

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

JOHN P. WINDMULLER

Interviewer: Morris Weisz
Initial interview date: January 27, 1995
Copyright 1998 ADST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Social and Political Origins

Emigration from Germany, December 1938, following Kristallnacht
Voyage of the Ill-fated Ship St. Louis to Cuba, June 1939
Departure from France, January 1942
Move to Champaign, Illinois, in March 1942

U.S. Military Service

1943-1946

Education

University of Illinois, 1942-1943, 1946-1948
Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1948-1951

Member, Cornell University Faculty, 1951

Exchange Program for German Trade Unionists and Management Personnel,
1951-1952, 1952-1953
Permanent Faculty Appointment, 1954

Political Influence of Family and Close Friends

Father - Small Businessman, Middle of the Road
Uncle - Successful Lawyer
Uncle - Physician, Socialist, Died in Soviet Union
Ernst Papanek - Austrian Socialist, ran OSE homes for refugee children in France,
1938-1940

Professional Interest in the International Labor Movement

World Federation of Trade Unions
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
Foreign Policy Conflict between the AFL and the CIO
International Labor Organization in Geneva

U.S. Labor Attachés

Margaret Plunkett
Robert Senser

Role of U.S. Government Labor Specialists
Reporting Function
As Go-Between

CIA Covert Funding of Foreign Labor Movements
Force Ouvriere in France

Labor Archives of the ILGWU and Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union now held at
Cornell University

INTERVIEW

Q: Today is Friday, January 27, 1995. [This is Morris Weisz] and I'm sitting in the charming home of Professor John Windmuller on Longboat Key near Sarasota, Florida. I am interviewing Professor Windmuller about his work as a university professor specializing on international labor. He has written a number of volumes, traveled extensively around the world, and attended various international trade union congresses. More specifically, he also spent, as I recall, over a year studying the labor situation in The Netherlands.

WINDMULLER: It was ten months to be exact.

Q: And wrote a large research study on the subject. He is one of the objective academic experts that we want to interview because of their more dispassionate view in analyzing the work of the U.S. Government in the international labor field. [Academics] we have already interviewed [include] Sol Levine and Jack Barbash, and if you have any suggestions of others we should add to our list, John, please give them to me later.

To begin this interview, John, would you describe your origins-social, political, etc.-including your early life and education and how you came into this field [of international labor]?

WINDMULLER: Well, I'll make this brief. I was born in Germany in 1923. I left Germany in considerable hurry at the age of fifteen, a few weeks after *Kristallnacht*, and went to Holland on a "Children's Transport." Most children's transports, at that time, went to England. I was one of the approximately 1,000 passengers on the ill-fated round-trip voyage in 1939 of the [ship] *St. Louis* with the destination Cuba. I was in the contingent of the passengers assigned to France, and I spent the ensuing two and a half years in France.

Q: You mean you were sent back to France from the United States?

WINDMULLER: No, virtually no passengers were allowed to leave the ship in Havana harbor and all were returned to Europe. When the boat arrived in Antwerp, where it finally docked, approximately one-fourth of the passengers were allowed to enter France, Holland, Belgium and the Netherlands respectively. My family of four was assigned to the French contingent for the simple reason that we had relatives in France who could help us until such time as we were able to leave France for the United States. The idea of going to Cuba was, of course, to wait there until the requirements for an American visa were met, but it was impossible to predict for any given applicant how soon that would be. Well, the wait turned into a two-and-a-half year stay in France, specifically Vichy France after June/July 1940.

Q: Yes, but why did you mention Cuba?

WINDMULLER: Because the destination of the ill-fated voyage of the St. Louis was Cuba. The ship had left Germany on May 13, 1939, with over nine hundred passengers. I was one of them. It picked up a few passengers in Le Havre after it left Hamburg. I was one of those passengers because I had already left Germany and I was not about to go back, not even to board a ship full of emigrants. The St. Louis proceeded to Cuba on the assumption that the passengers had valid Cuban entry visas that would be honored by the Cuban government. That government, however, declared the visas to be invalid. After a good deal of unsuccessful negotiations and fruitless cruising in up and down the Florida coast-seeing the skyscrapers of Miami in the distance-the ship was ordered by its owners, the Hamburg-America Line (Hapag), to turn around and return to Germany since it seemed impossible for the boat to be able to disembark its passengers. All this had quite an effect on me.

