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

PROFESSOR SOLOMON LEVINE

Interviewed by: Morris Weisz
Initial interview date: May 26, 1994

INTERVIEW

[Note: This interview was not edited by Professor Levine.]

Q: Professor Levine is one of the very few people who is expert in both the Japanese language and industrial relations. We will have a brief discussion of his background, before we go into the substance of his experience, and with some reference to his travels abroad in the industrial relations field on various grants and contracts. We will include his observations of the operations of the labor function in the diplomatic service, in its broadest sense. This would consist of information, eight programs, and the diplomatic service at the embassy.

Sol, to begin with, let's get an idea of your background, prior to your entering the professorial field.

LEVINE: I was born 73 years ago in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1920. I grew up in Boston and its Brookline map. I attended Harvard College and went into the Navy in 1942. I served as a Japanese language officer in Naval Intelligence until I was discharged, early 1946. I was in Japan and the Pacific for a number of months. After that, I returned to Harvard Business School, which had begun.

Q: Indicate how you got into this Japanese field, the examination, etc., and the introduction to it. You came to the field of Japanese studies even before you had your graduate degrees in labor.

LEVINE: Right. Actually, at that moment, when I went into the Navy, I was a student at the Harvard Business School, the very first semester there. There was a question of which military service I should pursue, and I received an invitation from the Navy for an interview to attend the Japanese Navy Oriental Language School in Boulder, CO, which the Navy had just established a few months before at the University of Colorado.

Q: This would have been about 1941?

LEVINE: No. This was late 1942.

Q: Late 1942, so you were already 22 years old, but only in the first semesters of college?

LEVINE: I graduated college in the spring of 1942.

Q: Oh, you graduated college?

LEVINE: In the spring of 1942. As a matter of fact, my first foreign experience was in Mexico. I received a fellowship to spend the summer studying the labor movement of Mexico. I went down there for several months.

Q: This was because your undergraduate work had already put you in the labor field?

LEVINE: Right. I majored in economics, particularly labor economics. I became interested in that field mainly as a result of a course I took with Sumner H. Slichter, the famous professor of economics, at that time, in Harvard in the labor field.

Q: Originally from Wisconsin.

LEVINE: Originally from Wisconsin. I was introduced to Wisconsin ideas at that time. The teaching assistants, all of whom I was exposed to, were John Dunlop, Jim Healy, and Russell A. Nixon, all of whom became, of course, very prominent in their respective fields in subsequent years. Actually my interest in labor probably dates back to my family background, where, although there was no real involvement with unions, my father was a businessman, very middle-class. He was very much concerned with social issues, and my mother was a mild, social protestor. I think she voted for Norman Thomas in the 1920s, at least for Davis in 1924, and Al Smith in 1928. I'm sure she voted for Norman Thomas in 1932. So there was this streak of dissatisfaction of society. This came out mainly in my older brother's life. He became a radical communist and eventually served in the Spanish Civil War.

Q: Was it with the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, or one of the others?

LEVINE: It was with the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. We, his siblings, have attempted to find out what his experience had been with the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, because he is no longer alive. The usual answer that we get from other members of the Brigade is, "Well, they never knew anybody by that name, Bob Levine." Everybody had different names; however, we are quite sure he was there because he was the repatriated---I forget who the Senator was that wanted to make sure these native Americans were returned to the United States from southern France, where they had fled, after their defeat at the river. He was among them.

Q: You then entered the Army.

LEVINE: No, then I entered the Navy in December 1942 with the assignment of going to Boulder, CO, to study Japanese.

Q: When we discussed this earlier, I asked what sort of an examination you had for aptness in the study of languages. You told me you had no examination at all.

LEVINE: None whatsoever.

Q: They chose Japanese and you agreed.

LEVINE: They had decided to have a school for Japanese language, and I was selected because I had been a member of Phi Beta Kappa. All Phi Beta Kappas were invited to go to that school. Everybody at that school was a Phi Beta Kappa, unless you had been born in Japan, or born in China. They were known as BIJs and BICs. Everybody else was a Phi Beta Kappa. In some ways, it was completely intolerable, but we won't go into that. Most of the people who became prominent in Japanese studies, in subsequent years, attended that school. Well-known names, such as Donald Keene, or Edward___________, were fellow students at Boulder, CO. There were many others, including several people who became Congressmen and the like. Jim Shyer, for example, was my roommate.

