Q: This is the interview of Howard D. Samuel on November 13, 1995. The interviewer is Harold Davey, and I thought we would start by asking Howard about the background for your work on the Labor Attaché Program, like your relations within the Labor Department with Secretary Marshall.

SAMUEL: Well, that’s an easy one. Ray Marshall and I’ve known each other since we were both members of the National Manpower Advisory Committee in 1969 or 70. We found ourselves to be kindred spirits when we were both serving on that advisory committee for about three years, I guess. We had contact with each other after that. We both had an interest, for example, in the issue of emigration, illegal and otherwise, from Mexico. Ray did some work in that area and I worked with him on a couple of things. I spoke at one of his conferences and so forth. When he became Secretary, I think I must have been one of the early people he spoke to. The AFL-CIO had urged that he bring someone like myself on board who had a relationship with the organized labor movement. When I did come on board, Ray and I found our relationship to be close and continuing and did continue close throughout the time I was there.

Q: Did you find that he was particularly interested in international affairs?

SAMUEL: Yes, Ray always was. A number of projects he did involved comparative economics, studying economic phenomena in this country and comparing them to those in other countries, so it was relatively easy to attract him into some of the programs that were sponsored by ILAM. [inaudible acronym]

Q: You mentioned that the AFL-CIO had urged him to take a person from the trade union movement such as yourself. Were your relations, after you were in the office, with the International Affairs Department mostly, or were they also with the president of AFLCIO, as far as your work.

SAMUEL: I think one of my responsibilities in ILAM was to maintain a relationship with, as we called it, 16th Street which was the term we used for the AFL-CIO. Specifically the eighth floor of 16th Street where the offices of Lane Kirkland, the Secretary/Treasurer, and George Meany the President were located. I maintained a close relationship with both of them, more with Lane, because I’ve known Lane for many
years. We had lunch together occasionally. Meany I went up to see I guess every six or eight months or so and tell him what we were doing and get his reactions.

**Q:** Did they express to you any concerns about the Labor Attaché Program?

SAMUEL: That was one of the issues I always raised with them because it was an issue they had been interested in and involved in for many, many years, much longer than I had been.

**Q:** Now with the State Department -- I believe your opposite number was Dale Good for most of the time you were there.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

**Q:** And that was your direct opposite.

SAMUEL: As far as labor attachés, I also worked with other members of the State Department on trade issues and on ILO, which were very different departments.

**Q:** I think you also had a relationship with Ben Read, who was the Deputy Under-Secretary for management.

SAMUEL: That’s right.

**Q:** He was not in Dale Good’s office either, but very supportive.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

**Q:** Early on, I recall, you had us prepare a proposed compact with the State Department about the Labor Attaché Program. Do you recall that particularly?

SAMUEL: I don’t, I must confess.

**Q:** We finished it, but it was never officially transmitted to State, and I always suspected that had you used it as a ply perhaps for getting something else you wanted like the relationship with Ben Read.

SAMUEL: I must tell you I must tell you that I really don’t remember the compact and [inaudible words]

**Q:** It would have formalized a lot of arrangements that the Labor Department had, but it would give us legal rights to do a lot of things in the Labor Attaché Program. In any event, maybe it’s a post hoc ergo propter hoc, but shortly after that I think you set up the relationship with Ben Read, which we just mentioned earlier. Was this an idea of yours do you think, or a State Department reply to an initiative you had made?
SAMUEL: Much of what I did in connection with the Labor Attaché Program was done in consultation with a gentleman who knew much more about it than I did, and that’s Harold Davey. My guess is that any initiatives we took to get closer to Ben Read or anyone else there could have been done as a result of consultation with Mr. Davey.

Q: Well in any event, those meetings with Ben Read every couple of months discussed things like new Labor Attaché positions and trying to get better promotions for labor attachés, and that was very useful.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: Speaking of new labor attaché positions, do you recall an effort by Secretary Marshall in a letter to Secretary Vance about trying to get a labor attaché job in Tehran?

