

Interview with Dale E. Good

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training Foreign Affairs Oral History Project
Labor Series

DALE E. GOOD

Interviewed by: Thomas D. Bowie

Initial interview date: June 1, 1996

Copyright 1998 ADST

Q: This is Tom Bowie and I have the great pleasure of interviewing my good and old friend Dale Good at his home in Shelburne, Vermont. I have been spending a delightful time visiting Dale and Lois. We really have been having a pleasant time, and now we must get down to work. Dale, how about starting off and talking a little bit about your background?

GOOD: Fine, Tom, and thanks for the compliment. Your being here almost makes this interview worthwhile in my view. I suppose we could begin by my going to Ohio State University at the end of the war and studying what was then called "Labor Economics." After taking a degree there and doing my academic work for a Ph.D., I decided that I needed more practical experience. So I went off to Detroit and started working as a spot welder at the Dodge main plant and became a member of Local 3 of the UAW-CIO [United Automobile Workers-Congress of Industrial Organizations].

I remember one of my experiences there was going through a strike in 1948 and becoming a member of what was called "the Flying Squadron." In my ignorance I asked an old-timer, "What is the Flying Squadron?" He said to me, "It's the goon squad." Well, I learned a lot from that experience and was due to become a member of the bargaining committee of

Library of Congress

the local when I received a letter from Philips Bradley, who was setting up the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations at the University of Illinois. He asked me if I would come there and do work in their research program, which I decided to do.

I was involved in doing a study of labor relations in Decatur, Illinois, as they liked to say in those days, “in the context of the community.” While doing that research work I did a lot of interviewing of Earl Heaton, who was the regional director of Region 8 of the UAW—AFL [United Automobile Workers—American Federation of Labor]. And Decatur at that time was a UAW-AFL town. Heaton had everything organized from the High Flyer Kite Company to Staley's Corn Starch Company. In view of the recent history of Decatur, it is an interesting commentary, I think, to remember how Decatur was back in the late 1940's. One day Earl asked me if I wanted a job organizing, and I said, “Yes.” He sent me to Logansport, Indiana, which was another memorable experience. While I was there, I organized three companies: a furniture making company, a die-casting company, and a foundry.

Then we got involved in the Korean War, and I was nominated to go as a labor representative to the National Production Authority (NPA), which was a defense agency. In Washington I became interested in the [State Department's] Labor Attach# Program, which was then expanding. I knew, of course, that my job at NPA would be temporary. Well, the upshot of that was that William Green nominated me on behalf of the AFL to become a labor attach#, and this began my Foreign Service career. I was sent first of all to Greece and then to Israel, and I had two other foreign posts, Vienna and Bonn, with assignments in the Department in between. One was in the in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs (IO). I was on the ILO [International Labor Organization] desk there. Then in 1971 I came back to be the deputy to Dan Horowitz, who was the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and Coordinator International Labor Affairs or S/IL [for short]. And then in 1973 when Dan was assigned as Consul General to Naples, I became the head of S/

Library of Congress

IL which proved to be my terminal assignment, since I was there until 1980, when I retired from the State Department.

Soon thereafter I went to work as an assistant to Lane Kirkland, the President of the AFL-CIO, and retired from that job in 1985. So, Tom, as far as I can recall, those would be the pertinent things to mention in my background.

Q: Fine. What knowledge have you distilled from all that experience?

GOOD: Well, perhaps knowledge, if we can use that term, will come out as I assess my experience in the Foreign Service.

Q: Excellent.

GOOD: I would suggest that we proceed not with reminiscing about life in the Foreign Service, which I assume has already been adequately covered in previous interviews, but to summarize my experiences and views gained from various assignments abroad and in the Department. For the sake of brevity some views and opinions shall be expressed as propositions, without the need for detailed discussion.

From the information Don Kienzle sent me on the [Labor Diplomacy Oral History] Project, it seems to me that it would be useful to focus on United States foreign policy regarding labor during the period following World War II, with an eye on what might be useful for future policy. US policy, of course, was developed on the basis of the international situation at the end of the war, and what a terrible situation it was! Europe, Japan, and other countries in Asia were in ruins; and free trade unions in many countries destroyed. The specter of communism was haunting and hovering over Europe, propelled by an adversary with formidable military might and skilled in the development and manipulation of mass movements. The US response, Marshall [Plan] AID, is especially significant for our purposes because the enabling legislation recognized the importance of trade unions

Library of Congress

in society, and also provided that workers in countries receiving aid should benefit from US economic assistance programs.