Q: Jim Shyer, the Congressman, yes.

LEVINE: The Congressman. He is no longer in Congress. He retired last year. He was my roommate, and actually he was kicked out of the school. This never got into The New York Times. He was kicked out of Boulder because he was considered to have had a subversive record as an undergraduate. It was very interesting because when he got elected to Congress, a few years later, he ran on his war record. He became a hero as a flyer in the Air Force.

Q: Because he flunked out?

LEVINE: That's right. If they hadn't kicked him out of Boulder, he may never have become a Congressman. Well, I have a lot of funny stories like that.

Q: So you already had an interest in labor as an undergraduate. You began to have a facility in Japanese.

LEVINE: The interest in labor is due both to family influences and my exposure as an undergraduate, but the interest in Japanese was out of the blue, simply because I had been a good student. They were looking for people who had studied hard, you see. So off we went. Betty, my wife, also entered the school. They recruited a contingent of women.

Q: Oh, is she a Japanese expert, too?

LEVINE: Yes. She showed up at the school about six months after I did. We were married six or seven months later. We both share that particular background. She had come out of Penn State, and was working at a terribly dull job at the Food & Drug Administration (FDA) in Washington, when she was invited to go to Boulder. She seized the opportunity.

Q: You gave me your own curriculum vitae (CV), which gives the details of a very wonderful scholastic background leading to your being in the Phi Beta Kappa, and various other honors, but I didn't know this about Betty. Why was she invited?

LEVINE: She was a Phi Beta Kappa too for an agricultural biochemist. That was her major, agricultural biochemistry. She had taken enough liberal arts, without particularly planning it, which qualified her to be elected to Phi Beta Kappa. To be a member of Phi Beta Kappa you are supposed to have a certain amount of social science and humanities. That is her link. She was elected too. She was a year or so behind me, I think.

Q: This explains for the interview the fact that both of you had done so much travel. She was willing and anxious, and enjoyed very much the trips to Japan.

LEVINE: She was as much committed to the study of Japan as I have been all these years. She was willing to put up with all sorts of stuff to do it.

Q: The end of the war found you in Okinawa?

LEVINE: Yes. I had participated in the Okinawa campaign from the very beginning, April 1, 1945, until almost the end of the war. I was flying back from Okinawa to Guam, as I remember, when the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and then on Nagasaki, a few days later. By the time I got back to Pearl Harbor, VJ Day was declared. So, I didn't stay very long. I turned around, and was sent back to the occupation of Japan for several months. I was in Japan itself, not counting Okinawa as part of Japan, for about four or five months before I was discharged. I was working on a project called The Naval Technical Mission to Japan, where we were trying to gather all the blueprints for Japanese war ships. That took me around Japan considerably.

Then I returned to the U.S. Betty had been discharged by that time too. By that summer, I re-entered the Harvard Business School. Betty had entered Radcliffe College's program in business management, because, in those days, Harvard Business School would not admit women. Radcliffe had a very good program going for women at that time. It was run by Ateenorf Whitehead, not Anorf Whitehead; he was the son. This was Ateenorf Whitehead, who was the collaborator of Roethlisberger, Dickson & Mayo, in the famous Hawthorne studies. Ateenorf was the statistician. You can still read his books. That experience at the Harvard Business School also re-exposed us to the labor field, and got us very much interested in the whole area, not only of human relations in industry, but in the whole question of labor and management problems. Again, I was exposed to Sumner Slichter and Jim Healy, who were at the business school in those days. Betty was particularly exposed to a guy named Jack Hogan. Did you know Jack Hogan?

Q: No, I didn't.

LEVINE: He was a professor of labor economics in New Hampshire, but he had come down to teach the gals at Radcliffe. He was a student of Slichter's as I remember.

Q: When did you get out of the business school?

LEVINE: I got my degree in, I think, June 1947. I was there about a year, completing prewar work. They had given me credit for prewar work.

Q: Then onto MIT?