SAMUEL: I don’t remember a specific letter. I remember going with Secretary Marshall to see Secretary Vance. We used the example of the loss of the Tehran labor attaché post shortly before the Shah had to leave the country, before the Revolution. I remember very clearly Ray Marshall telling Cy Vance at the time would it have been good if we had had a Labor Attaché who was walking the streets, which is something Labor Attachés do and usually no one else in a typical post does do. We could have gotten some better idea before it happened of what was happening and why it was happening. Vance agreed; he said we probably had made a mistake in removing that post. We used that as an example of why we should not lose any other posts in other countries. I think Vance sort of went along with that, because at that time we were afraid that either for reasons of economy or any other reasons we might lose other positions.

Q: I believe there was an actual letter that led to a reply from State saying they didn’t need a labor attaché and that was just before the Shah fell and everything fell through. I remember Secretary Marshall, later on, in your meeting and elsewhere rued the day that State had failed to respond positively to that request. I notice that during your tenure, you were Deputy Under Secretary I believe from 1977-1980.

SAMUEL: Actually until November of 79.

Q: The first, almost three years of the Carter administration.

SAMUEL: Yes.

Q: During that period two new Labor Attaché jobs were established, one in Bridgetown and one in Greece that had not been there before, so there was a net increase while you were there.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: Do you recall a particular program you launched on recruitment of labor attachés, trying to bring people in from outside?
SAMUEL: It was in response I think to a certain extent to the State Department’s predilection from time to time of honoring the post of Labor attaché but not putting in a legitimate labor attaché -- putting in someone that they had some other reason for disposing of in that particular way but who had no particular background in Labor. That gave us a good deal of grief and we spent I think, an inordinate amount of time trying to assure that those who were assigned labor attaché posts were actually labor attachés. One of the ways we try to do this is to bring in more people from outside the State Department. Since the State Department, you’ll recall, was under a mandate to diversify, our response was to try to find people who were not white males, who would serve properly, with the proper background as labor attachés. We did make some arrangements and I think at least one person did go in I think from the CWA.

Q: That’s right. It was Enrique Perez.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: I believe he was the first lateral entry in over ten years.

SAMUEL: We had not quite so good an experience with another person. I suppose it’s not so serious to use her name: Velma Hill.

Q: Yeah.

SAMUEL: Who was a black woman who worked with the teachers. She came very highly regarded [inaudible words] I remember seeing Al Shanker and getting his approval for us to, in effect, take her away from the teachers. She agreed and everything was in order. Then at the last minute just as her appointment came through, she changed her mind. I think there were family problems.

Q: Yes I think there were. She was tentatively assigned to Nairobi and would have gone to Kenya if she hadn’t changed her mind at the last moment. I think there were a total of ten candidates that you had expended ILAM funds to bring to Washington to interview in order to facilitate the recruitment process, and of the ten the only one of them who finally went through is Enrique Perez. He had a fantastic career as a labor attaché. One of the things you stressed was labor attaché conferences during your tenure. Looking over the records, there was New Delhi in March, ‘77, Munich in June of ‘77, Tunis in September of ‘77, so there were three the first year.

SAMUEL: Yeah, we had a lot.

Q: Then we had New Delhi and Copenhagen the following year and another one in New Delhi when I guess you had already left. You had a Washington one that Ray Marshall chaired.

SAMUEL: That was different. That was labor ministers, wasn’t it?
Q: He also presided at this meeting too.

SAMUEL: I think we had something like six in the not quite three years.

Q: Yes.

SAMUEL: One of the reasons we did is that my predecessors had had none for quite a long period. I think we were trying to catch up a little bit. I also felt that these meetings were useful in encouraging the enthusiasm and commitment of the labor attachés and certainly in improving their knowledge. Also, we tried to use it in certain respects to bring the labor movement in closer contact. We had labor speakers at all these conferences I believe and they were usually vice presidents of the AFL-CIO appointed by Mr. Meany or Mr. [inaudible] which improved the communication between the two organizations.

Q: As I mentioned earlier, I have a number of names of labor attachés [inaudible phrase] you might or might not have had relations with. Since this is an oral history of the labor attaché program, you might have some insights on some of these. I’m going to start with those who are long time labor attachés, although your career in ILAM was three years, but you might have had contact with some of them before or after. Herb Baker was in Germany in ’72 and in Italy in ’78. Do you have any particular recollections of Herb?