This gave impetus to the development of labor programs, first in those countries receiving Marshall [Plan] AID and later in other countries as our economic assistance programs expanded. The US labor movement was enlisted to assist in developing and administering labor programs as part of our overall economic assistance efforts. Labor offices became a part of the aid missions in Europe. The fledgling Labor Attach# Program received greater attention and the number of labor attach#s assigned to our embassies increased markedly. A new office was established within the Department to be a kind of supercoordinator of labor programs and given the imposing title of “Special Assistant to the Secretary and Coordinator of International Labor Affairs” (S/IL).

A position was also established in the economic assistance agency in Washington called the “Director of the Office of Labor Affairs.” Both of these positions were filled initially by trade union officials. I should like to remark here parenthetically, Tom, that the economic assistance agency headquartered in Washington had various names throughout this period, but for the purposes of simplifying the discussion, I prefer to refer to it just as “A.I.D.” or “AID,” whatever the name of the agency may have been at the time.

Q: Sure. That will be understood.

GOOD: A new development took place when President Kennedy discussed with AFL-CIO President George Meany the question of conducting labor programs in Latin America as part of the Alliance for Progress. This led to the establishment of the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), an AFL-CIO established instrumentality for conducting labor programs in Latin America. This was followed by the establishment of two additional institutes by the AFL-CIO, the Asian-American Free Labor Institute and the Afro-American Labor Center, which conducted programs in Asia and Africa. Financing of these institutes

Library of Congress

was provided by Congressional appropriations as part of the economic assistance legislation and also by contributions from the AFL-CIO.

Q: Was there ever any employer involvement in these programs?

GOOD: Yes, as I recall, Tom, there was. An effort was made to bring employers into the program and also to get contributions from them. For a time, I think, there was an employer representative on the board of AIFLD, the American Institute for Free Labor Development, I don't recall that the other institutes were able to succeed in this, but yes, it was felt desirable to also get employer participation in this program.

Q: Well, as the program developed, were there problems of coordination and overlapping [jurisdiction] between the labor attach#s working abroad and the labor officers sent abroad by AID? Was that resolved satisfactorily?

GOOD: Tom, you will remember that this question frequently came up at our periodic labor attach# conferences, which were held at the time If I remember correctly, the Washington officials present at those conferences usually explained that AID mission officers were “operational,” spending much of their time in the field in connection with setting up and conducting labor programs. Labor attach#s, on the other hand, were “observers” and “reporters,” analyzing and assessing labor developments in their reports to Washington.

In actual fact, while friction between labor attach#s and AID labor officers did develop in some cases, differences usually were resolved by the officers themselves. For example, a good sized AID labor office was established in Greece when the assistance programs for Greece and Turkey began. This office was initially headed by Clint Golden. When I arrived in Athens in January of 1953, the AID Labor Office was headed by Alan Strachan, with whom I had no difficulty in establishing a cooperative relationship. However, a problem soon developed in Washington involving S/IL and the Director of the AID Office of Labor

Library of Congress

Affairs. This was resolved by making the head of S/IL also the Director of the AID Office of Labor Affairs.

Q: Well, I guess that took care of that.

GOOD: Yes, you remember that was Phil Delaney who settled that. Now, perhaps we can go on to discuss what was the policy governing our labor programs abroad.

Q: Excellent.

GOOD: It has been the policy of the US Government to support the development of free labor movements. This was the basic policy guiding our programs abroad. This was spelled out in some detail, you no doubt remember, Tom, in the policy statement you and I prepared when we had the responsibility for S/IL while also heading the AID Office of Labor Affairs. For the record, I would suggest making that policy statement a part of this interview, perhaps as an appendix. Given the spirit of the times, it makes almost strange reading today. (See Appendix A.)