Q: This was still before the United States entered World War II?

WINDMULLER: Yes. The United States didn't enter the war until December 1941. So this sequence of events took place two and a half years before American entry into the war. Having been refused permission to enter the United States, we went back to France, where we stayed about two and a half years in various homes that were maintained and financed by a French charitable organization that went and still goes under the name of OSE, *Organisation de Secours aux Enfants*, an organization principally for assisting Jewish refugee children. In November 1941 our U.S. entry visa number finally came up, and our family was invited to present ourselves at the American Consulate in Marseille for the formalities. We were fortunate to obtain passage on a boat out of France that was operated by a French shipping company and that took us from Marseille to Casablanca, where we were fortunate one again to get passage on a Portuguese liner operating under the flag of a neutral country for the dangerous transatlantic passage without fear of being torpedoed.

We arrived in the United States in February 1942 and decided to settle in Champaign, Illinois, seat of the University of Illinois, where we had relatives. (The various social organizations and committees that assisted refugees were always glad if a newly arrived family did not settle in New York City.) I went to summer school that year in Champaign to make up a part of my education and was admitted in the fall to the University of Illinois as a freshman.

Q: Without high school in America?

WINDMULLER: Without any formal schooling at all after age fifteen. But I passed certain equivalency tests and that seemed to be sufficient for the Illini registrar's office. In any case, I was accepted. In March of the following year, 1943, I entered the American Army and spent the next three years in the military with ample opportunity to perfect my English. When discharged, I went back to Champaign in March 1946 to resume my studies.

Q: The military in what theater?

WINDMULLER: In the American theater. I spent a year and a half in Keesler Field, Biloxi, Mississippi and another year and a half in Camp Ritchie, Maryland.

Q: Was there no effort to take advantage of your German language facility as Kissinger did?

WINDMULLER: Well, yes. That was the purpose of being sent to Camp Ritchie, which was a military intelligence training center and which principally trained American soldiers to interrogate prisoners of war. I was blocked from entry into the program because of difficult eyesight. But I didn't mind, for I was able to stay in Camp Ritchie as a so-called "permanent party." It was certainly a much more pleasant place to be than Biloxi in every respect.

I went back to the University of Illinois, in the summer of 1946, and graduated in January of 1948. I took double summer sessions in 1946 and 1947 in order to accumulate as many credits as I possibly could, so as to catch up with my age cohort. Nevertheless, I remained somewhat older than the average student, not only because I was a veteran, but also because I had missed a whole year of schooling.

Q: You went under the G.I. Bill?

WINDMULLER: Yes. In fact, the G.I. Bill paid for my entire education including the final hurdle, the doctorate. In January 1948, when I finished my undergraduate degree program at Illinois, I was admitted to the graduate program of the then recently established New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University. I did this on the advice of Emmett McNatt. I don't know whether you knew him.

Q: I didn't know him.

WINDMULLER: Emmett McNatt had himself been a graduate student at Cornell a generation earlier under Sumner Slichter and had written his own doctoral thesis under Slichter on the Lehigh Valley Railroad and its labor relations. Subsequently, Slichter left Cornell to go to Harvard.

Q: After Slichter left [the University of] Wisconsin and before he went on to Harvard.

WINDMULLER: Yes. Well, I didn't know that Slichter was also at Wisconsin.

Q: I'm pretty sure he was.

WINDMULLER: He certainly was at Cornell.

Q: Oh, yes.

WINDMULLER: Cornell turned out to be a good choice, and I have been there ever since. I began studies under Maurice Neufeld, Jean McKelvey, Vernon Jensen, and John McConnell, who later became Dean of the ILR School. I suppose my interests in international labor organizations and labor problems became more defined at that time. I wrote my doctoral dissertation on "American Labor's Role in the International Labor Movement." It was later published under that title, *American Labor and the International Labor Movement: 1940 to 1953*.