SAMUEL: I remember visiting with him in Italy, but I think it was after I was out of the Labor Department. We spent some few days with him when I was back in the AFL-CIO.

Q: Herb just passed away last year. Dick Booth was an assistant in Italy in ’76 and went to Colombia in ’78. You perhaps didn’t have much contact with him.

SAMUEL: No, I remember came in at some of our conferences.

Q: One of the Labor Attaché conferences?

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: Cy Chalfin was in Sweden in ’74, probably extended into your early reign?

SAMUEL: Didn’t know him.

Q: I know you know Pete Dodd in Norway in ’76.

SAMUEL: Yeah, we met him in Norway.

Q: You’d I guess seen him at that labor attaché conference in Copenhagen just before.

SAMUEL: mhmm [editor believes this to be an affirmative]
Q: I think you were impressed with Peter’s handling of himself in the meeting with the Norwegian Labor Ministry officials. Does that ring a bell with you at this time?

SAMUEL: I don’t remember too clearly.

Q: I think what it was is he was, well, somewhat diffident in large meetings. This particular meeting he interrupted on several occasions, and rather forcefully!

SAMUEL: That’s right. You’re right about that. I remember.

Q: Forcefully and effectively, we thought.

SAMUEL: Somewhat to our surprise.

Q: To our surprise based on earlier [inaudible words] John Doherty, a long time labor attaché was in Portugal in ’78. Did you have any dealings with John?

SAMUEL: Well I remember him very clearly at the meeting in Tunis. John was there, and he was never one that could be ignored very easily. He was very outspoken, very jolly, the life of the party.

Q: John Grimes was in Belgium in ’77 and also was Labor Attaché in Tunisia in ’79. Did you --

SAMUEL: I remember his name. I don’t really --

Q: Bob Hare?

SAMUEL: Same thing --

Q: was in Belgium and Kenya. You wouldn’t have seen him in Kenya.

SAMUEL: Well we were in Kenya. We met somebody, it might --

Q: He didn’t get there until ’79, but if you were there at that time? We have the list her of who was Labor Attaché in Kenya. What year do you think you were there?

SAMUEL: I think it was ‘77.

Q: Okay, ’77. Let’s see, if it were actual Labor Attaché it would have been Bob Hare, but it looks to me as it were probably a labor reporting officer in there just before he arrived, because it looks like Hare didn’t get there till about ’78 or ’79. I mentioned Don Night who was in Colombia and Barbados.

SAMUEL: No.
Q: He’s mostly in the Latin American sphere, so he wouldn’t have come to many of our conferences, although he probably came up to the one we had in Washington.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: John Lamazza was in Korea and Japan about --

SAMUEL: Well I got to know him a bit when he was in Japan much later.

Q: Okay?

SAMUEL: [inaudible words] an industry group. A few of us in the labor movement went to meet with an industry group and John was very helpful, helping us set up the arrangements.

Q: Now how would a labor attaché be helpful to a delegation from the American labor movement when you went to Tokyo? What did he do for you?

SAMUEL: He really served, to a certain extent, as a liaison between ourselves and the [inaudible name] which was the industry group. He was able to communicate with them much more readily than we could across the ocean [inaudible words]. A good deal of the arrangements were set up with his help and advice.

Q: Jim Shea has been around a long time. He was in Brazil and Australia, I think, during this period.

SAMUEL: Yeah. I remember him as “our man in Australia.” He had a remarkable relationship there with both the government and the labor movement and I think a lot of other people.

Q: Yes I think remarkable is a very well taken phrase about Jim, because it’s incredible how well he was able to establish relations with, as you say, the government and the labor movement. Did you have any contact with Les Slazack in Japan? I guess by the time he got there you had gone back to the IUD.

SAMUEL: That’s right. We may have been there when he was there, but I think this particular relationship with the Japanese businessmen didn’t start till later.

Q: Now what about Dan Turnquist. Did you see him from Venezuela or Sweden during this period or later?

SAMUEL: I met him. I remember him. We met him also, I think, afterwards when he was in Paris, I think after I left ILAM.

Q: Well that’s all right.
SAMUEL: He was also a very effective labor attaché. Had a very good understanding of the issues, and had a good relationship with the host country.