While on the subject of policy, I wish to discuss another question we faced in the mid-1970s. Portugal was becoming politically unstable and fears were expressed that growing communist strength would pose grave problems for NATO. I remember some newspaper headlines at the time raising the possibility that NATO would be outflanked if Soviet influence continued to increase. Because our labor programs were linked to our country economic assistance programs, and Portugal was not an AID country, we had no overt means to conduct any labor programs in Portugal. I discussed this problem with various officers within the Department and [offered some suggestions on] how it was possible to deal with our inability to conduct labor programs in non-AID countries. My idea, based somewhat on the method used in the FRG [Federal Republic of Germany] of establishing private foundations financed by public funds for carrying out various kinds of programs in foreign countries, was to establish a foundation for international labor assistance financed by Congressional appropriations. I also discussed this idea with

Library of Congress

Lane Kirkland, who was then Secretary Treasurer of the AFL-CIO, and Irving Brown, representative in Europe of the AFL-CIO, and both offered suggestions. Following these discussions, I drafted a paper entitled, "A Proposal for International Labor Assistance." However, I found little interest within the Department, in part because it was felt that the Congress would not support such a proposal. As time went on and the situation in Portugal became less acute, I filed this proposal and forgot about it.

In 1980 I retired from the Department of State and went to work shortly thereafter for Lane Kirkland, who by that time was the President of the AFL-CIO. One day he asked me whether I still had a copy of my proposal, and, if so, to dust it off and make some copies for him as he wished to give it to some people. Fortunately, I found a copy, did some editing-It is has always struck me how wordy we became in the Department-and gave him some copies. He kept asking me for more copies, and I don't know how many he wound up passing around. However, the upshot was that later on a bill sponsored jointly by Senators Kennedy and Hatch was introduced in the Senate calling for the establishment of a "Foundation for Democracy" or some such title and subsequently legislation was enacted establishing such a foundation. I think it would be informative to include as an appendix to this interview a copy of my original proposal. [See Appendix B] This story also provides an interesting commentary on how things get done in Washington.

Now, what can we say about US Government sponsored labor programs? I think that this would be an excellent subject for study by someone knowledgeable in the field, because I am not aware of any really serious study of these problems. My experience leads me to suggest the following propositions with respect to government programs administered by AID Mission officers, as was more or less the case when Marshall [Plan] AID began:

1. Empirical evidence suggests limited success in US Government efforts to support free labor movements. The best case can be made with respect to countries where certain conditions prevailed, as in Europe, with its history of free labor movements and economic development. The results of such programs are unclear in countries which have not

Library of Congress

attained a certain level of economic development and where trade union rights were not fully recognized or established.

2. US interests and considerations which go into the formulation of policy, including domestic considerations, and the role of diplomacy raise questions as to whether the US Government or any government can encourage through unilateral programs the development of free trade unions in other countries with any degree of success.

3. One of the most important elements in encouraging the development of free trade unions in any country is the policy of the government in that country. Given favorable government policies, trade unions in some form may develop in countries with limited economic resources.

4. One of the characteristics of free labor movements is freedom from government control and influence. Activities of representatives of US Government agencies, with respect to relationships with trade union officials, should be confined to intelligence gathering. There should be no intervention in the internal affairs of a labor movement by a representative or agent of any US Government agency

These considerations lead me to the conclusion that the US Government should not be involved directly or indirectly in conducting or administering labor programs in other countries. A more appropriate method would be to use the treaty provisions of the United Nations, and especially the International Labor Organization (ILO), to further the rights of workers and influence policies of countries which are member states of the ILO. I appreciate that domestic considerations have kept us from ratifying more than a few ILO Conventions, but the fact remains that this is the most appropriate avenue available to governments.

What about AFL-CIO conducted and administered programs? Again, I am unaware of any overall study of these programs which attempts to evaluate their effectiveness in terms of developing free trade unions. However, in view of the numerous close relationships

Library of Congress

of AFL-CIO officials with leading trade unionists and political officials in other countries, and the long-standing interest and involvement of the AFL and the AFL-CIO in foreign affairs, including their own self-financed activities, I would suggest that the AFL-CIO is the appropriate organization to conduct labor programs in other countries. A few examples may demonstrate more clearly what I mean.

