Separate but loyal: Muslims in American society after the September 11 attacks

November 26, 2021

The September 11 attacks in 2001 had a huge impact on American society. But at the same time, the Muslim community in the US also suffered from unprecedented pressure in political, legal and social contexts and received unfair treatment. The American anti-terrorist research institutions and law enforcement departments once showed great concern that local Muslims could become a major factor in triggering domestic violent extremism. However, the reality was just the opposite. After the September 11 attacks, US-based Muslims demonstrated their loyalty and national identity as Americans more than before. Muslim ideology has no charismatic attraction in the US. By contrast, the main terrorist attacks in Europe were planned and carried out by the second generation and later of extremist Muslims in Europe. In addition, a lot of European Muslims went to Syria and Iraq to participate in Islamic jihad. To answer the question of why Muslims in the US and Europe are so different, Lei Shaohua, an associate professor of Peking University's School of International Studies, offered a keynote speech.

Lei Shaohua discussed three main topics – an overview of the current situation of American Muslims, American policy toward Muslims and responses of Muslims, and a comparison of American and European Muslim policies, and tried answering the following three questions. Why did local Muslim extremists that anti-terrorist experts feared not appear in the US after the

September 11 attacks? Why can American Muslims hold a strong identification with and loyalty to the US? Compared with Europe, why does the US see success in its politics with domestic Muslims? He opined that "strong national identification" is the precondition for the US Constitution to safeguard religious freedom, and treating all religions fairly is at the core of the American religious policy and ethnic politics. US-based Muslims live a life that is culturally "separate" but loyal to the country. "Separation" is an objective state of ethnic lifestyle, and "loyalty" is an active identification with the country from the heart. Separation does not mean division, freedom does not mean privilege, and loyalty is the foundation of "unity." This is the most important reason for the success of American Muslim policy as well as America's universal religion and ethnic policy.

I History and overview of American Muslims

·Formation of American Muslim community

Up to the 19th century, American Muslims were mainly black slaves trafficked from Africa, who formed the majority of African Muslims in the US and account for one fourth of the American Muslim population. Muslims from around the world and their descendants who arrived after the slave trade ended making up the remaining three-quarters of the current Muslim population. Especially after the US Congress passed the Immigration and Naturalization Act in 1965, which abolished an earlier quota system based on national origin, immigration inflows were seen from various countries and ethnic groups. Muslims were one of them. After 1965, many Muslims from the Middle East region and South Asia immigrated to the US to flee from war, poverty and political persecution. Since the Iranian

Revolution in 1979, many Shiite Muslims immigrated from Iran.

According to a Pew survey, as of 2017, there were 3.45 million Muslims in the US, accounting for about 1.1 percent of the total US population. While there are Muslim communities in every state in the US, the main Muslim communities are on the East and West coasts and in large cities in the Midwest. The cities with the largest numbers of Muslims are New York, Los Angeles, Chicago and Detroit. The diversity of American mosques also reflects the heterogeneity of American Muslim communities, as groups of different Muslim communities come from different countries, races, or denominations. Different mosques have different ceremonies and doctrinal concepts. Muslims are the third largest religious group in the US, after Christianity and Judaism.

In general, the Muslims in the US can be divided into two groups, African American Muslims and immigrant Muslims. The identification of Muslim groups in the US is very complex. It includes identification with Islam and the Umma, identification with the US and their country of origin, and different identifications with living communities and self-identities. Even in a pluralistic society like the US, Muslim Americans have a complex diversity. Their religion, living habits, traditional culture, and political participation mix together to form a very complex multiple identity. In stark contrast to other immigrant groups, Muslim Americans cannot be defined by race or nationality, but rather religious and cultural identity.

·Profile of Contemporary American Muslims

According to the data from the latest Pew survey, 92 percent of American Muslims identify as Americans; 97 percent identify

as Muslims; 89 percent identify themselves as both Americans and Muslims. At present, the population that sees the fastest increase is Arabian Muslims, from the Middle East and North Africa. In terms of education and income, American Muslims are higher than the average level in the US. Politically, 66 percent Muslims support Democrats, 13 percent support Republicans and 20 percent hold no clear political position or support no party.