Q: John Warnock was in France in ‘77, so perhaps --

SAMUEL: I knew John, and again John was also in Japan during the period I was involved and also was very helpful there.

Q: Herb Weiner was in UK, in London, in ‘77.

SAMUEL: He was assigned in ‘77. He was one of the first assignments when I came to ILAM.

Q: Did you have any contact with him?

SAMUEL: We had some, yes.

Q: Now, sometimes would the labor attachés like Herb Weiner, they would send in their usual reports, which would filter their way down to you. Did sometimes they send direct phone calls or reach you individually?

SAMUEL: I don’t recall that happening very often, no. I think generally I saw them indirectly.

Q: They would go through the area advisor. [Mr. Samuel is speaking at the same time as Mr. Davey, but his remarks are inaudible.] John Becker was in India, I think when one of the labor attaché conferences ... do you recall?

SAMUEL: I don’t remember him well; I remember his name.

Q: Steve Block was there for the first conference, Steve and his wife, do you recall Steve?

SAMUEL: No.

Q: Bob Caldwell was in Turkey in ‘76. You may not have had much to do with Turkey. Jessie Clear was in Tunisia in ‘77.

SAMUEL: I remember the names of a lot of them, but I really don’t recall.

Q: Aler Cook was in Spain in ‘76. Tony Freeman was a labor attaché in Argentina in ‘76. I don’t know if you had any contact back in that period. Before he came up to be --

SAMUEL: That was before I came to ILAM.

Q: Well, but it started in ‘76, so it would extend during the time you were in ILAM.
SAMUEL: I knew Tony Freeman very well, but --

Q: You would have seen him at the Latin American Labor attaché conference. I suppose you had continued contact with him when he was the head of what we used to call SIL?

SAMUEL: Yes.

Q: When you were out of the ILAM and back with IUD.

SAMUEL: That’s right.

Q: I think perhaps you had a relationship with Frank Golino in South Africa, because you were very active with that --

SAMUEL: I think that was also after I left IUD. I became a member of a commission which went down there and he was one of the people we worked with.

Q: But I think while you were in ILAM there was a WEHAN?

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: I know you were very critical of this gentleman from, I believe it was, the Labor Ministry who came to Washington to defend his WEHAN.

SAMUEL: Well, not totally critical, he didn’t go quite as far as we wanted.

Q: No.

SAMUEL: He did pretty well. We had some contact with the State Department, Dick Moose.

Q: I was going to suggest that the reports that formed the basis of some of your observations would have come from Frank Golino, the labor attaché there at the time.

SAMUEL: That’s right.

Q: John Gwyn was in Portugal in ’79, and elsewhere, he was in Washington before that. I don’t know if you had any contact with him? George Heatley in Indonesia and Korea?

SAMUEL: Yeah I remember --

Q: Now Bob Immerman was in Japan for a number of years starting in ’75, so did you have any relations with him?

SAMUEL: I knew him, but I think it was actually before I came to ILAM, because I was
in Japan before that. Also Herb Ihrig. He was, I guest, our first host when I went there in ‘72, which was our first visit.

Q: So you’ve had a relationship with Japan for twenty years or so.

SAMUEL: Yeah. Herb was very helpful to us. Two of us went from the Amalgamated Clothing Workers at that time to establish a relationship with Zensen Dow Maythe Japanese textile apparel union. That relationship did not exist, so we went there feeling a little bit like Admiral Perry. We were welcomed with open arms and spent ten days --

Q: Very appropriate, Admiral Perry.

SAMUEL: That relationship has continued ever since.

Q: Good. Herb Ihrig, as you may know is one of the lateral entry labor attachés who came in before that ten-year hiatus when none were hired. He’s one of two or three that came out of the military.

SAMUEL: Really?

Q: He and John Condon I know are two who were very effective labor attachés but were industrial labor relations experts in the Defense Department.

SAMUEL: I see. Well John of course later became ambassador to Fiji.

Q: That’s right.

SAMUEL: And had a colorful career out there.

Q: Did you come into contact with Don Kienzle in Thailand or Denmark?

SAMUEL: I sort of remember the name --

Q: Probably in connection with some labor attaché conferences?