Q: And, it came out in both hardcover and paperback.

WINDMULLER: Yes, it did. And after I received my doctoral degree in the spring of 1951, I was asked to stay on at the ILR School [as a member of the] faculty. I was given responsibility for organizing and directing a one-year program for young German trade unionists and management people, who were selected to come to this country to become familiar with American labor relations and, more generally, with American society.

Q: Funded by?

WINDMULLER: Funded by the State Department. Similar programs were established at the same time at the University of Wisconsin and the University of Illinois. At the University of Wisconsin, the person in charge was Sol Levine.

Q: At the University of Wisconsin? You mean at Illinois, don't you? Sol Levine was at Illinois until. . .

WINDMULLER: Yes, he was at Illinois. Yes, you may be right. It may have been Bernie Krueger [at the University of Wisconsin].

Q: But, in any event, there were parallels.

WINDMULLER: There were two parallel programs to the one at Cornell, and there was a certain amount of exchange of information among the three directors of the programs. It was a successful program, on the whole, as indicated partly by the fact that it was extended for another year for a different group. And then it was extended for a third time in 1953. While this program was in progress, I spent a good deal of my time on program affairs, but I [also] began to teach in the school's regular program. Initially I offered one course in Comparative and International Labor Problems and later on a number of courses.

We staffed the program initially in part with visitors: for example, Adolf Sturmthal, who held an appointment at Bard College at that time, and later on at Roosevelt University in Chicago, and still later at the University of Illinois. Adolf Sturmthal was a visiting professor at Cornell, teaching international courses for a two-year period in the early 1950s. Charles Gulick from the University of California at Berkeley was another.

Q: Gulick was an expert on aid programs.

WINDMULLER: That's right. He had written a major two volume study on Austria from Hapsburg to Hitler and was probably the most knowledgeable person in this country on Austrian political developments.

Q: And, you had students from abroad. I remember visiting there once and John Niland, I think, was the there. Or am I wrong?

WINDMULLER: John, an Australian, was a member of the faculty.

Q: Yes. He is currently head of the IIRA (International Industrial Relations Association).

WINDMULLER: Yes. He decided, when an opportunity arose, to go back to Australia and to make his academic career in Australia rather than remain in the United States, which he could well have done, if had he preferred that.

Q: Well, I hope that you are going to continue discussing your career and [international labor issues], but I do want to step back a minute to get a bit more about your social background.

WINDMULLER: Sure.

Q: Did you come from a labor background?

WINDMULLER: No. My father was a small businessman who owned and operated a store. I had one uncle, a physician, who was a Socialist, and who perished in the Soviet Union in the early 1940s.

Q: As a soldier?

WINDMULLER: No. He was a physician, who went to Brazil when he could no longer practice medicine in Germany. And then, from Brazil-where the climate did not agree with him-he was sent by an organization, whose name I do not recall, to the Soviet Union to practice his profession where it was needed. Together with quite a few other German Socialists and Communists, he was jailed on grounds of politics in the course of one of Stalin's anti-spy [periods].

Q: Or pro-German period. Stalin had a pro-German period.

WINDMULLER: Well, there was a pro-German period, yes. I don't really know the details, but that did not really have much of a decisive effect on me. If Socialism ever had any effect on me, it must have been in France during my involuntary stay there, because the children's home in which I spent most of my time in France was under the guidance of an Austrian Socialist youth movement leader. Of course, by that time, he was no longer a leader. His name was Ernst Papanek.

Q: Oh, my Lord! He was later very well-known.

WINDMULLER: Yes. Ernst Papanek had fled Austria in 1934 and had gone to Prague with a number of other Austrian Socialist leaders. He was a member of the Vienna City Council and Youth Secretary of the Austrian Socialist Party. In France, he established and directed a number of homes, at first for orphan refugee children. Later on, the "orphan" criterion was no longer paid much attention to, and the homes were open to all children whether they were orphans or not. In any event, Papanek was a remarkable personality.

