Conference 35th session. Geneva: International Labour Office.

³⁴ See more: A. Dallin, *The Soviet Union at the united nations. An inquiry into Soviet motives and objectives*, New York, NY: Praeger 1962.

munist sternly stated positions in the ILO. Eastern European communist regimes may have been competing with Western Europe for the role of leading compassionately, including, for example, working hours, holidays with pay, protection of women workers, occupational safety and health, investigation of worker complaints, protection against dismissal, maternity protection, and various social security provisions, such as pensions, family allowances, and state funding for alimony payments. It will be justified at this point to state that as long as there were communist regimes, we had to deal with our kind of rivalry in the scope of the reform program offered or the vision of „decent work”. The disappearance, though not entirely, of this player in the international arena has not weakened the ILO itself. It should be emphasized, however, that the bloc of socialist states had a huge impact on the rhetoric of national social regulations.

References

- Abi Saab G., *Wither the International Community*, „European Journal of International Law” 1998, Vol. 9.
- Alcock E., *History of the International Labour Organisation*, Macmillan UK 1971.
- Berkovitch N., *Women’s alternative path to citizenship. An examination of global employment policy*, [in:] C.L. McNeely, *Public Rights, Public Rules: Constituting Citizens in the World Polity and National Policy*, London – New York 1998.
- Bockman J., *Markets in the Name of Socialism. The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism*, Stanford, Stanford University Press 2011.
- Brölmann C., *ILO Convention practice mixed methods in norm setting for Social Justice*, „Amsterdam Law School Legal Studies Research Paper”, No. 2019-37.
- Carrion-Crespo C., *When Labour Law Went Global: The Road to the International Labour Organization, 1871–1919*, „Journal of Agriculture, University of Puerto Rico” 2012, Vol. 37, No. 1.
- Chinedu Okafor O., Adebola T., Al-Alami B., *Viewing the International Labour Organization’s Social Justice Praxis Through a Third World Approaches to International Law Lens: Some Preliminary Insights*, [in:] *ILO100 for law social justice*, ed. G.P. Politakis, T. Kohiyama, T. Lieby, Geneva 2019.
- Cohen S.F., *Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution: A Political Biography, 1888–1938*, Oxford University Press USA 1980.
- Dallin A., *The soviet union at the united nations. An inquiry into soviet motives and objectives*, New York, NY: Praeger 1962.
- Degras J., *The Communist International 1919–1943: documents*, „The Royal Institute of International Affairs” 1920, Vol. 1.
- Dupuy P.M., *International Law: Torn between Coexistence, Cooperation and Globalization. General Conclusion*, „European Journal of International Law” 1998, Vol. 9.

Eyal G., Szelenyi I., Townsley E.R., *Making Capitalism Without Capitalists. Class Formation and Elite Struggles in Post-Communist Central Europe*, Londres – New York, Verso, 1998.

Eyal G., *The Origins of Postcommunist Elites. From Prague Spring to the Breakup of Czechoslovakia*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Heidin A., *Cold war isomorphism: communist regimes and the West European model of worker participation*, "Journal European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology" 2016, Vol. 3, No. 2-3.

Heller H., *The industrial revolution: Marxist perspectives*, Pluto Press 2011.

Jakovleski V., Jerbi S., Biersteker T., *The ILO's Role in Global Governance: Limits and Potential*, [in:] *The ILO @ 100*, ed. Ch. Gironde, G. Carbonnier, Brill 2019.

Kott S., *ILO: Social Justice in a Global World? A History in Tension*, <https://journals.openedition.org/poldev/2991> [access: 16.04.2020].

Kott S., *The Social Engineering Project. Exportation of Capitalist Management Culture to Eastern Europe (1950–1980)*, [in:] *Planning in Cold War Europe*, ed. M. Christian, S. Kott, O. Matějka, De Gruyter 2018.

Kott S., OIT, *Justice sociale et mondes communistes. Concurrences, émulations, convergences*, in *Le Mouvement social*, https://www.academia.edu/39257916/Sandrine_Kott_OIT_Justice_sociale_et_mondes_communistes._Concurrences_émulations_convergences_in_Le_Mouvement_social_2018_2_p.139-151 [access: 16.04.2020].

Liszczyński T., *Prawo pracy*, Lublin 2008.

Masters P.E., *The International Labor Organization: America's Withdrawal and Reentry*, „International Social Science Review” 1996, Vol. 71, No. 3-4.

Rhynes C.S., *International Law – The Substance, Processes, Procedures and Institutions for World Peace with Justice*, Washington 1971.

Rockwood B.L., *Human Rights and Wrongs: The United States and the I.L.O.--A Modern Morality Play*, <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1991&context=jil> [access: 16.04.2020].

Rodgers G., Lee E., Swepston L., Daele van J., *The International Labour Organization and the quest for social justice, 1919–2009*, Geneva 2009.

Rubinstein A.Z., *Moscow's third world strategy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1988.

Rubinstein A.Z., *Soviet foreign policy since World War II: Imperial and global*, Boston 1985.

Simma B., Paulus A.L., *The International Community: Facing the Challenge of Globalization*, „European Journal of International Law” 1998, Vol. 9.5.

Sobczyk A., *Różnicowanie praw (ochrony) zatrudnionych – wybrane kryteria i ich ocena*, [in:] M. Bosak (ed.), *Funkcja ochronna prawa pracy a wyzwania współczesności*, Warszawa 2014.

Świątkowski A., *Praca towarem?*, „Polityka Społeczna” 1992, No. 4.

Świątkowski A.M., *Polskie prawo pracy*, Warszawa 2010.

Świątkowski A., *W kierunku ustawowej dyferencjacji praw i obowiązków pracowniczych zatrudnionych*, „Palestra” 2015, No. 1-2.

Temin P., *Two Views of the British Industrial Revolution*, "The Journal of Economic History" 1997, Vol. 57, No. 1.

Windmuller J.P., *Soviet employers in the ILO: The experience of the 1930's*, "International Review of Social History" 1961, Vol. 6, No. 3.

Van Daele J., *The International Labour Organization (ILO) in Past and Present Research*, https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/FADBC7A7D-C66CB9225745DE537D176B8/S0020859008003568a.pdf/international_labour_organization_ilo_in_past_and_present_research.pdf [access: 16.04.2020].

Vosko L.F., *Decent Work: The Shifting Role of the ILO and the Struggle for Global Social Justice*, "Global Social Policy" 2002, Vol. 2, No. 1.