LEVINE: I heard about this program down at MIT. I actually walked there. It's only a 45 minute walk. So, I walked there, and went in and asked the secretary where I could find out about the industrial relations program. She pointed me in a certain direction. I walked to that office and there was Charlie A. Myers. I knocked on the door and he said, "Come in." I went in and said, "I'm interested in entering the industrial relations program." He looked at me and said, "Who are you?" I explained that I was interested. He was more interested in the fact that Betty was at the Radcliffe program, than he was that I was at the Harvard Business School. It turned out that he, too, was a graduate of Penn State. Their families had known each other back in the old days. These are the coincidences that happen.

The MIT program was, I think, virtually the only program in the U.S., the only degree program, at that time, which was concentrating on industrial relations. I don't think the Cornell program had begun yet, really, or any of the other programs, like in Illinois. There had been studies at Wisconsin but MIT, and possibly Princeton, were the only places in the United States that had organized the regranting of programs. The MIT one had been started by McClaren, who may have already been dead by that time. McClaren had been instrumental in getting the MIT program established, and funded, back in the 1930s. They had recruited Doug Brown and Charlie Myers, Paul Pazores, and several other people, to--

Q: You mentioned MIT and Princeton having, really, the only first degree programs. Let's mention the fact that Charles Myers, the professor at MIT---at Princeton, we had---

LEVINE: There was the other Doug Brown and there was Dick Lester.

Q: Dick Lester, but also, one of the other four horsemen.

LEVINE: No, Frederick H. Harbeston, at that time, was in Chicago. Harbeston remained in Chicago, until, I would guess, the late 1950s, or early 1960s, and then moved to Princeton.

Q: The reason I mentioned this is for later on in your interview. These were two of the famous four people, referred to as the four horsemen, who began this study of international comparative labor relations. John Dunlap was the third, and the fourth, Clark Kerr. Those four people really originated the international comparative study of industrial relations with their publications in the field for the Ford Foundation.

LEVINE: Oh absolutely. As a matter of fact, it started before the Ford foundation. I think it was the Carnegie Foundation that had initially funded their work, around 1950, 1951, or 1952, somewhere in there.

Q: This had a great effect on government programs in the labor field because the Ford Foundation grants enabled the search to be carried on, although very useful to the government, it was far beyond what the government could have afforded.

LEVINE: If the four horsemen had not opened up this field, I don't know who would have done it. At that time most of the interest was studying American labor relations as American labor relations. There was no particular interest in comparative work. We used to talk, in those days, about doing work in your own backyard, that sort of thing. A lot of it had to do with the causes of industrial peace, or, Illinois, which had been established in 1947 or 1948, devoted an almost better institute. This was the Institute of Illinois, and the research leader was Milton Derber. It devoted all of its resources to the so-called alienized studies, the study of industrial relations in a single community, namely Decatur, Illinois, without any reference, whatsoever, to any experience outside of Decatur, Illinois.

Q: Those were limited and had disadvantages, but they were good, in and of themselves, to teach us about how industrial relations worked in a community.

LEVINE: They were very good, actually, for developing research methodology. They were good for developing and defining the nature of the problem, and hypothesizing and setting forth a research plan. In that sense, they served a very useful purpose, and maybe it could not have been done with foreign studies. The first foreign studies by academics, in this period, I think, began essentially with Charlie Myers going to sleep. By this time there had been studies, like Walter Galenson's studies, which had come out, about Sweden, Denmark, and so forth.

Q: You notice that I ______________________________.

LEVINE: I see that you have that. Now he is on China, Taiwan, and all that sort of stuff.

Q: He is retired and working in Washington at the Labor Department library.

LEVINE: That's great. Give him my regards. There was almost nothing. There were some studies about the British experience. I think there was a Val Owen study on France that was just about to come out.

Q: Val Owen was the study of Italy. The important thing is all of those were either studies in the United States, the backyard of industrial relations, or discreet studies of labor in a particular country. I think that is the point that Barbash made, which I mentioned the other day. His entry into the international field was because he felt he had to be able to teach American trade unionism, in terms of its ideological compassion with the European countries.