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: Later on, when he retired, he’s still working and he’s active in this oral history program today. Jim Leader was in Venezuela in ’77. Do you recall Jim?

SAMUEL: Yes I do.

Q: Did you have any relations with hem in Venezuela at that time or since then?

SAMUEL: No.
Q: How about George Lichtblau in Israel in ’75. Did you have any contact with him?

SAMUEL: No, actually I’ve never been to Israel. Wasn’t he in Korea?

Q: Yes he was, at a different period.

SAMUEL: Again, in ’72, when we paid that visit to Japan, our next stop was Korea. George Lichtblau was a remarkable host. He took us to a place called the Peace Market, I forget the Korean name for it, which was sort of the center of town. I guess we would call it a very large warehouse that had been set up as a manufacturing center, with very young women, girls, sitting in very cramped quarters manufacturing clothing under rather horrendous conditions -- seven days a week, ten or twelve hours a day. I think George exposed us to this at some danger to himself, because we were followed everywhere we went by the Secret Service. That is the Korean Secret Service, not the U.S. Secret Service. He was a very honest man.

Q: Well that’s interesting. Emil Lindahl was Labor Attaché in the Philippines in ’76 and in Canada in ’79. Did you have any contact?

SAMUEL: I remember his name. I don’t recall --

Q: Emil had been in Vietnam also. In fact I remember when I had stopped in New Delhi at one point he had just got his orders to go to Saigon and it was a very difficult situation to go into. They were joking that he made an awful big target! Emil was a big man, but it worked out all right there. Then Ernie Nagy. I know you know Ernie. Did you see him in Italy in ’73?

SAMUEL: Yeah, not ’73.

Q: I mean he went in ’73, but you saw him later during his tour there?

SAMUEL: I think in ’77. He also had a very good relationship with the local labor movement and with the government. I think probably more extensive than some people would have liked.

Q: Well that refers I think to one of the questions they often ask [slurred phrase]. How did they have relations with the left wing and the Communist trade union movement. That was I guess an issue in Italy and France and in other countries, but those two in particular. At the time [inaudible words] did you think Ernie was correct to have a broader contact?

SAMUEL: I certainly thought that it was useful to have contact. I did not think that merely having contact gave that legitimacy, which I’m afraid was the AFL-CIO position. Nevertheless, what he did, we did not publicize. We didn’t want it to become a cause celebre. Do I think he did it properly and quietly and [Mr. Davey inserts “discretely.”] and sent in his reports.
Q: Later on he was Labor Attaché in London in ’84 and on. Had you contact with him again?

SAMUEL: Yes we visited London quite often and saw them. In fact when we stayed in ’85 for two months he helped find us a flat which we could rent. Then we met him in Berlin.

Q: This group that you were over with, that he was helping, what was that organization called?

SAMUEL: Which --

Q: When you went to London. [Mr. Samuel is speaking at the same time as Mr. Davey, but his response is inaudible.] Oh, that was private. I guess he also helped when you went over for your meetings that you used to have every --

SAMUEL: Oh, I went to the British North American Committee, whose meetings are held almost every Spring some place in England, not necessarily in London, and we would often see the Nagys while we were there.

Q: Let’s see. Nixon, Art Nixon, was in Mexico about the time you took [inaudible word]. He was actually the year before. Did you have any contact with Mexico while you were --

SAMUEL: Not very much. I remember meeting Art, but don’t have any clear memories of activities he had undertaken.

Q: Bob Pfeiffer was just finishing his tour in Geneva, I think. Did you, at an ILO meeting, run into Pfeiffer?

SAMUEL: Probably did.

Q: But you don’t recall?

SAMUEL: Remember we were out of the ILO for two years.

Q: So that might have been the time that he was there.

SAMUEL: Dale Povenmire I remember. Is he on your list?

Q: Yes he is. Dale Povenmire was in ... Where’d you meet him in Portugal or Brazil?

SAMUEL: Brazil.

Q: He went to Brazil in ’78.
SAMUEL: Yeah, that’s when we met him in Brazil.

Q: What sort of --

SAMUEL: Actually I think that might have been after I left [inaudible acronym]. I was part of the South African commission which met in Brazil, an intermediate point between the U.S. and Johannesburg, and spent some time developing its conclusions.