1. Let us recall the strong effort by the AFL and also the CIO immediately following the end of World War II to support US Government efforts and programs to rebuild Europe. This is another highly important story waiting to be told. Of course, there is Philip Taft's excellent study, which he published in 1973, I believe entitled, "Defending Freedom, American Labor in Foreign Affairs." However, Taft doesn't go much into the activities of the AFL in Germany itself, and therefore I think this is an area that needs to be looked at and written about because it is a very important part of our overall diplomatic efforts of the time. By the way, Bob Murphy has a very insightful forward to that book, which is also worth reading.

But to go on, the AFL unstintingly supported aid to Greece and Turkey and the Marshall Plan. Top AFL officials had close personal relationships with many of the top government officials of European countries, as well as the top trade union leaders, and these contacts proved invaluable in rebuilding Europe economically and promoting democratic societies. One example involving Germany is the report issued by the German Trade Union Federation (DGB) in 1984 documenting how the US labor movement assisted the German trade union movement when it was being persecuted by Hitler, as well as the assistance given during the immediate post-war period. In this period the close relationships which the AFL officials and especially George Meany had with the head of the German DGB, Hans Boekler, and political leaders such as Kurt Schumacher and Konrad Adenauer were instrumental in promoting trade union growth and political democracy.

2. In a more recent example, let us recall the support by the AFL-CIO of Lech Walesa and the Solidarity labor movement in Poland and the role of Solidarity in changing the history of that country and establishing democracy.

Library of Congress

3. I should like now to cite an example of the readiness of US trade union officials to assist in solving problems affecting US interests. After his arrival in Bonn, Ambassador Cabot Lodge told me that he had given instructions that if one person called he was to be put through to him immediately, day or night. That person's name was Teddy Gleason, President of the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA). I was surprised. After all, it is written that the Lowells talk only to the Cabots, and Cabots talk only to God. And here was a Cabot who had this kind of relationship with a feisty Irishman, who got his start selling hot dogs as a boy on the tough New York docks. Ambassador Lodge must have noted my surprise and proceeded to explain to me that when he was Ambassador in Saigon there was such a backlog at the docks that it was almost impossible to get anything in or out. In response to the Ambassador's request, the Department arranged for a team of experts to go to Saigon to correct the situation. Included in that team of experts was Teddy Gleason. Ambassador Lodge went on to say that Teddy worked day and night, and that he had to order Teddy to take breaks because he felt that Teddy was going to suffer a heart attack. Ambassador Lodge concluded that it would be impossible to overestimate Teddy's contribution to getting the Saigon docks open. Hence, if he ever called he was to be put through immediately.

Q: Isn't that wonderful! Very touching.

GOOD: Yes, I was really surprised at that and pleasantly surprised, because it showed a little known side of Ambassador Lodge, who generally was reticent to show any emotional involvement.

4. Now, perhaps we could also cite a few more examples to make this point about the personal relationships which AFL-CIO officials had [with world leaders]. The stories of David Dubinsky, President of the ILG [International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union], are legion, but let me mention a visit he paid as head of an AFL delegation to London soon after the end of the World War II. While in London, he, of course, had to pay a call on his old friend Ernie Bevin, then Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Attlee Labor Government.

Library of Congress

Times were very tough in London. Taxis were not to be had, and when they were ready to go to the Foreign Office, they found that the question of transportation was a problem. Dubinsky, however, resourceful as ever, saw a truck making deliveries to the hotel. He went out and bargained with the driver of the lorry to take them to the Foreign Office. And so this high level delegation clambered up the back end of a truck and were brought to the Foreign Office in grand style.

Once inside in the waiting room, Dubinsky immediately looked to see whether he could open some windows, as he said, "to let a little fresh air into the British Foreign Office." When they were ushered into Ernie Bevin's presence, the first words spoken by Dubinsky, as he stared at a portrait hanging on the wall behind Bevin's seat, were, "What do you have a picture of that son-of-a-bitch there for?" Surprised, Bevin turned around to see whose portrait it was. It was that of King George III. Bevin turned around and wagged his finger at Dubinsky. "If it hadn't been for that son-of-a-bitch, you would still be a part of the British Empire." Can you imagine speaking to a Foreign Minister in that way? But it shows a close relationship and what such a close relationship meant in terms of a cooperative relationship, not only with the [British] labor movement, but with the British Government and with our own government.