LEVINE: The inspiration for what became industrialism and industrial man was the need, as perceived by guys like Clark Kerr and John Dunlap, to have some way explaining industrial relations in response to the Marxist interpretation. Here the U.S. was becoming very much involved through Punch Four programs and assistance programs with all these countries. Of course, then, there was the Marshall Plan. There had to be some way of explaining the American experience, and the experience of other countries. They did not accept the Marxist explanation, as so many Europeans and some people in developing countries, had set forth. I think that is what carried the whole thing along, and what aroused the Ford Foundation to give a very large grant to the four horsemen. They have a whole long list in one of their books, 40, 50 different studies---

Q: You are referring to people using this industrialism and industrial man. This was the theoretical center of the publications in that field by the four horsemen.

LEVINE: Yes, that's right.

Q: Industrial relations systems by Dunlap and industrialization.

LEVINE: They are very closely related. Industrial relations systems came out slightly ahead, a couple years ahead of industrialism, and industrial man, but they are sort of part of the same package. My own involvement with them, after I received my degree from MIT and had already been established at Illinois--I went to Illinois in 1949, and received my degree from Wisconsin in 1951; I was finishing my dissertation.

Q: Your dissertation was not in Wisconsin, was it?

LEVINE: I meant MIT, I'm sorry. Anyway, my work on the dissertation actually had been very domestic, very locally oriented. Through the good offices of Sol Balkan---

Q: Research Director of Textile Workers Union.

LEVINE: That's right. He induced me to study a number of companies in unions in the New England area, which were struggling with a whole question of trying to preserve their existence by undertaking very large-scale technological changes. I wrote this dissertation on technological change and collective bargaining in the *New England Bulletin on Western Textile Industry*. I concentrated on certain case studies of how they worked out their "solutions" through this whole problem of displacement and readjustment of the work forces and the like, including wage rates and conditions of works. A lot of the work that has gone on in more recent years reminds me of what I did, back in 1947, 1948 on research funds provided by the Social Science Research Council.

Q: Your first international work, then, was when you got a Fulbright to Japan?

LEVINE: Right. The reason for it was---

Q: Your work in the occupation was not related to the ________________________.

LEVINE: No. I was involved in some Navy projects and while I observed what was going on as an ordinary member of the Armed Forces, I was never involved in the labor policy.

Q: So, you came home, got your degree, and then came back to Japan in 1949?

LEVINE: No, I came back to Japan in 1953. It was a long hiatus, eight years in fact.

Q: You say that since then you were mainly concerned with international labor.

LEVINE: Yes. I did not know at that time, in 1952 when I applied, that I would be spending most of the rest of my career working on international labor matters, especially on Japan. What aroused me about Japan? It was probably because of our intense experiences of Japanese language during the war, and partly because I had a moral obligation to MIT. I had offered Japanese as one of my foreign languages, but they allowed me to substitute Spanish, my other language being French, rather than take Japanese because they had nobody to examine me. They accepted my written pledge, however, that someday I would use Japanese in a future study.

Q: When they could get somebody to examine you?

LEVINE: No, they just trusted me. Anyway, the opportunity came along, and we applied. I believe it was the second year. Fulbright was open in Japan and off we went. I think I was the very first scholar in the labor field to receive a Fulbright as a researcher.

Q: It's out of the time sequence that we will be following, but I remember discussing with you this question that concerns the Foreign Service, generally, and especially, in the labor field, the desirability, necessity or irrelevance of the knowledge of the vocal language. I would like you to indicate that because we have had various experiences with people who did and did not know the language, and some of the people who did not know the language, were even fairly effective. It is very important.

LEVINE: I was never a member of the Foreign Service and didn't have any particular interest in becoming a member of the Foreign Service. I was exposed to most of the labor attaches over the years from about 1953 to more recently, three or four years ago. There is no question that the most successful labor attachés, from my point of view, were those who became very proficient in Japanese language. Most successful, in particular, in relating to the relevant Japanese and ______ to the trade unionism management people, and the _________________________ host government community. Those who did not, I always felt, were fairly remote from what was actually going on. They may have been very good in communicating American affairs to the Japanese, such as explaining the National Labor Relations Board, (NLRB) or explaining the nature of American unions, and that sort of thing, but I didn't think they were especially important resources about Japan itself, except in the case of one, or two, or three of them.