Q: I’m always fascinated by the fact that Brazil has a contact, a short one across the Atlantic Ocean, to Senegal or Dakar or what have you, and the idea of going that way has always intrigued me, rather than going through Europe.

SAMUEL: No, I think that’s the standard way. As a matter of fact, the Commission used that way to go through [inaudible place name]. On the way back they decided to stop at [inaudible place name] for a couple of days of consultation.

Q: You were down for a Latin American, one of the inter-American labor ministers’ meetings --

SAMUEL: an OAS --

Q: OAS meeting that you had down in Caracas?

SAMUEL: That was in Peru, Lima.

Q: Jim Murphy was there in ’77. Paul Hilburn came in ’79. He had a heart attack and had to leave early. Dick Booth came on around 1980, so it might have been John Kean.

SAMUEL: It might have been, yeah.

Q: He went on to another, larger labor attaché position in Buenos Aires later on.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: John Kean was a very effective officer as I recall. Thinking of that OAS meeting, as I recall that’s the one where Ray Marshall couldn’t go because his son was so ill.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: And you had to get Bob Brown?

SAMUEL: Bob Brown came down --

Q: At the last minute.

SAMUEL: [inaudible words] to lead a delegation. I had to lead them after he left for
another two or three days. There was what turned out to be one of our more embarrassing activities. Our delegation included some people from the private sector. One of them was a person from the UAW, a labor person who had been involved with international affairs for some time. These people were assigned to various subcommittees which met separately, and of course I didn’t try to attend all the subcommittee meetings. Subcommittees pass resolutions on various subjects, but we supposedly had people who were monitoring all of this. To my surprise, I went to the Ambassador’s house for breakfast one morning and he showed me some headlines in the local paper saying that the OAS was about to pass a resolution attacking the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank for its policies toward less developed countries. This did not happen to be the policy of the United States and he couldn’t understand how we had become involved with that. I later found out that this gentleman from the UAW had swung his subcommittee over to this and managed to get them to pass his resolution totally outside U.S. government policy. We were now saddled with it, because he was the acknowledged leader, and everyone was coming and saying “Is this U.S. policy!” So it came to the plenary, of course, and I tried to simply evade the subject. I didn’t want to deny that the subcommittee’s activity was wrong. I don’t remember now what we said, but we tried to evade any responsibility.

Q: So it did not pass in the plenary.

SAMUEL: It never passed.

Q: So the role of the Ambassador was --

SAMUEL: Somebody [inaudible words] had voted on it at a lower level, but when it came to the plenary, it voted against it.

Q: So the Ambassador’s role was to work closely with you and alert you to this thing that was in the press.

SAMUEL: I hadn’t even been informed, unfortunately. The chief staff person on ILAM’s group did not keep in touch with what was going on. I think you know who that is.

Q: Yes, I think so. Now going on, Harry Pollack was in U.K. in ’73. I don’t know if you had any dealings with him in London.

SAMUEL: I did before I came.

Q: Oh before you came, because about that time, I guess, he came over to be the deputy to Dale Good, initially. Of course when he assumed the position, it wasn’t long after that before he died.

SAMUEL: Very suddenly.

Q: Very suddenly, but did you have any contact with him officially.
SAMUEL: Oh yes, with Dale. I think he was a little bit dismayed by the activity and interest on the part of the Department of Labor.

Q: He being Dale, or Harold?

SAMUEL: I’m talking about Harold. I think he felt that this was properly a State Department function and we should simply advise. The advice part was all right, but not consulting. So we had some tension between DOL and State Department.

Q: Certainly when he assumed the position of SIL that was the case and those of the staff, I know, were kind of surprised at Harry’s change because he had always been supportive of Labor Department people coming out in the field where he was Labor Attaché, then seemed to take such a position. In fact I recall a little tension at one of the Labor Attaché conferences when Harry was chairing for State. As I recall there were several things, one of which was he wanted to introduce the Ambassador from China, former head of the UAW.

SAMUEL: Oh, Leonard Woodcock.

Q: Yes, and you had thought that since you were out of the labor movement that it would be appropriate for you to do it, but he insisted. Then he misspoke his name.