Many more examples could be given, but I like one or two about John L. Lewis. When I was in Greece, President Eisenhower appointed a committee to investigate the effectiveness of our AID programs abroad. It was named after the head of the committee, Benny Fairless, who was the head of US Steel or some steel company. John L. Lewis was a member of that committee, and they came to Greece when I was there. The monarchy was still reigning at that time, and Queen Frederika was fascinated by the prospect of being able to see and talk to John L., so she insisted on having a dinner at the palace and arranged the seating in a way so that she sat across from John L. and could easily speak to him. During the conversation, she said to Lewis, "I want to ask a question about the American labor movement, but first I want to tell you a story about the Greek labor movement. After the war, we had a civil war here in Greece; the people from the north

Library of Congress

crossed our borders and destroyed all the villages along the border; and we had a problem getting the people to move back to those villages unless their homes were rebuilt. We were very poor, and the Greek labor movement volunteered to work for nothing one day and donate their wages to the reconstruction of those Greek villages. And they did this. They worked one Sunday and the wages that they would have been paid went into a fund to rebuild those Greek villages.” And then she said to John L., “Now, tell me, would the American labor movement do something like that?” John L. looked at her and said, “Please do not come to the United States. We do not like to work on Sundays.” But the Queen persisted; she said, “You mean to tell me that the Greek labor movement did something for its country that the American labor movement would not do for the United States?” And John L. said with a disarming smile, “Not for me, but they would for you, your Majesty.” And the Queen purred throughout the rest of the dinner.

Many more examples could be given, but I think these will suffice to make the point that the AFL-CIO's long record of involvement in international affairs and its close relationships with top labor and political figures throughout the post-war period make it the logical instrumentality to conduct labor programs abroad.

Finally, Tom, let me make a few brief observations about the Labor Attach# program. Again, its growth was partly due to the recognition of the important role of labor movements in some countries with which we had close relationships and due also to the influence of the Cold War on our foreign policy. However, this period of history is unlikely to be repeated, even as farce, and I would suggest the need in the future for a different approach in assuring that labor considerations are fully taken into account in our foreign policy. We, after all, are now in a new era and I think it calls for a new approach to this entire question.

The Labor Attach# Program was useful in our international relationships during this period, but I think it can now be eliminated in favor of having a Foreign Service, as a whole, more knowledgeable in the role of labor movements in societies and the implications of this for

Library of Congress

US interests. Labor considerations should be an integral part of the conduct of diplomacy and not considered as a separate category somehow grafted on to foreign policy. This would mean that Foreign Service Officers would have to be knowledgeable, not only on the role of labor in the countries to which they are assigned, but also the international activities of trade unions as well as the policies and activities of the US labor movement.

It is especially important that State Department officials are sensitive to the role of trade unions in democratic societies and are aware of the role and manipulation of mass movements and how this affects the political affairs of countries. My experience is that labor considerations become an integral part of foreign policy when top officials of the State Department are knowledgeable about the role of trade unions. I am thinking here about Secretaries such as Dean Rusk and Henry Kissinger and other top officials such as Phil Habib, who knew something about labor and how mass movements were created and manipulated. It was easy to get their attention regarding impending labor developments affecting US interests.

I should like to conclude with a word about reporting. The State Department surely is one of the largest repositories in the world of little read and unused information. This is due largely to the voracious demands of Washington end-users, many of which have few if any statutory responsibilities in foreign affairs. Instead of a list of reporting requirements as long as your arm, there should be no labor reporting requirements which do not relate directly to US interests in the country involved. The more time a Foreign Service Officer following labor developments spends out of the embassy meeting and talking with people the better.

Tom, those are the thoughts which I think are of importance to me in my experience and I hope you are not disappointed in what I had to say.

Q: Far from it, Dale. I think that you have stated a very challenging proposition, namely the proposition that [the] labor [function] should be focused more effectively, clearly, and

Library of Congress

actively in the general responsibilities of the Foreign Service rather than confined to labor attach#s.