Despite the difference between Islamic culture and American mainstream culture, most American citizens hold no continuous bias or hostility toward local Islamic culture or the Muslim community due to the separateness of Muslim communities. The September 11 attacks in 2001 caused an impact unprecedented to the US society and a peak of hate crimes targeting the Muslim group appeared, making long-existing Islamphobia increasingly intense during this extraordinary period. After the September 11 attacks, unfair treatment toward Muslims in the US mainly came from some religious groups, political figures and ultra-conservative individuals.

According to an FBI report, hate crimes against Muslims rose from 28 cases in 2000 to 481 in 2001, a 17-fold increase over the same period the previous year. These crimes include physical attacks and threats of violence against Muslims, vandalism against property and arson. Even at the University of California, Berkeley, known for its liberal atmosphere, some Muslim students received death-threats via email. At the same time, many anti-Muslim foundations and think tanks in the US used long-term and mainstream propaganda campaigns to influence the public perception of Muslims. The most influential essay was Samuel Huntington's "Clash of Civilizations."

Although it is not an anti-Muslim theory, the September 11 attacks intensified the idea of a "clash" between Islamic and Christian civilizations, and Huntington's theory is widely cited. Regarding political figures, due to election needs, some politicians deliberately pander using Islamophobia in certain constituencies to attack their competitors or win votes. In addition, these political figures also openly conduct anti-Islamic or anti-Muslim campaigns to a certain extent. After the September 11 attacks, the Bush administration signed the *Patriot Act*, causing great damages to the Muslim community. The most controversial aspect of the *Patriot Act* is that it gives the federal government the privilege to bypass the Fourth Amendment, allowing the federal government the right to secretly conduct a physical search or wiretap on American citizens in the name of counterterrorism.

II American Muslims after the September 11 attacks

After the September 11 attacks, although some Muslim communities and individuals in the US were treated unfairly, the US government and general public carried out various measures at the political level to maintain American social unity, build Muslims' national identity, and strengthen the integration of Muslim communities into American society. After the September 11 attacks, the US federal government's Muslim policy revolved around the two cores of preventing domestic terrorist attacks and integrating community relations. These policies were mainly formulated and implemented in five areas: religious reconciliation, immigration policy, anti-terrorism policy, public education, and political participation.

·Religious reconciliation

Islam is the third largest religion in the US. In terms of public policy and public relations, the US federal government has been making every effort to prevent intensifying the conflicts and divisions between different religions' ideologies and national identity at the national level. After the September 11 attacks, the entire American social mood was very unfriendly to the Muslim community. To avoid intensifying the conflict, then President George W. Bush urged Americans to resist anti-Muslim impulses in his report to Congress on September 20, 2001. On the ninth day after the September 11 attacks, Bush invited American Islamic religious leaders to the White House to condemn terrorism. He deliberately invited the chairman of the largest Muslim organization in the US to preside over a mourning ceremony at the site of the destroyed World Trade Center, publicly demonstrating his support and confidence in the Muslim community. This political gesture helped promote religious reconciliation and underscores America's multiculturalism and its inclusiveness.

·Immigration policy

The Bush and Obama administrations tried very hard to reform and improve immigration policy. Examples include the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act during the Bush administration and the Dream Act promoted by the Obama administration. With these immigration policies, the administrations hoped to create effective and relatively tolerant immigration policies for the Muslim population who come to the US legally. Immigration policies during these two administrations still actively safeguarded "political correctness," avoiding policies targeting specific groups, especially Muslims.

After Donald Trump came to power, he totally neglected the "politically correct" principle, not only completely stopping the "Dream Act," but also bypassing Congress to promulgate an immigration administration order and tourism bans that directly targeted Muslims. Trump claimed in a public speech his goal was to fully ban Muslims from entering the US, and ordered the State Department to stop issuing the US tourist visa to seven Muslim countries, refusing to accept refugees from Syria, while requiring the arrest of illegal immigrants in the US.