SAMUEL: Oh I remember that.

Q: He called him, I think Stan Woodcock which is the head of the TUC in the U.K. where he’d spent so many years. Woodcock did not like that, and he also introduced the American Ambassador and said that he’d read certain things from his autobiography about his background. The Ambassador got up and said, “Well, I’ve never written an autobiography and I never will.” He also called him Len, and Woodcock said, “Well, I’m only known by a few people on the East Coast as Len.” In other words he didn’t go by Len. So, he kind of struck out several times, but he did chair those sessions. He became bureaucratically very arbitrary, I thought.

Q: How about Erwin Rubin? You said you didn’t go to Israel, but he was Labor Attaché in Israel in ’78.

SAMUEL: [inaudible words] I remember his name.

Q: Okay. Roger Schrader in Germany, did you have any contact --

SAMUEL: Yes, I remember Roger.

Q: ’77 he went there. About the time you came to ILAM.

SAMUEL: We were there, and I think we went with Ray Marshall.
Q: Oh!

SAMUEL: At least once, maybe twice.

Q: Well that would be one of the first meetings of the DTM, Department of Ministry special program that Ray Marshall helped set up?

SAMUEL: I don’t recall.

Q: Okay.

SAMUEL: I remember going there --

Q: It may have led to it. I don’t think that was a formal meeting.

SAMUEL: It might have been leading up to it. I know we met with the Labor Ministry, but also they had two people occupying a position which was held by one person here.

Q: Yes.

SAMUEL: A second person was in charge of pensions and retirements.

Q: Yes, the group at Nuremberg does part of it and the group at the capital --

SAMUEL: We met with both departments.

Q: So, Roger Schrader was your Labor Attaché there and I presume his work was effective and everything went smoothly for you?

SAMUEL: There is no audible response.

Q: Now, did you run into John Stevens? Again, in Geneva in ‘78, but if we didn’t have the funds right then, it may be that you didn’t go there.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: Colombia. He doesn’t ring a bell.

SAMUEL: No.

Q: Tom Walsh was in Mexico and then Canada.

SAMUEL: I remember him but --

Q: Now one man, the last on my list, is Ed --
SAMUEL: Didn’t Walsh come out of the labor movement?

Q: Yes, I believe he did, in early days. Ed Woltman. you and I went together.

SAMUEL: Yes.

Q: He was the host Labor Attaché at the Labor Attaché conference in Copenhagen, you will recall.

SAMUEL: I remember him.

Q: In fact I think you and I were together in Munich having a reception after one of the Munich conference sessions and he said, “Well why don’t you come to Copenhagen for the next one.” Low and behold, the next one was in Copenhagen as a result of his invitation to you.

SAMUEL: Yes, plus an interest expressed by some other people.

Q: Yes, everybody concurred, but that was sort of the nucleus of it. Everybody was interested in going, because I guess we’d been to other places before. Speaking of some of the ambassadors, you’ve touched on relations you had that were fruitful. Do you recall any of the ambassadors who gave a difficult time to achieving your goals in the international labor field?

SAMUEL: I prefer to remember the names of ambassadors who seemed to be helpful, including the ambassador in Tunis.

Q: Okay.

SAMUEL: Inaudible phrase.

Q: Was that Mulcahy?

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: Ed Mulcahy?

SAMUEL: Yeah, and Morocco.

Q: That’s one conference I missed, so I didn’t go.

SAMUEL: It wasn’t a conference. We went there and spent some time because the Labor Attaché had not been made a member of a country team, I think as a result of our visit, and the ambassador agreed that that should be.
Q: I remember you had some policy differences --

SAMUEL: In Egypt we --

Q: I was going to mention Egypt.

SAMUEL: We did not do well.

Q: Dealing with the aid function, you were trying to get something in that area, and the ambassador?

SAMUEL: [He] was not interested at all, and was not interested in having a Labor Attaché.

Q: No, so you struck out on both counts.

SAMUEL: We struck out very badly.

Q: Also, by the way, he never let us have a Labor Attaché conference there, the various ambassadors, because those were the days when the conferences were funded with surplus foreign currencies, and Egypt was a surplus foreign currency country.