Q: He finally ended up in the United States.

WINDMULLER: He ended up in the United States, if one may put it that way, for he arrived already in 1940, and became the director of Wiltwyck, a home for delinquents north of New York City. He also became an Associate Professor of Educational Psychology at Queen's College. His wife was a psychiatrist. Both are now deceased. I don't know whether you knew him or not.

Q: No. I never met him, but I certainly have read about him.

WINDMULLER: So Papanek, a Socialist, made no secret of his political beliefs and aroused in me an interest in socialism which I have retained-although I have never practiced socialism nor felt myself in any way tied to it.

Q: One of the things that we found in early interviews is the usefulness of that sort of background in doing work for the government or in academia. I was just speaking at our lunch today about one of our former labor experts in the German Occupation, Louis Wiesner, who began his interview by saying that the best qualification he had in the work

he did, i.e., analyzing Communist efforts in the period of the Occupation, was the fact that he had actually been a young Communist. So you had the sort of background that was not unfriendly to [socialism].

WINDMULLER: That's right.

Q: Well, your career then was taking off as a result of starting an exchange program and. . .

WINDMULLER: And an interest in the international labor movement, which I have never lost. The first Congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) which I attended took place in Stockholm in 1953.

Q: The first one I attended, also.

WINDMULLER: By that time, the ICFTU was four years old. It had been founded in 1949. The reason that I was able to attend the 1953 Congress was that a New York City journalist with close ties to trade unions talked my school, the ILR School at Cornell, into providing the funds that would enable me to go. He is now at the Hoover Institute at Stanford University, and I can't think of his name [Arnold Beichman]. But, I'm sure you know him. He used to be the editor of IBEW [International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers] Local 3's paper.

Q: Local 3 of the IBEW. . .

WINDMULLER: Yes.

Q: I don't recall.

WINDMULLER: Oh, I'm sure you know him. He graduated from Columbia University in about 1936 and may have been head of the Communist student organization there.

Q: We will fill in names, John, as we [go over the transcript of this interview].

WINDMULLER: He persuaded the Dean of the ILR School to make funds available that would enable me to go to Stockholm.

Q: That was the first time I remember meeting you, although we were there in different capacities. You had nothing to do, however, with covering any of the WFTU [World Federation of Trade Unions] events preceding that period?

WINDMULLER: No. You see, when the WFTU was founded in 1945, I was still in the Army. And when it broke up in 1948-49, I was a beginning graduate student, who didn't know anything about the international labor movement. So by the time I became absorbed by [international labor] and started writing my Pd.D. thesis, it was about 1950-51 and at

that time there was really no way for me to attend WFTU meetings. Besides, I doubt that I would have been allowed to sit in on their meetings.

Q: Probably not. Do you mind if I interrupt you with some questions?

WINDMULLER: Go ahead.

Q: With respect to the earlier disagreements between the old AFL types, who would not under any circumstances join the WFTU because of its Soviet orientation, and the CIO elements in the American labor movement who were agreeable to joining this WFTU- some of them with the idea that they would later be better able to split off the anti-Communist elements in the CIO and some others because of their genuine adherence to Communist trade unionism-did you get any feel at the ICFTU Congress, or afterwards, as to how they resolved those problems? What impact did those earlier AFL-CIO disagreements have on their relations to one another? The thing that comes to mind is the enmity of the old AFL types towards those people who had gone along with the idea of joining the WFTU.

WINDMULLER: Well, I'm not quite sure that I caught the question.

Q: Well, I remember a debate in Washington between Haakon Lie, [former Secretary General of the Norwegian Labor Party], and Irving Brown, who took the official AFL position that [the American labor movement] should not join the WFTU because it is controlled by a foreign state. Lie explained the Norwegian experience during the 1920s when the Norwegian Labor Party temporarily joined the Comintern because the party felt it had to be with the masses and that when the masses got educated, the party would be able to pull its entire membership out of the Comintern. That sort of disagreement existed in the American labor movement, the Reutherites feeling that they had to join the WFTU because it was the world body.