·Anti-terrorism policy

Federal government decision makers realized that the September 11 attacks were planned and implemented by international terrorist organizations, with the purpose of manufacturing hatred in the US, thus tearing social unity and causing more chaos. After the September 11 attacks, the federal government gradually established a US national counter-terrorism system that involved legislation on security, institutional design and public education. The core of US counter-terrorism policy is to identify the source of true terrorism and terrorists, avoiding the involvement of innocent people or creating greater social divides and hatred.

First, in terms of legislation and policy rhetoric, the United States Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Bureau of Investigation used three different definitions: terrorism, hate crimes and homegrown violent extremism. The official document used the word "counterterrorism" in the context of combating international terrorism, and "counter violent extremism" in the context of combating domestic terrorism. Federal law enforcement agencies gave different definitions of these three

concepts and categorized the illegal activities and malignant violence in the US at different levels based on ideology, motivation and implementation. Political concepts such as "terrorism" that are imbued with serious ideology, religious hatred, ethnic conflict and the potential to cause social panic are avoided, and generally replaced with the more neutral term "extremism," which helps to mitigate public panic, prevents the alienation of ethnic groups, and enhances people's trust in the federal government.

Second, in law enforcement, although federal law enforcement agencies had an unfair law enforcement approach to the Muslim community during a specific period, in general, federal agencies have achieved fruitful results in combating hate crimes and preventing excessive law enforcement toward the Muslim population by themselves and local law enforcement agencies. The federal agencies' excessive law enforcement toward the Muslim population does not mean that they allow hateful behavior. Once a hate crime happens, federal and local law enforcement agencies impartially protect Muslim victims, and detect and arrest the suspects.

·Public education

In terms of promoting public education, the most important task of the federal government is to intensify the patriotic education of Muslims at school. Public schools, especially those with many Muslims, strengthened patriotic education, and established students' respect of and identification with the national flag, national emblems and national anthem. This mandatory patriotism education shaped a strong patriotic ideology, playing a decisive role in developing national

identification among the young generation of Muslims.

After the September 11 attacks, the US federal government noticed flaws in decision-making due to the inadequate Muslim studies, so they started to provide federal funds and encourage private donations to support research in the Arabic language, the Middle East region, Islam as a religion and Muslim populations. Relevant think tanks have held a variety of public lectures and seminars. Many universities have opened Arabic courses and established Middle East research centers. Some famous universities have also increased and strengthened the study of Islam. After the September 11 attacks, research on Islam-related language, culture, politics, laws and international relations developed rapidly in American colleges and universities, not only promoting inclusiveness and understanding between religions and ethnic groups, but also cultivating a lot of academic and professional talent for the US government's administration and international relations.

·Political participation

The federal government encouraged the active fostering of US-based Muslim youth leaders, especially female Muslim youth leaders, and supported and trained a lot of patriotic Muslim journalists. Young Muslim leaders could not only become professional and technical talent in a certain field, but also guide more Muslim youth to develop in the direction of identifying with the mainstream values of the US. The federal government and local governments have jointly created conditions to set up scholarships and internship programs, which have further stimulated the enthusiasm of Muslims, especially young Muslim groups, for political participation. After the September 11 attacks,

the federal government's Muslim policy proved to be very successful, and American Muslims were not generally marginalized or excluded from political participation. This is completely different from Muslims in Europe.

After the September 11 attacks, there was unfair treatment of some Muslims by law enforcement agencies in the US and some discrimination and Islamophobia in society. The partiality of the US foreign policy to Israel created tension with the Islamic world, and the clash of civilizations concept and other ideas not conducive to American Muslims were seen in the academic world. However, the American Muslim community did not show any of the increase in domestic terrorism that many anti-terrorism agencies were worried about. On the contrary, overall national identity and loyalty became higher than before. After September 11, the amount of domestic terrorist activity in the US was extremely low, and the fact that the Islamic State had difficulty appealing to American Muslims was more proof of the positive effect of the federal government's policies on American Muslims and the success of American ethnic politics.