SAMUEL: Right. I remember that.

Q: They always gave an excuse that they were too busy, but they would have other conferences, you see, but never had any priority to have a labor [one]. Then finally they ran out of excess currency. Egypt ran out first and then they cut it off for everybody a couple of years later.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: So are there any other ambassadors that were difficult for your goals? Egypt is the one that stands out most in your mind.

SAMUEL: That was one. We met the ambassador in Greece who was very supportive.

Q: So you would say on the whole that the ambassadors were helpful, with a couple of exceptions.

SAMUEL: They were.

Q: Did you do much with USIA, the U.S. Information Agency? Do you recall working --

SAMUEL: Well, when I was in ILAM they were one of those which supported some of our activities with funds. Wasn’t it the Information Agency which provided us with funds for exhibits and so forth?
Q: Yes they did. Well the Commerce Department and I think some from USIA.

SAMUEL: I think we tried to establish a relationship and encouraged them to continue.

Q: Recently, I mean in the last five or ten years, the worker rights issue has come to be more accepted, but I think certainly during your tenure you were calling attention as you did in Korea.

SAMUEL: I think we raised it. It had really been quiescent for some time and we raised it as an issue again for the first time in quite a while. Ray Marshall was very supportive, which made our task much easier. I raised it via the trade machinery of the government particularly through the Trade Policy Review Group which was at the sub-cabinet level and got support from Alan Wolff the USTR and from Fred Burke at Treasury. It became part of the USTR’s agenda when he went to GAT. Unfortunately the other countries at GAT were not interested at all and it was rejected I think unanimously. We raised it also at a ministerial group that Ray Marshall was involved with and again it didn’t get terribly much support. It was a valiant effort but it didn’t move very far.

Q: It’s interesting that it continued to grow after you left. I think the ripples expanded wider and wider.

SAMUEL: It grew to a certain extent, and then Congress under the Reagan administration passed several laws that made labor right a criterion in our trade relationships with the Caribbean Basin with the GSP (Generalized System of Preferences) and [inaudible acronym] and as a result it became part of our law. Unfortunately it was not as effective as it might have been because no administration, neither Reagan nor Bush, was interested in enforcing it terribly rigorously. So I think there are only about ten or twelve countries that ever felt the impact of the GSP program.

Q: Well as far as losing their benefits it’s probably under ten.

SAMUEL: Yeah.

Q: Some others might have felt the impact in the sense that they did modify their policies out of fear.

SAMUEL: I remember that in the Dominican Republic.

Q: Well Central African Republic I think is another one that was --

SAMUEL: Which one is that?

Q: Central African Republic, [in the] early days threatened with it and they had an almost complete change. There are several, which one did you mention in Central America?
SAMUEL: The Dominican Republic.

_Q: I think Haiti was another one where they began to modify a little bit. So there are a number of them, but certainly in the major countries the administrations have not been willing to take action. Indonesia or Korea are the big players._

SAMUEL: Yeah, and they probably never will on a uni-lateral basis. It always seems that it’s done on a multi-lateral basis. It’s been very uphill, because we tried to bring it back as an issue recently and by now the business community, which used to be fairly neutral, has taken a very strong position against it. At the present time, with a republican congress, it’s virtually impossible to get adequate support.

_Q: Patt Derian, did you work with her, or did she come in right after you left?_

SAMUEL: No, we worked with her and were able to persuade the State Department to make labor conditions part of their annual report on human rights.

_Q: Yes._

SAMUEL: So that --

_Q: That was very useful. You were talking about Jessie Clear before. Jessie came out with Patt Derian to a Labor Attaché conference in Delhi I think the year after you had left and she spoke to all the Labor Attachés about the importance of human rights and worker rights and so on. So that’s part of the continuum. Well, any other comments you want to make about the Labor Attaché program?_

SAMUEL: Well, I think it’s a very useful program and continues to be useful, but as with any program which has a lot to do with the labor movement, it’s got to be fought for. It’s not going to survive on its own and that’s particularly true now under the pressures of the budget. Obviously that could be one of the early victims of the budget crack down at the State Department, which would be very unfortunate.

_Q: Thank you very much, Howard. Over and out._

_End of interview_