WINDMULLER: Well, there was more to it than that. After the split in the AFL and the rise of the CIO, the AFL seized every opportunity it could to deprive the CIO of international recognition as a legitimate body. Likewise, the CIO seized every opportunity to have itself recognized by sister organizations abroad and government agencies as a legitimate, bona fide trade union organization. The question of membership in the WFTU was at first influenced by this struggle between the AFL and the CIO, and when it became clear to the AFL that the CIO could not be prevented from becoming a part of the WFTU, that, I think, clinched the AFL's position of opposition.

Now, I don't want to minimize the ideological element. I think it was very strong, very powerful. But there was also the question of recognition. The AFL, at that time at least, never really accepted the CIO as a legitimate body. The two organizations were engaged in an internal struggle that we nowadays have forgotten. It was very bitter and, I think, had a lot to do with the AFL's decision to boycott the WFTU.

I'll give you a more concrete example. In about 1942 or possibly 1943, after the United States had entered the war, a British delegation of trade union leaders, headed by Walter Citrine, came to the United States in order to see what trade union organizations could do, in addition to what they were already doing, to assist in the war effort. One of the objectives that the CIO urged on the visitors was the creation of a more inclusive organization at the international trade union level than had existed in the inter-war period in the form of the International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU). When the AFL realized the direction in which the CIO was trying to influence the British trade union delegation, it made clear that it would have no dealings whatsoever with any broader organization, not only because of the likelihood that the Soviet AUCCTU (All-Union Central Council of Trade Union) would be a part of it-although that, too, played a role, of course-but also, and particularly, because the CIO would thus become a second, legitimate official [U.S.] trade union movement in such an organization. Now this happened already in 1942.

Q: The AFL's theory was that only one organization could represent American workers.

WINDMULLER: Exactly. Only one.

Q: The AFL made compromises later on, however, by accepting the Mine Workers and the Machinists.

WINDMULLER: That's right.

Q: Well, go ahead, I interrupted you because I wanted to get your thinking on that.

WINDMULLER: Sure. That's all right. To continue with my autobiographical account, I became a permanent member of the faculty at Cornell in 1954-My initial appointment was in 1951-and I was in the fortunate position of being able to devote most of my time and effort to subjects in the international and comparative areas, but not entirely, and I think it was good that it was not *entirely* the case. I also taught collective bargaining, labor history, and trade union organization. This was a good thing, because I do believe that anyone who works in the international area would be well-advised to become thoroughly familiar with the American situation.

Q: That is such an important point. In my interview with Jack Barbash, I asked him why he had stayed out of the international field for so many years. He said it wasn't until later on that he realized his ability to teach U.S. domestic labor problems to students from Europe had to [be based on] an understanding of the different economies and social structures that these people were coming from.

WINDMULLER: Well, I always told my students in comparative courses-This is a standard part of my introductory lecture-that I am sure they will forget most of what I am going to say in the course of this semester, but if all they get out of the course is a better understanding of the American situation, I will be very satisfied.

Q: That's interesting. By the way, were your lectures published in any way?

WINDMULLER: Not as lectures.

Q: For instance, this particular comment. Where would it appear?

WINDMULLER: No place.

Q: That's too bad. Okay. Go ahead. You are now a full-fledged professor doing some courses, but your major work is in the international area.

WINDMULLER: Yes. My major work was in the international area. In the late 1950s, I received a grant from the Ford Foundation to spend a year at the International Labor Organization (ILO) in Geneva, which on the whole was a good experience, although in terms of research it was not as productive as I think it should have been. But I wrote an article, which is little known, on the role of Soviet employers in the ILO—the ILO, of course, being a tripartite organization. On the face of it, the answer to the question, "Is there a role for Soviet employers?" should be, "No." That question became, for a short time, the subject of a major controversy inside the ILO. The period was the mid-1930s, 1934 to 1938. It was resolved in favor of those who wanted to keep the Soviet Union inside the ILO and who were, therefore, willing to accept Soviet "employers."