III Comparison of American and European Muslim policies

Policies and practices toward Muslims in the US show that in American society, Muslims' religious beliefs do not conflict with their sense of belonging to mainstream culture. Unlike postmodern political movements such as gay rights, women's rights, animal rights, and environmental protection, the rights of American Muslim groups are a process of "giving" by a state, not the result of Muslim groups bargaining with the state through social movements. Unlike the ethnic identity crisis in Europe, American Muslim ethnic politics effectively balances personal

identity, religious beliefs, the global Muslim community, and national identity. "Loyalty" to the US has become an important symbol of American Muslim national identity. This is not just the success of American ethnic politics in the Muslim community, but also applies to other religious groups such as Catholics and Mormons. The most successful thing about American religion and ethnic politics is that it can clearly distinguish the boundaries between the public sphere and private life. This is mainly reflected in the correct application of the First Amendment to the Constitution, strict and fair law enforcement, and political participation.

·Ensuring the applicability of constitutional protections

The First Amendment to the US Constitution established the principle of prohibiting the establishment of a state religion and prohibiting obstruction of freedom of religion and speech. "A high degree of national identity" is the premise for the US Constitution to protect religious freedom, and "fair treatment of all religions" is the core of US religious policy and ethnic politics. In the field of US federal public policy, religious belief is an individual freedom, so no religion can be propagated in the public education system.

By contrast, Europe adheres to the traditional concept of the "nation-state" on the one hand, but overtly supports multiculturalism on the other hand. This leads Europe's Muslim policy to two extremes, resulting in the phenomenon that the religious and ethnic identity of European Muslims goes beyond their national identity. Muslim policies in these countries confuse Muslim public life and personal life, thereby further strengthening their faith and ethnic identity, while ignoring

national identity and respect for other groups.

Many European countries have satisfied Muslims demands of halal food and worship, and supported special requirements for female Muslim students to wear modest swimming gear. These requirements are seemingly "harmless" but have resulted in increasingly expanding privileges of the Muslim group. Once Muslim privileges became available, Muslims ask for more privileges. When their requirements moved beyond social tolerance, "Islamophobia" spread in Europe, making this group more difficult to integrate into European society and resulting in ethnic conflicts and even terrorism.

When the conflict between the nation-state tradition and ethnic politics reached a certain level, laws in some European countries went to another extreme. For instance, France forbids students from wearing headscarves and robes, and refuses to serve halal food; in Austria, it is illegal for Muslim women to cover their faces; in Hungary, the government prohibits the construction of new mosques. Such discriminatory laws and policies targeting specific groups violate the principle of legal fairness and further strain the relationship between European Muslims and traditional societies. The spread of feelings of helplessness, discrimination and isolation, in the absence of national loyalty and identity, strengthened the European Muslim group's belief in Islam and identification with Muslim identity, which eventually led to a lot of European Muslims joining the "Islamic State" to participate in a holy war.

·Strict and fair law enforcement

Strict and fair enforcement by US law enforcement agencies helps build an equal society. Strict and fair enforcement not only

protects Muslims from social injustice, but also prevents the emergence of European-style Muslim privileges. On the other hand, legitimate "law enforcement terror" has become an effective public management and law enforcement strategy. After the September 11 attacks, US law enforcement agencies over-enforced the law. They used a "good cops and bad cops" strategy. "Bad cops" in law enforcement and "good cops" in politics cooperated with each other, forming a situation in which Muslim groups have "low trust in law enforcement agencies but high trust in the federal government." In this way, the Muslim community accepted patriotic education more smoothly, and a younger generation of young Muslim leaders who have a high degree of national identity and abide by the laws of the US are gradually cultivated.

