

discussion to the war in the Pacific. Participants in the Conference included Professors Ernest B. Price, University of Chicago; Harold M. Vinacke, University of Cincinnati; James T. Watkins, IV, Ohio State University; and Wilbur W. White, Western Reserve University; also Congressmen Bolton, Chipperfield, Jonkman, Mundt, and Vorys.

The International Labor Conference. 1941. Thirty-five nations sent delegations to the session of the International Labor Conference held in New York City October 27–November 4 and in Washington, D. C., on November 5, 1941. This session (regarded officially as a special one) was the first to be held since the outbreak of the European war.¹ A total of some 190 delegates and advisers were reported to have attended. Absent were delegations from the Baltic countries, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Rumania, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, and the U.S.S.R. The occupied countries of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Holland, Norway, Poland, and Yugoslavia were represented by complete delegations; Luxemburg, by two government delegates; and France, by one government delegate.

The debate on the Director's report to the Conference provided an opportunity, for the first time since the outbreak of European war, for a general and popular discussion of war issues and reconstruction at the end of the present war.² In this respect, the Conference undoubtedly rendered a substantial service in the mobilization of public opinion in support of a stronger union of nations to meet post-war problems. No such extensive international gathering, and no such complete and detailed discussion of the post-war world, took place during the World War of 1914–18.³ The influence of this session, and of succeeding sessions, of the Conference on the post-war settlement is likely to be appreciable.

The Conference also provided an opportunity for renewing and strengthening contacts between the governments of smaller countries, and

¹ The twenty-sixth session of the Conference was originally scheduled for June, 1940, but was postponed when the German armies invaded the Lowlands. *The I. L. O. and Reconstruction: Report by the Acting Director of the International Labour Office to the Conference of the International Labour Organisation*, New York, Oct., 1941 (Montreal, 1941), p. 73; Smith Simpson, "The I. L. O. in War-Time," *American Labor Legislation Review*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (Sept., 1941), pp. 121–128; "The International Labor Organization in 1940," *American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Apr., 1941), pp. 359–363.

² The Inter-Allied Conference of September 24, 1941, held at London, was representative of governments only. *New York Times*, Sept. 25, 1: 1.

³ For descriptions of the meetings held during the first World War, see Carol Riegelman, "War-Time Trade Union and Socialist Proposals," in J. T. Shotwell (ed.), *Origins of the International Labor Organization* (New York, 1934); Lewis L. Lorwin, *Labor and Internationalism* (New York, 1929), pp. 181–185. At the 26th session of the International Labor Conference, 66 delegates from 27 countries took part in the discussion. *Provisional Record*, p. 305.

between employers and workers. This gave rise to a meeting of the governments of central European countries and a declaration by them of an intention to consider a post-war plan for the reconstruction of central Europe.⁴ The Conference gave rise, also, to a meeting of the International Federation of Trade Unions. One can visualize a very considerable influence to result from such extra-Conference relationships.

The resolutions adopted by the Conference covered a wide range of subjects mainly concerned with post-war developments.⁵ One requested the Director to begin immediately to plan for the establishment of a World Textile Office under the aegis of the I.L.O.⁶ Another authorized the Director to start consultations so that, when the war ends, plans may be put into effect immediately for the "regulation of economic and social conditions in the mercantile marine."⁷ A third endorsed the "Atlantic Charter," thus enhancing the usefulness and practical value of this declaration of last August.⁸ Another requested the Governing Body to take appropriate steps, and to consider the appointment of a committee, to encourage the export of goods from American countries as a means of diminishing unemployment.⁹ A fifth expressed the feeling of the Conference that agrarian reform was desirable in countries essentially agricultural in order to permit a rational mobilization of agricultural resources

⁴ *New York Times*, Nov. 3, 1941, 3: 3. See also the joint declaration made at the Conference by the governments and employers' and workers' delegates of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia. *Provisional Record*, pp. 318-319.