GOOD: Well, I think that's right, Tom, and it would certainly mean that we have to have a Foreign Service which knows more about labor and can recognize and report accurately on what's going on in this field as it affects US interests. Now this would mean in the first instance, I think, educating our Foreign Service, which would mean that we would have to expand the training program for Foreign Service Officers in the field of labor, so that when they arrive in the country to which they have been assigned, they would know something about the labor leaders of that country; and they would know something about the role of labor in society. In some countries they would be fully aware of how the government is trying to manipulate weak labor movements to support political purposes. It would mean that they would be personally acquainted with US labor leaders, so that they understand the relationship of US labor to the labor movements of the countries to which they are assigned. They would know something about the activities of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and international trade secretariats and be aware of any visits of these officials to their countries [of assignment] and the purpose of such visits. So it would mean establishing in the first instance an expanded training program and then briefing whenever they came back on home leave or were assigned to another country. It is sort of the concept of our labor exchange program, where we tried to get young labor leaders and introduce them to the United States, so that they had favorable impressions of the United States and were knowledgeable about our society, so that when they became important political figures in their own countries, they would have a sympathetic understanding of our policies. I think we have to do same thing with the Foreign Service. Let's see that they are trained, so that when they move up the ladder and get to be top officials, they will have that knowledge. The ideal situation, of course, is to have a Secretary [of State] who is aware of this but I suppose that with political assignments sometimes reaching far down into the hierarchy of the State Department, that is too much to expect, but I think that the few examples where that has existed demonstrate

Library of Congress

the point that I want to make. So I see it primarily as one of education and training. Now that would also, I think, eliminate this conflict that some people in the Foreign Service always had about sharing their responsibilities with other departments in the United States [Government], which always leads to friction. So I think that the representation of other departments abroad needs to be drastically curtailed. After all, I don't know what the percentage is now of Foreign Service Officers in our overseas establishments, but it is a small minority, and I don't see how this means that the Foreign Service can be the Foreign Service or that the State Department is really in charge of foreign policy, and I think we have to move in that direction.

Q: I can't help but add that the work of part time labor reporting officers has often been quite impressive, and they have worked actively and effectively with perhaps little or no training.

GOOD: Yes, I can think of some examples of that being true, also, Tom.

Q: But that doesn't mean to say that there shouldn't be plenty of training for the whole Foreign Service. I think that your point is absolutely essential. It's conditioning the culture of the Foreign Service.

GOOD: I think so, too, and especially in the atmosphere of today that isn't easy. Is it?

Q: No, far from it.

GOOD: Of course, this goes back to the heart of the problem again of how we consider labor in our own society. We cannot expect to have a low regard for labor in this country and then conduct effective labor programs abroad. I am sometimes reminded or think about the fact that some of our politicians have a different attitude about labor abroad and labor at home. They will attack labor at home while at the same time heaping praise on some labor movements abroad which they think would favorably affect our foreign policy and its outcome. Poland comes to mind. On the one hand some politicians were

Library of Congress

castigating labor in the United States while falling all over themselves trying to elbow their way into a meeting with Lech Walesa when he was here. So we have to be, of course, consistent in our policy.

It has also occurred to me that I should have mentioned something when we were talking about a training program for Foreign Service Officers, and that is that they need to know something about socialism, and they need to read some Karl Marx. Now we have countries with which we are allied which have strong socialist movements, and we cannot understand those movements if we do not know something about socialism and the role which Karl Marx's writings still play in the thinking of some of these people. I was always amused at what Karl Marx wrote about the characteristics of the labor movements in various countries. If I remember correctly, he wrote somewhere, "The German proletariat is the theoretician of the European proletariat; the English proletariat is its economist; and the French proletariat is its politician." Well, he realized, of course, that the Germans felt that they were supreme in the realm of theory, and again, coming back to Germany from a long stay in London, he said, "Now we are in Germany. We shall have to talk metaphysics while discussing political economy."

Or even, I think, a poem of Heinrich Heine is interesting, too. It is from "A Winter's Tale," "Deutschland, Ein Wintermaerchen."

The Russians and French possess the land,

The British have the sea;

But we in the airy realm of ideas,

Have unchallenged mastery. Now I think that it is important to know something about Karl Marx and socialist attitudes because socialists still explain many developments in terms of Karl Marx's writings. Marx's theory provides a sort of a framework which socialist leaders use in analyzing problems.

Library of Congress

Q: May I interrupt and observe that Joseph Schumpeter said, "as a tool for analysis."