·High political participation of American Muslims

Although the American Muslim group is the third largest religious group, its overall population is still not very large. In addition, the vast territory of the US further dilutes the population density of American Muslims. Therefore, the entire Muslim group has little impact on mainstream American politics and culture. In terms of geographical factors, the US is far from the Middle East and has a natural marine barrier. All Muslim immigrants entering the US must undergo strict screening before they can obtain visas. Poverty and marginalization are hotbeds of terrorism, and American Muslims are generally well educated. About half of Muslims in the US are engaged in engineering, medicine, education, and business management, and their social status is relatively high. The poverty rate of Muslim Americans is lower than most other religions or minorities, so Islamic

extremism lacks the soil to survive in the US. The federal government implements an active policy of Muslim political participation. Political participation helps the mainstream society listen to the voices and demands of Muslims, and at the same time builds a strong national identity among the Muslim group, which objectively makes American politics and society more inclusive of Muslims than Europe.

IV Conclusion

Europe has traditionally adhered to a "nation-state" homogenous identity and culture, but advocated multiculturalism in public policy. Multiculturalism politicizes Islamic culture at the expense of a society with a common national identity and values, leading to the overall failure of European Muslim policy. Compared with Europe, the US approaches a Muslim policy based on "national identity." The result of European Muslim policy is the politicization of ethnic issues, while the US has successfully "depoliticized" Muslim ethnic issues. Ethnic political parties, political participation, ethnic public policies, social equality, ethnic groups, religions, ethnic protests, ethnic social movements, ethnic politics, ethnic integration, division, riots, massacres and even civil wars are all, in the final analysis, manifestations of "identity politics." In modern politics, the core of Muslim ethnic politics is the question of whether strong religious beliefs and modern political systems can be integrated. Religion is a personal belief, not one that interferes with or influences other religions, or harms political and social rights. All ethnic groups require "a high degree of national identity." This is a prerequisite for the protection of religious freedoms in the US Constitution. The success of American ethnopolitics lies in the

fact that it adheres to this principle from beginning to end.

Religious freedom with a strong national identity, strict and fair law enforcement, poverty eradication and non-political social marginalization are all important principles in the US to prevent domestic violent extremism and promote the integration between Muslim communities and mainstream American values. "Separation" is an objective state of ethnic lifestyle, and "loyalty" is an active identification with the country from the heart. Separation does not mean division, freedom does not mean privilege, and loyalty is the foundation of "unity." Therefore, "separate but loyal" as an important hallmark of the success of American Muslim policy will persist for a long time.

After Lei Shaohua's presentation, the participants had in-depth exchanges and discussions on the relationship between a wave of refugees and the source of terrorist attacks in Europe, the nation-state and multiculturalism, and Muslim identity politics.

The International Labor Organization
and Industrialization：
Logic and Origin of Labor Hegemony
December 24, 2021

This session of the Yannan Roundtable invited Chen Yifeng, associate professor of the Peking University Law School, to deliver a speech. The salon was moderated by Xie Kankan, assistant professor of the School of Foreign Languages of Peking University.

By introducing the relevant history from the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, when the International Labor Committee was set up to discuss and formulate labor standards, to the early 1930s when the ILO was established, Prof. Chen Yifeng discussed issues such as the narrative of the history of the ILO and the economic rationale of industrialization and the so-called humanist cause.

He not only discussed the development and impact of the organization in terms of international law, but also emphasized the political games behind labor protection. In this way he revealed the ILO's implicit North-South problem. His discussion is of great help to our understanding of "labor protection" as a new tool of hegemonic discourse in the international political economy.

I Competing Narratives about ILO History

Chen Yifeng said that there have always been different narratives about ILO history in academic circles. The first

narrative takes the foundation of ILO as a natural continuation of European humanism. From 1818, many non-government actors in Europe, including the trade union movement, socialist revolutionaries, and enlightened entrepreneurs, called for international legislation on labor. In1900, an international association to advocate for labor legislation was founded in Paris, France. In 1906, a convention banning the use of white phosphorus when making matches was initiated in Bern, Switzerland.