Q: In other words, what you are saying is, there is a two-way float that is necessary. One way *is facilitated by a guy who knows the American labor system and the American labor movement; the other is a person who can understand what is happening in Japanese labor, and try to explain to the American government. What you are saying is very few people had both.*

LEVINE: Yes. If you want me to mention it, I think the most successful labor attaché that I knew in Japan was Robert M. Immerman.

Q: Yes and you promised to give me his phone number. I'm trying to get hold of him.

LEVINE: I gave it to you.

Q: Oh, yes, you gave it to me.

LEVINE: Try him at Columbia during the day. This doesn't mean the others weren't to some degree---

Q: You are talking about the optimum.

LEVINE: Yes. Going back to the very beginning, the very first embassy officer that I was exposed to was Sam Berger in 1953, soon after we got to Japan as a scholar for the first time. Sam Berger showed a great deal of interest in the fact that I was a labor scholar and that I came from a labor institute that had a strong Wisconsin influence. I was from Illinois, where his good friends, particularly Mil Derber, with whom he had gone to school in Madison at the University of Wisconsin, and others, like Bill Chalmers, and Phil Yarmouth ,had gone. They were all Wisconsin products, friends of Sam Berger.

Q: This is the first time you are mentioning him in this interview. Sam Berger was from the University of Wisconsin, and was an officer who was well known in London during the period of the first labor government in the postwar period. He was not, however, a labor attaché in Japan. Was he a political officer?

LEVINE: Well, I think he may have first gone as a labor attaché.

Q: No, he didn't. Our records reflect that.

LEVINE: I just assumed, or I was told, that he first arrived there as a labor attaché, but quickly was promoted or transferred to a political consul. The labor field was very critical in those days, particularly for the political maneuvering that was going on. He had had much more skill in understanding these things than anybody else in the embassy. Now there was another guy named Alan Taylor, who became a labor attaché. He didn't play as strong a role, as far as I was concerned.

What Berger did was to take a great interest in getting to know the scholarly community in the labor field in Japan. Nobody knew them in the American embassy. He, I think, quite appreciated the relevance of scholarship from his days in Madison, from his exposure to Commons in Parliament, and from his experience in Great Britain. So, he concluded that there must be a similar group, an important group, in Japan. That is where I came in. He asked me to introduce him to the key people. I remember we had a gathering at his residence one evening. Ten people or so came, including the giant in the field. You wouldn't know from his appearance that he was a giant in the field, but it was Professor Kazuo Okochi. Without any doubt he had the greatest influence, intellectually, in the labor field, in the social policy field, in postwar Japan, even down to the present. He died about 10 years ago. Okochi became President of Tokyo University, but resigned in the midst of the riots of 1968. He said that he never thought he had to face such responsibilities. He thought he had been elected to an honorary post.

Q: You are making an observation that is important to us. That observation is, like other aspects of Japanese culture, that academics are looked up to. They guide activities in various fields. It is not like the United States, where the labor movement would not look up to an academic to guide them. What is a big difference as you pointed out so many times.

LEVINE: The respect for the intellectual is much stronger in Japan, particularly for leaders of their most important institutions of higher education. They were looked up to. It was not on Okochi, but the Professor Ichiro Nakayama was another giant in the field. Nakayama became the second Chairman of the Central Labor Relations Commission of Japan. This was a new postwar institution established to adjudicate and mediate disputes, and settle unfair labor practices, and things of that sort. He commanded tremendous respect. He had been a leading economist. He was known as the Japanese schumpeterian. He translated all of Joseph Shumpeter's work. He had been a student of Shumpeter back in Austria in the 1920s, I think.

Q: You are now telling me that he knew German.

LEVINE: He knew German, yes. He knew English, and he may have known French too. He was president of Hitotsubashi University, one of the great public universities of Japan in Tokyo. It specializes in economics and commerce, and things like that. That was the university to which I was assigned as a Fulbrighter in 1953 because of Nakayama. Between Nakayama and Okochi, you had the two very important, highly respected, intellectuals. Nakayama was sort of a doer and Okochi was a thinker. The two often disagreed, I must say; however, that is another story. Sam Berger was very instrumental in inquiring that evening at his house about whether or not Japan had anything like the 10 volume documentary histories of labor.