Q: The mid-1930s was the period that you discussed in your paper, but it was not until later in the 1950s that the question of Soviet employers was [raised].

WINDMULLER: Well, in the 1950s it came up again. That's why I wrote the article. I wanted to give some historical perspective to the question which agitated people at that time. I got access to the minutes of some meetings that were usually not accessible. I thought my article, which was published in the *International Review of Social History*, was an interesting piece. It was published in Amsterdam by the same organization that has custody of the papers of the IFTU and the German Social Democratic Party.

Q: The ones that had been hidden underground?

WINDMULLER: That's right. It was in the Kaiser's [post-World War I home in exile in the Netherlands].

Q: Well, that's interesting. I remember the AFL used some of the arguments that you made in the 1950s.

WINDMULLER: Yes.

Q: Yes. Well, that was one year that you spent abroad at the ILO.

WINDMULLER: It was my first sabbatical, 1957-58.

Q: Did you attend the ICFTU meeting in Vienna?

WINDMULLER: Yes, I attended the Vienna ICFTU meeting in 1955, but I missed the next one in Tunis.

Q: But you wrote articles after each of them?

WINDMULLER: Yes, but not after Tunis.

Q: Well, at that time, what impact did the work of the U.S. labor attachés and USIA and AID labor officers have in our overall diplomacy? Did you visit them or did you get an idea of how effective or ineffective they were from your work at the ILO and the ICFTU?

WINDMULLER: I have no very strong recollections one way or the other about my contacts. I am sure that I was in contact with the American labor attachés in Stockholm and Vienna, during the course of the conferences. It is conceivable that I even had some correspondence with them afterwards, although I don't recall any reason why that should have been the case. On the whole, I found them helpful, insightful.

Q: Insightful. That's interesting because one of the complaints we have about the present situation is that there is, because of the budget cut-backs, such a diminution in the capability of labor officers to do the work that the old timers did. [Labor officers] at the present time don't have the [in depth] insights as much. . . .

WINDMULLER: Well, that could well be.

Q: Unless they have a particular interest [in labor].

WINDMULLER: I really haven't kept up with it. I used to know quite a few labor attachés, and I was on reasonably friendly terms with most of those whom I knew. But in the last five, six, seven years, I have, for the most part, lost those contacts. That is, of course, partly attributable to changes in my own situation-my retirement, less activity.

Q: By the way, are you still giving your course in comparative labor?

WINDMULLER: Not this year, but I have some very, very good replacements.

Q: Who's teaching international labor?

WINDMULLER: Several people. The principal one is Lowell Turner, who is a German specialist. We have another specialist on the Asian Rim countries, Sarosh Kuravilla, a South Indian from, I think, Kerala. And we have a very good economics specialist, who has since left us.

Q: You can supply the name when you edit the document.

WINDMULLER: Yes, I will have to insert that.

Q: For instance, I have a name that I was searching for. The Austrian Social Security official was. . .

WINDMULLER: Oscar Weigert?

Q: No, no, no. Yes, he was an overall expert. Oscar Weigert was the Head of the Division of Foreign Labor Conditions before I was. [The name] I was trying to think of before was Arnold Steinbach.

WINDMULLER: Oh, Arnold? Oh, sure.

He [Steinbach] was certainly one of the most knowledgeable people in international labor, whom I have ever met. In fact, I cannot think of anyone who succeeded him who equaled, not to say surpassed, his knowledge of international trade unionism.

Q: No. No one there, and I knew most of them. In fact, I was asked whether I was interested in taking his place and I said, "impossible." Anyhow, he was wonderful, and of course [he has died].

WINDMULLER: You were asking me about my experiences with officials of the U.S. Government in the international labor field.

Q: Yes, both abroad and in Washington.