Other non-governmental organizations helped establish international conventions that regulated women's work at night in factories. The role of these non-government actors was so prominent that people believed the foundation of ILO at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 was a continuation of the movement toward humanism. This transformed labor problems from a private issue to an international one, improving the conditions for labor protection. This narrative of the ILO as a humanist agency promoting rights at work is very typical.

The second narrative takes the foundation of the ILO as a political engineering whose main role was to mediate and confine labor conflicts in Europe. An important background for the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in1919 was the victory of the October Revolution of Russia in 1917.

Amid fear of Bolshevism, the ILO hoped to transform radical labor organizations and labor movements into an effective international mechanism for fostering peaceful, cooperative, disciplined, and manageable labor. Overall, the basic ideology of the ILO is Labor-Management Cooperation and the gradual improvement of society. It was formed against the background of

competition with Soviet Bolshevism and attempted to reform labor relations. In this sense, the ILO is a political organization, and much of its operations were directly related to politics.

Chen Yifeng proposed a perspective on the history of the ILO from a combined political and economic perspective. He said that the foundation of the ILO and the implementation of labor standards were based on the needs of industrialization. Based on a prediction of the future social order, especially the social order of an industrialized society, the ILO developed a set of labor standards. As an industrial social order continued to expand from Europe to other parts of the world, European labor standards were gradually imposed on non-Europe countries. The ILO is not primarily for the realization of humanistic standards, but more for the development of an economic order for the entire world market against the background of international competition between European products and products from the East, especially China, Japan and India.

By incorporating labor standards into government regulations, the ILO has, to a large extent, transformed the development of European industrialization into the advancement of labor protection, thus establishing a supposed hierarchical relationship and opposition between modernization and backwardness.

This narrative adopts the perspective of looking at the ILO from the perspective of international law in the Global South, abandoning a traditional Eurocentric perspective, and emphasizing the discourse and hegemony of industrially developed countries in international society.

II The Power of International Organizations

Chen Yifeng pointed out that there are two main understandings of the power of international organizations in law circles. The first understanding is more formal, arguing that the powers of an international organization are conferred by the states that establish the organization. The second understanding argues that the powers of an international organization come from its aim and purpose. Political scientists mainly study how intellectual power becomes rational discourse and power of international organizations, as well as how intellectual power becomes mainstream power through the activities of international organizations. Legal circles mainly rely on the formal, legal view to understand the power of international organizations, while political circles rely on anthropology and sociology to some extent to emphasize the legitimacy and importance of intellectual power.

In addition, Chen Yifeng also proposes a third dimension, arguing that international organizations develop power also in the sense that the power between countries is formed in social relations and state relations.

For example, international agreements such as the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) and the China-EU Comprehensive Agreement on Investment have provisions requiring China to ratify the Forced Labor Convention. Recently, the US passed a law banning imports from China's Xinjiang on the grounds of forced labor. Labor issues become a powerful discourse to reshape the world's political and economic landscapes. In this context, it is of great significance to trace how labor issues were generated and shaped by political and discourse hegemony.

III Embedded Industrialism of the ILO

Chen Yifeng said that the ILO protected workers in the context of ongoing industrialization — it only protected industrial workers. Workers without a labor contract, legal worker status or employer were not protected. The ILO practiced tripartite principles, in which the government, trade union representatives, and employers were represented, with the government having two votes and the other two parties having one vote each.

The ILO introduced a strong focus on industrialization in determining what kind of workers would be protected. First, the ILO regarded industrialization as the model to measure whether a country or society is progressing. Second, the ILO emphasized the universality of industrial protection and the promotion of industrial production on a global scale, and provided normative programs for social governance. This scheme took the form of labor protection, but in fact, defined the economic logic and development direction of each society through a specific labor protection framework. Finally, by limiting the protection of workers to workers in industry, workers who were not formally employed, without social security, or without union representation were often not protected.