Q: Which he had been acquainted with---

LEVINE: Which he had been exposed to. Maybe he actually participated in compiling the great documentary at the university of Wisconsin. I remember Ansers that he had seen the 10 volumes; Japan had nothing like it, but wished that they could develop something like that. Berger said, "Well, maybe, something could be arranged." Something was arranged. I served on the committee. Okochi was the chairman, and there was another, third great intellectual in

Japan in those days. It was a fellow named Professor Fujibayashi Keizo. He had also studied in Germany, back in the 1920s. They all had. Keizo was a social psychologist that particularly worked on industrial matters at Keio University. He was the vice-chairman of the Central Labor Relations Commission. Fujibayashi and Okochi immediately went to work as the heads of this new committee to apply to the Ford foundation for funds. As Berger indicated the Ford foundation could be interested in this. I was on the committee to render the whole thing in English. We proceeded and within a few months this considerable grant (for those days) came through. It launched a project, which was supposed to have produced 10 volumes of the documentary. Only seven have appeared. I had them, but I gave them to the library. I don't have them anymore. I'm sorry.

Q: In Japanese?

LEVINE: It's in English because the first labor newspaper published in Japan, which was called *Labor World* in Japanese, carried one of its pages in English. It was an eight-page thing and the last page was all in English.

Q: What was the reason for that, do you know?

LEVINE: The reason for that was the founder of the newspaper, Pikano (sp), had spent several years in the United States, particularly in California, and had gotten to know Samuel Gompers. Samuel Gompers, whether he was authorized or not, designated Tatana (sp) as the AFL (American Federation of Labor) organizer in Japan. Now that newspaper appeared for six, seven, eight years before it collapsed. All those issues have been reproduced and fill a separate volume. So you can read what was going on in English, if you follow that newspaper, week by week. At any rate, Okochi and Fubiyashi lead this team with the help of the Ford foundation, to produce these very rich volumes. If you do labor studies' history, or you do history at all, in Japanese history, you have to use those. The total collection of the documents is at Tokyo University in the archives there. So they are available in totality.

Unfortunately Sam Berger never got to know the intellectuals as well as he wanted to because Sam Berger left Japan early in 1954, as I remember. This was after Richard Nixon, then vice president of the United States, came to Japan. It was to urge that the Japanese repeal the postwar constitution, especially Article IX, which renounces the use of arm forces, against any rearmament, against any aggressive action, and so forth. That had been imposed upon Japan by the U.S. occupation itself. That was by General MacArthur. MacArthur and the whole occupation establishment drew up the constitution. Nixon was urging this on his visit as vice president. Apparently it was now the White House policy to get a change: the Cold War had begun, and all that. Now eight years later,

---I understand that Sam Berger took exception to some of the things Nixon said or did. For example, Nixon went and paid homage to the war dead at the so-called Yasukuni Shrine, which had been one of the shrines established in the prewar period as state shintoism. Of course, the postwar constitution separated church and state and destroyed state shintoism. Nonetheless, he revised it by going to the Shrine and paying homage; that only Nixon could do. He was deeply resented by many people in Japan. You have to remember that the allied occupation, which, of course, was dominated by the Americans, was welcomed by, probably, a majority of the Japanese. It was welcomed; the new constitution embodied principles that had been advocated in the prewar period. There had been a considerable liberal streak in Japan. For example, Japan came close to adopting what became the postwar legislation and labor reforms as early as 1931, as a result of their exposure to the ILO (International Labor Organization). They lost that bill, I think, by one vote, in 1931. That is how close it was. It was really remarkable because had they adopted that legislation, they would have had a new deal, at least as far as labor was concerned, before we had our own new deal. There was a strong streak of liberalism and democracy that was there all the time. I don't think the White House, or at least Richard Nixon, or probably Eisenhower, had any appreciation of this whatsoever. They were running roughshod over it.

Q: Who was the American Ambassador at the time?

LEVINE: It was a guy named John Allison. What he was saying to Nixon, I have no idea. It was common knowledge that Sam Berger had talked up, saying that this was not a wise thing to do. He felt that this was not a way to develop a relationship with the Japanese, Cold War or no Cold War. Two weeks later, he was in Wellington, New Zealand, and never returned to Japan. Everybody assumed that it was the result of Richard Nixon demanding that he be exiled.