⁵ Conference of the International Labor Organization, New York, Oct.-Nov., 1941. Resolutions adopted by the Conference (mimeo.)

⁶ *Provisional Record*, pp. 301-303. Objection was taken to the resolution by the Mexican Government on the ground that it involved a violation of national sovereignty. *Ibid.*, p. 303. The special interest of the International Labor Organization in the textile industry dates from a resolution adopted by the eleventh session of the International Labor Conference in 1928 requesting an inquiry into working conditions in that industry. *Record of Proceedings*, International Labor Conference, Eleventh Session, 1928, pp. 354-357. This inquiry, although begun, was disorganized by the depression which began in 1929 and was not completed. The World Textile Conference, called by the I.L.O. in 1936, resumed the thread of interest. For the two monumental studies presented to the Textile Conference, see *World Textile Industries, Studies and Reports*, Series B, No. 27 (Geneva, 1937). For comments on the Conference, see Smith Simpson, "The World Textile Conference," *Washington Post*, Apr. 17, 1937, and "The I.L.O. Month by Month," *American Federationist*, Vol. 44, No. 5 (May, 1937) pp. 501-508. At the 86th session of the Governing Body (Feb., 1939), the International Labor Office was instructed to establish a tripartite textile committee "to consider labor conditions in the textile industries, taking into account those aspects of the industries which, directly or indirectly, may have a bearing on the improvement of those conditions, and to make recommendations to the Governing Body." *Minutes of the 86th Session of the Governing Body*, pp. 54-61. ⁷ *Provisional Record*, pp. 339-342.

⁸ *Idem*, pp. 343-347.

⁹ *Idem*, pp. 349-361.

and improvement of nutrition.¹⁰ Other resolutions adopted by the Conference were based on the report of the Conference's Committee on Collaboration and emphasized the interest of the I.L.O. in coördinated effort on the part of public authorities, workers, and employers in the winning of the war and the peace thereafter.¹¹ Since this question of collaboration proved too large and complex to be treated adequately by a single session, the Conference requested that it be placed on the agenda of the next session.¹²

In addition to the foregoing resolutions, and among the more important resolutions adopted by the Conference, was one which had its genesis with the delegation of the United States. This requested the Governing Body to call to the attention of governments of all member states the need for associating the I.L.O. with post-war reconstruction, and to ask that the I.L.O. be represented in any peace or reconstruction conference following the war; to request such governments to set up representative agencies to study post-war problems; and to set up from its own membership a small tripartite committee to prepare measures of reconstruction and emergency measures to deal with unemployment.¹³ Added significance was given to the resolution by President Roosevelt's invitation to the Conference to hold its final session at the White House.

The sum total of the Conference resolutions is greatly to expand the scope and usefulness of the International Labor Organization. Combined with the fact that the I.L.O. is the only general international institution which is continuing to function during the war, the pressure of events and the success of the New York Conference make the I.L.O. possibly the most important instrument for democratic policy in international affairs. Its significance to practical statesmen, as well as to students of political science, can therefore be expected to increase considerably as the months pass.—SMITH SIMPSON.

Thirty-seventh Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. The thirty-seventh annual meeting of the American Political Science Association was held in New York City December 28–31, 1941, with the Hotel Pennsylvania as headquarters. This was a joint meeting with the American Society for Public Administration, which held its third annual meeting on December 27–30. Registrants for both associations numbered 1,024. This registration compares with 403 registrants when the Association met in Chicago in 1936; 531 in 1937 in Philadelphia; and 555 in 1938 in Columbus. At the joint annual meeting of the two societies in 1939 in Washington, D. C., there were 1,232 registrants; and in 1940 in Chicago, 1,130 registrants.

¹⁰ *Idem*, pp. 350–361.

¹¹ *Idem*, pp. 322–328.

¹² *Idem*, p. 328. No date was set for the next session of the Conference.

¹³ *Idem*, pp. 330–337.