Since industry or the factory is the basic place to protect workers' rights, the factory was regarded as a small political entity in the struggle to achieve practical governance and social rights. The Constitution of the ILO issued in 1919 contains many references to industrial conditions and the international adjustment of industrial living and working conditions, to provide industrial workers with more adequate wages. Its basic concern was to achieve peaceful industrial relations and the effective,

normative organization of unionized workers. Overall, in the European context, the attempt to manage the labor movement by government was the primary direction of industrialization.

When the ILO was established, one of the significant debates was whether to set international labor standards. At the Paris Peace Conference, the nine basic principles of the ILO were laid down, emphasizing the principles of freedom of association, freedom of trade unions, labor not being treated as a commodity, the abolition of child labor, and the establishment of a factory inspection system. It is important to note that these were seen only as principles, not directly enforceable labor standards. The Paris Peace Conference avoided making any substantive provisions on international labor standards. This move contains a specific conceptualization of international organizations, believing that international organizations themselves represent progress and development, not necessarily the solution to real substantive problems. After establishing the international organization, the idea was that people would gradually accept the standards through more substantive international conventions.

IV Economic Rationale of the Humanitarian Cause

In 1919, the ILO won the power to formulate international labor standards, in two forms. The first is the International Labor Convention, which is open to ratification by ILO Member States. The second is the International Labor Recommendation. Supporters of this form believe that universal protection of international labor should come from reconciliation, rationality, and law, and advocate the use of moral force to promote labor protection and achieve world peace.

In 1919, labor protection was regarded as an important

dimension of world peace, but such universal humanism had a specific political and economic background. Britain's then-chief negotiator on the International Labor Legislative Council admitted that the motives of what the British did in Paris were not all motivated by humanism. The British were particularly concerned about labor conditions in other countries, hoping global conditions could rise to the same level as in Europe, to prevent products from Eastern countries from posing competition and damaging the products of the Western world. A significant task of the ILO was to raise living standards in the Eastern world. Equality in terms of trade is to a large extent equality in terms of labor conditions. Therefore, the ILO aimed to make international competition fair and acceptable. The Constitution of the ILO emphasizes that "the failure of any State to adopt humanitarian labor conditions constitutes an obstacle to the improvement of labor conditions in other States." It can be seen that the ILO attached great importance to the development of humanistic, fair and regulated global competition.

This emphasis on labor conditions in non-European countries is directly related to the first wave of globalization that followed colonial expansion. Because of globalization, labor conditions in the southern hemisphere and colonial countries became increasingly important. The ILO later recognized that labor issues under the Vienna Contract were based on two principles: addressing the difficulties suffered by workers and ensuring fair labor conditions. The underlying principle was to protect developed countries from unequal competition from the East, which was essential to Western civilization. After signing the Vienna Contract, the ILO started to set up various

organizations in colonial countries or backward countries.

For example, from 1930, it set up branches in Prague, Tokyo, Rio de Janeiro, Warsaw, Budapest, and other places to collate labor information and promote labor standards.

Non-European countries were under great pressure to ratify the international treaty. For example, India's then-suzerain, Britain, continued to press India to ratify. Contemporary Indian scholars believe that the main purpose of this behavior was to protect British domestic industries from competition from India. Japan and China also encountered the same problem.

Another key principle of the ILO was transforming industrialization into a hierarchy of backwardness and modernization. The ILO has focused on labor conditions in China since the 1930s, describing them as inhuman and exploitative. Instead of taking an economic or social perspective, they turned the degree of economic development into a moral issue, understood and measured the agricultural economy of Eastern countries from a humanistic perspective, and believed that the East's backwardness lay in the exploitative use of labor.

Given the backwardness of economic and labor conditions in the East, Europe chose to use a humanistic discourse to wrap its concerns about international economic competition and enforce labor standards in the East. It is worth noting that the Governing Body of the ILO was composed of 24 seats at that time, of which 12 were for government representatives, 6 for workers, and 6 for employers. The first Governing Body, elected in Washington in 1919, had 20 members from Europe, a composition that fully demonstrated the Eurocentrism of the organization.