WINDMULLER: Both abroad and in Washington. Although I am not sure I can make these fine distinctions, I have, on the whole, been quite impressed with their knowledge. In one or two cases, I was rubbed the wrong way. I remember once a labor attaché at the State Department building in Washington, who at that time [technically] was not a labor attaché [but] a labor advisor to an assistant secretary for a particular region, tried to convince me that I had made the wrong career choice because the salaries for labor attachés and similar kinds of positions quickly exceeded those of an assistant professor in an academic institution.

Q: [Salary alone] would be a bad way to make a career choice.

WINDMULLER: Yes. Exactly. But that was one of the few exceptions, and I have known quite a few labor attachés. In fact, I was wondering why you had apparently omitted some [former labor attachés] from your program of interviews. For example, I didn't [find the name] of Margaret Plunkett.

Q: Well, I'll be glad to answer that. No defense is necessary, but I'll give you the news about her. I assume you knew her from Holland.

WINDMULLER: Exactly.

Q: She is very ill.

WINDMULLER: I'm sorry to hear that.

Q: [She is living] in Minneapolis. She cannot walk around very much. I spoke to her over the telephone when I was in Wisconsin for Jack Barbash's funeral. She encouraged me to come up. I checked on it, because I wanted to interview her, and found out that for a one-day, round trip the cost would have been eight hundred dollars. We are trying to find somebody who is located near there. We just are very anxious to get her interview done for two reasons: One, she is one of the very few women who was in the labor attaché field and [secondly] she did a wonderful job at the posts where she was assigned. And, as a matter of fact, she came to a labor attaché conference in India, [while I was Labor Counselor there], and we arranged for her to conduct a lecture tour around India; she made very good presentations on a number of general labor issues as well as women's issues.

WINDMULLER: Yes.

Q: She was in Israel and did very well there, and she is just generally a wonderful person. She worked with Esther Peterson and me in the Labor Department on women's issues. Is there anybody else you are surprised not to see covered?

WINDMULLER: Yes. There's somebody whose name I can't recall, who works in the Washington Headquarters of Asian-American Free Labor Institute (AAFLI).

Q: Yes. [Robert Senser]. He was one of our top people. He has an official position at AAFLI. He has declined to be interviewed until he retires. [Note: Robert Senser was subsequently interviewed in June 1995.]

WINDMULLER: He used to be in Belgium.

Q: Right. Very good guy. Anyhow, we're doing the best we can.

WINDMULLER: I'm sure you do.

Q: Anybody else?.

WINDMULLER: Where you might be a little thin in terms of representation is in the labor officers of Marshall Plan missions.

Q: Well, let me turn off the tape recorder and I'll tell you what the problems are.

WINDMULLER: No, you don't have to justify it.

Q: No, I know. But, just as a matter of interest. (Tape recorder turned off.) We can continue now. [Please comment] on the need, desirability, and effectiveness of having [labor specialists] in all aspects of foreign relations work: USIA, AID, CIA, and regular diplomacy, and any observations you may have on the capabilities such people should have.

WINDMULLER: Well, I don't think there's anything new or unconventional that I could say about this. I find that probably the most important function remains the reporting function. Labor attachés and other people in related positions have an unusual opportunity to become familiar with certain aspects of a country's culture, economy, and social structure that may not be available to other members of our diplomatic staff. They can put considerations into the hopper, where policies are thought about and eventually made, that others may not think of or may not be particularly well-qualified to articulate. So, I think that whatever the labor attaché can enter into the policy-making process, there is likely to be a gain for the outcome of that process, because factors that need to be taken into account are being taken into account or should be, in any case.

The liaison responsibility is the second [function], although I think it does not approach the first one in importance. This is the ability of a labor attaché to function as a go-between between American trade unions, American employers, American government agencies, and the local situation. This can be of considerable importance, but is usually, I think, eclipsed by the policy-making function. That is what comes to my mind most readily.

Q: Let me ask you one specific question which comes up more frequently in our conversations with academics and other outsiders as well as from some within the organization, based on twenty-twenty hindsight. Academics and liberals squirm at the idea that we used government financing, some of it secretly, to help institutions abroad, or to vitiate the efforts of our Cold War enemy, the Soviet Union. Even my old friend Jack Barbash had the feeling, which he expressed in his interview, that we shouldn't get involved with CIA support in a delicate situation in another country. It interferes with what happens there.