GOOD: Yes, exactly. I think he is absolutely right. Do you remember what Churchill, for example, said about the Marshall Plan, "the most unsordid act in history." Of course, he wasn't a socialist, but a prominent socialist in Germany, Willy Brandt, explained away the Marshall Plan by saying that the fundamental consideration for the United States in providing aid was its excess production capacity. Well, my point is, whether we agree with Willy Brandt or not, he gets this analysis from the framework of Marxian ideas, and a Foreign Service Officer has to know something about this if he is to analyze the activities of the socialist movement and those countries in which the labor movement is closely allied with the socialist party, such as in Germany. The German DGB [Trade Union Federation] never once broke with the SPD [German Social Democratic Party] on matters of foreign policy; it did occasionally on economic policy but never foreign policy. So the attitudes of German labor leaders and German politicians in the SPD and their attitudes toward the United States are determined to some extent at least still by a Marxian framework, and this we need to know.

—

APPENDIX A: AID Policy on Labor (1975)

AID's labor policy is to encourage the legitimate rights of workers in the developing countries and to ensure that they share equitably in the economic and social benefits of development. It is essential that the fulfillment of workers rights and aspirations be reflected in increased employment opportunities, especially among the poor; improved levels of income and working conditions; programs of social security and employment protection. AID labor policy seeks to carry out in a practical fashion the following principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

— Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his

Library of Congress

interests.

— Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

— Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

Increasing the social and economic well-being of workers in developing countries and assuring that economic benefits of development are shared equitably require both enlightened development strategies oriented to employment and mechanisms by which workers may collectively protect their legitimate rights. Increasing productive and freely chosen employment opportunities in agriculture, industry and commerce is essential to economic growth and reducing poverty. It requires the enhancement of the occupational skills of the labor force and improvements in the occupational skills of the labor force and improvements in the organization of the labor market to permit the more efficient utilization of the labor force. Finally, AID labor policy objectives also focus on the development of labor intensive projects, the specific provision of jobs for the neediest workers and the integration of women, minority groups and rural workers into the labor force.

AID implements its labor policy by: 1) helping to strengthen free, effective, and well organized trade unions representing both urban and rural workers for the purpose of protecting their legitimate rights; 2) supporting Ministries of Labor in coordinating and improving working conditions; 3) incorporating labor factors and programs in USAID Missions' overall country plans; and 4) supporting efforts to increase the utilization of women in the labor force.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides in Section 601 that "...it is declared to be the policy of the United States...To strengthen free labor unions..." Free and responsible trade unions, enjoying the right to engage in collective bargaining, help to improve the well-being of workers, help to assure the equitable distribution of income and

Library of Congress

act as a force for change on issues relating to working conditions, human rights and family planning.

AID implements the purpose of the Act to strengthen free labor unions by supporting programs carried out by three AFL-CIO sponsored labor institutes: the American Institute for Free Labor Development (in Latin America), the Asian-American Free Labor Institute, and the African-American Labor Center. Among the achievements of these institutes are the development of trade union leaders through training programs, the construction of low-cost worker housing units, the development of vocational training programs, the establishment of farm cooperatives for purchasing farm equipment and marketing farm products, and the establishment of workers' health programs.

Ministries of Labor also have a vital role to play in protecting the wages, working conditions and security of workers as well as improving the employment and income conditions of the poor. AID can further implement its labor policy by supporting the efforts of labor ministries to develop and utilize the skills of the labor force, and to assure safe, secure working conditions and living standards which cover the basic needs of workers and their families. AID therefore gives special attention to Ministry programs related to wages, employment, employment standards, social security, skill training, labor statistics, and employment services.

USAID Missions implement AID labor policy by incorporating labor factors and programs in their overall country plans and development strategies. This provides the best means for furthering AID objectives regarding labor intensive development projects, providing jobs to the neediest workers and promoting the integration of women, minority groups and rural workers into the social and economic mainstream of the developing countries.

AID development programs also emphasize increasing the utilization of women in the labor force. Women throughout the world constitute a significant group which traditionally has been denied opportunities in training and employment. As one means of implementing

Library of Congress

this element of its labor policy, AID supports efforts to strengthen institutional and government agencies for women, such as women's commissions, women's bureaux, and the UN Regional Commissions.