At that time, China approved some of the ILO labor provisions to show its sincere participation in the ILO and its concern for labor issues. In addition, China was competing for the board of the ILO in 1934 and needed a good performance. Furthermore, in the view of some Chinese government officials and elites at that time, European standards of civilization were reflected by the ratification of treaties and labor legislation in the context of the ILO, and therefore the acceptance of international labor conventions was an important indicator of China's gradual realization of civilization. This caused China's labor legislation to be oriented toward the international dimension without regard to domestic conditions. For example, at that time, many domestic studies argued that the Factory Law of 1929 was completely unenforceable and many of its provisions would cause protests among domestic factory owners and serious unemployment.

The Washington Conference of 1919 adopted ILO Convention No.1, the Washington Convention, which discussed issues related to working hours. Article 1 of the Convention is the definition of industrial premises, which makes it clear that labor protection applies only to the industrial sector, including mining, power generation, manufacturing, transportation, construction, and so on, and distinguishes this sector from the agricultural and commercial sectors.

According to the convention, workers in the industrial sector must work no more than 48 hours a week and no more than eight hours a day. At that time, the Convention also specifically discussed China and put forward three suggestions for China, hoping that China would formulate a Factory Law to protect workers, implement an eight-hour workday whenever possible,

but gradually, start with a 10-hour day and a 60-hour week. China's foreign concessions were to negotiate with the assistance of the ILO and be subject to uniform standards.

But in practical terms, the eight-hour day is very difficult to implement and requires fundamental changes to the entire industrial and factory system. For many manufacturing enterprises, the shift from a 10-12 hour working system or even a 14-hour working system to an 8-hour working system means the shift from two to three shifts. A factory must have a good foundation to achieve this standard while ensuring production efficiency and market competitiveness. Chen Yifeng believes the 8-hour day was essentially a revolution in industry, not just an issue of working hours.

V Conclusion

Chen Yifeng said that the ILO built public power on many issues through humanistic discourse and expanded its influence on the formulation and decision-making of labor standards on a global scale through the formulation and clarification of labor standards. The ILO tried to break away from Eurocentrism and build itself into an organization of global governance and expand its structure globally. Collecting information on local labor, it has become a significant platform for European countries to promote labor standards. Due to economic competition, labor has become a global issue. The ILO, to a large extent, has obtained the legitimacy of regulation and power by turning concerns about competition from Eastern countries' products into labor issues.

This process reflects the particular orientation of the ILO itself: The ILO was an industrial and economic organization since its foundation. Its economic functions were very strong during the

period of the League of Nations, and it was responsible for many social, economic, and political affairs. After the Second World War, many of its economic functions were transferred to the newly established World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and other organizations, and it became purely focused on international labor. For a long time, the ILO has established the benchmark of legitimate social and economic issues, and has thus build a global economic and social order.

During the discussion session, the participants discussed the following issues: the role of the fear of China and other developing countries in the foundation of the ILO, the relationship between the ILO and the communist labor movement, the discourse power of labor issues, the historical narrative before the ILO, and post-World War II development. Chen Yifeng participated in all these discussions.

Chen Yifeng believes that an important reason that European countries supported ILO was to compete with the Third International in the political ideology of labor discourse. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the legitimacy and identity of the ILO provoked many controversies. After World War II, especially after the rise of neoliberalism, the economic importance of the ILO gradually decreased with the establishment of organizations such as the World Bank and the implementation of the Marshall Plan.

Chen Yifeng also pointed out that the current debate on labor and trade is similar to the early days of the ILO, aiming to change the global trade system and break up the current trading regime through discourse on labor. We cannot overestimate the stability of the free trade order and the economic order, for they can at any

time become incoherent and divided by introducing new elements.

The participating scholars emphasized that how to coordinate the concept and practical interests of China's economic development to the present, have a voice in the international community and correctly express this voice, is an urgent issue for China. Chen Yifeng's study on the ILO has great reference significance.