WINDMULLER: Well, the best example is, perhaps, Force Ouvrière in France.

Q: Absolutely.

WINDMULLER: There we had a situation where, over a long period of time, funds made available by American agencies or trade unions helped to keep the organization alive and operating at a level that was reasonably effective. Reasonably. A few years ago, Force Ouvrière, after many, many years of being third in the race between the different French

[trade union] organizations was moving up more rapidly than the others and seemed to be on the verge of overtaking, not the CGT, but the CFDC.

Q: The Catholic [trade union federation].

WINDMULLER: Yes. But I'm not sure whether that resulted in a lasting gain or not. In any event, if there is an objection to this relationship, I would be willing to accept an observation that criticizes this process of rendering aid on the basis that Force Ouvrière will never establish itself as a viable, well- functioning, strong organization if it continues to rely on foreign sources of income to meet its budgets. That I can see as a valid objection. But I don't really see the moral side of it as valid. After all we are in a contest here and I don't regard this as being outside of the rules. I don't know how you feel about it.

Q: Well, I'm defensive about [the criticism]. I had nothing to do with the CIA support for Force Ouvrière. What was the name of the former minister in France and Mayor of Marseille, who recently died? He was very well-known. Gaston Defferre. He was the one who observed, approved and facilitated Irving Brown's use of secret government funds to support the efforts of some alleged gangsters who were trying to throw. . .

WINDMULLER: Oh, yes. Oh, that's an old story. He had a double name. He was in control of the dockworkers in Marseille.

Q: Ferre-Pisani.

WINDMULLER: Yes, Ferre-Pisani. That's it.

Q: What troubles me about the critics [of covert aid], including Defferre, who said to Ev Kassalow, I believe, "Well, we could have gotten rid of the Communists on our own. We really didn't need the American help," and that type of thing, is that [their criticism ignores] the context of the times, which was that we were trying to get aid to France and the Communists were interfering with unloading vital aid needed by France..

WINDMULLER: Oh, sure. There's a book, you know, on this subject by the son of a labor attaché, Roy Godson.

Q: Roy Godson, right, who is now in intelligence matters, etc. But the problem is that when told Jack Barbash, "You are looking at it [in terms of the ideal situation]. If we could have gotten the Russians not to support the CGT, we could have afforded not to support the gangsters to the extent that we did," which I have no details about, but I'm assuming it's correct. He said, "Well, you're asking me my opinion. On balance, over the years, I don't think [covert aid] is a good idea. Now, what a person does as a practical matter during the situation"-you know, he throws it back at me-"is another question. That's for you to determine. But, as an academic in the field, I just feel it's improper." Well, I just wanted to get your comments on it.

WINDMULLER: Yes. Sure.

Q: We will be closing now and I would like to ask you to summarize for the record what you said about the status of Cornell's files, records and other materials from the ILGWU (International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union) and the Amalgamated [Clothing Workers Union]. How did Cornell get [the materials]? What is available? Who is the contact person? I think you said someone named Strasberg is in charge of the material.

WINDMULLER: I cannot answer the question of how Cornell got it. As to the other questions, I would strongly urge [interested scholars] to get in touch with Richard Strasberg, who is the Associate Librarian of the ILR School Library. He will be able to tell you whatever you need to know about it. I believe that material is accessible to anybody who is willing to use it under the established rules.

Q: Well, fine. Thank you very much. I will let our students know. And this applies also to the various people at the Foreign Service Institute who are doing research in the field or at Georgetown's Lauinger Library for Diplomatic Studies. It could be very valuable.

John, is there anything else you'd like to say?

WINDMULLER: No, not at this point.

Q: Well, thank you very much. This has been very pleasant.

WINDMULLER: For me, too.

Q: Good health to you and Ruth.

WINDMULLER: Thank you.

End of interview