—

APPENDIX B: A Proposal for International Labor Assistance

The role of labor in foreign affairs has become more than ever an important and even decisive factor. American foreign policy, especially the international economic assistance program, depends for success, in large measure, on the role of labor movements. This is especially significant with respect to those countries where cooperative bilateral relationships are important to US interests. During the post-World War II period this was particularly true in Europe, where the labor movements played a role in determining the foreign policies and the attitudes of European governments relative to the Atlantic Alliance. This is a fact which has been recognized in the past and was especially demonstrated in the implementation of the Marshall Plan in Western Europe.

It has been emphasized, time and again by Secretaries of State and other Government officials, that labor's role in foreign affairs, especially as it affects American foreign policy, is of great significance. Informed officers dealing with foreign affairs are aware that our adversaries, especially the Soviet Union, recognize this important and decisive role of labor in international affairs. The allies of the US in Western Europe also are extremely conscious of labor's role and many governments have provided funds in one way or another to the trade unions of their respective countries to assist not only trade unions in the Third World, but also in European countries, such as Spain and Portugal. Most funds that have been given for international assistance by European trade unions have come from their governments. In most cases, this has been done by granting funds to institutes that the trade unions have established. Government assistance is absolutely necessary

Library of Congress

since no trade union can meet the economic challenge of a movement backed by a state power like the USSR

It is therefore necessary at this time to reconsider how the US Government best can provide funds for trade union programs, including Western Europe, where there is a clear need for such assistance as is the case where the Communists are already or are becoming a vital force in the trade unions. Economic aid that is being provided or will be provided for European countries on the governmental level to stabilize their economies—made even more acute by the sharp increase in the price of oil—will go for naught if the Communists remain in complete or partial control of the trade unions as we see primarily in Portugal, Spain, Italy, France and now the growing danger in Greece. It is therefore of interest for American foreign policy makers to take into account these factors and draw the necessary conclusions. An objective analysis will lead to the inescapable conclusion that assistance through American labor to trade unions in Western Europe as well as to labor organizations in developing countries is vital to American foreign policy and its implementation.

The US Government since the end of World War II has supported the development of free labor movements through grants to three AFL-CIO sponsored labor institutes in accordance with provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act. That Act increasingly has directed that development assistance be provided only to poor countries, and the legislation presently provides that “No assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis under this Act to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth, except to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963...” (Section 620 m). In addition, changes in direction and policies regarding development assistance programs over the past several years require A.I.D. procedures and practices not always applicable to labor programs.

A more effective and flexible way to carry out such programs is needed: an instrumentality whose sole purpose would be to carry out labor programs consistent with US policy

Library of Congress

objectives. This could be done by amending the Foreign Assistance Act to provide for the establishment of a Foundation to carry out such programs in accordance with the long-standing US policy to encourage the development of free trade unions.

There are precedents for such action. An appropriate example is the establishment by Congress in 1969 of the Inter-American Foundation. This Foundation, and its operating arm, the Inter-American Social Development Institute, was established under the Foreign Assistance Act to strengthen the bonds of friendship and understanding among peoples of this hemisphere, support self-help efforts, and encourage the establishment and growth of democratic institutions.

The elements of a legislative provision to establish a Foundation for labor programs would be as follows:

An appropriate section would be included separately in the Foreign Assistance Act which would re-affirm the present provisions in the Act that “it is declared to be the policy of the United States...to strengthen free labor unions...” (Sec. 601), and would provide that in order to carry out this policy a Foundation would be established to be called the Foundation for International Labor Assistance, or other appropriate title. In carrying out its functions regarding trade union programs, the Foundation would utilize appropriate existing resources, including the AFL-CIO sponsored labor institutes—the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), the Asian-American Free Labor Institute (AAFLI), and the African-American Labor Center (AALC). Provision would also be made for programs in selected European countries.

Management of the Foundation would be vested in a Board of Directors, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board, selected from its members, would be a person well qualified in labor matters and with experience in international affairs. Provision should be made for appropriate Government and private representation, as well as trade union representation, on the Board. In view of

Library of Congress

the fundamental role of the AFL-CIO, provision would be made for consultation with the President of the AFL-CIO in appointing the Board members.

A funding level of \$75 million over a five year period should be authorized, to remain available until expended. (This represents an increase of about \$3 million over present funding levels for labor programs, to provide resources for the European program.)

End of interview