Q: Let's discuss a little bit more your relation with the embassy and the embassy labor officers, and how most of you seem to walk along power lines, but separate from one another. They didn't support your work in any financial way.

LEVINE: Only insofar as I was supported by Fulbright. No, there was no direct support from the government. My other sources of support were either my home university or the Ford foundation, and then later on the Japan foundation.

Q: Any observations about the series of labor attachés during that period?

LEVINE: Another important guy was not a labor attaché; he was a labor information officer, Arnie Sokolov. He helped develop the whole program of sending labor teams from Japan to the U.S. in the 1960s.

Q: What was your part in that?

LEVINE: It began, again, going back to Okochi and Nakayama in the late 1950s, around 1960. We returned to Japan in 1959, again this time as a Fulbright professor, and lecturer. I was assigned to Keio University to help develop the new industrial relations institute, the first one of its kind at a university in Japan. It was under the leadership of this fellow, Fujibayashi, whom I mentioned before, and my good close colleague, Hisashi Kawada, whom you probably remember. Kawada had lived in the United States for 10 or more years, from the late 1920s, until he was repatriated to Japan in 1942. Kawada had been active in the American

Trade Union Movement. He was a member of the Restaurant Workers of New York City. He was very proud of the fact that he was elected sergeant-of-arms of his local union, which was way downtown New York City.

Q: He was voluntarily repatriated to Japan in some sort of an exchange?

LEVINE: No, no. He was sent back as a foreign alien on the Grips Home. They call themselves the Grips Home Club. It still is active, apparently, although most of them now are dead.

Q: That was an exchange. Didn't we exchange?

LEVINE: Oh, we exchanged diplomats and other people. Why he was included, I don't know. He left Japan as essentially a refugee. He was a stowaway on a ship. He had been a stowaway with the help of the Quakers, who speared him out of Japan, because he had been involved in student riots at Keio University. He was considered an unwanted subversive. When he woke up, he was in Wichita, Kansas, attending the Friends School, from which he held a degree. Then he went to the University of Pennsylvania. He lived at the Friends School in Philadelphia. I think he was a cook there. Then he got a master's degree at the University of Pennsylvania. He had a very unusual experience, and was on the faculty at Keio University in the 1950s, and active and established in this new institute.

Well, the new institute looked to Illinois and Cornell as their models, so they wanted somebody like me to help them plan this new institute. I was a visiting professor. In the course of that year Okochi and Nakayama raised the possibility of organizing a group of leaders, especially from Tokyo, who would be from the non-Communist, the socialist wing, who wanted to develop relationships with the AFL-CIO (American Federation of Labor/Congress of Industrial Organizations) and other foreign labor movements. There was this huge gulf that existed between the two.

Without going into the details about all this, within the next two years, this got organized with the help of the Asia Foundation in San Francisco. There was a guy in Tokyo named Jim L. Stewart who was their representative and took a great deal of interest in this project, particularly since it was coming from Nakayama and Okochi. Some dozen or so leaders of Soho Union, who were considered very promising as their future leaders of Soho Think Tank, were asked to join. They all agreed. In addition, there were some other academics, particularly a young academic named Shirai [Ed: most likely Shirai Taishiro].

Q: I met him in Japan once.

LEVINE: Shirai is 75 years old. For the first time in his life, next month, he is getting married. Isn't that nice? He is marrying a widow, whom he has known for 40 years. We are invited to the wedding, but we can't go. We had lunch with him, just before we left. Anyway, isn't that nice? He has never been married.

Q: He was one of the intellectuals---

LEVINE: He was one of the intellectuals selected to be on this team, along with a couple---I left out an important step: Fulbright itself back in 1954, 1955, sponsored what turned out to be 20 or so Japanese to study for a year or two at the Illinois Institute. I was in Japan when this was formulated. I served on the committee to select these people, but Nakayama was the chairman of this committee that selected these people. These were hand-picked people, and went on to become quite eminent, mainly in management, but some became academics.

Q: They were labor management people.

LEVINE: Yes. I think that was the beginning of labor studies in Japan. Labor studies in Japan began at Illinois.

Q: Let me get into some of this stuff that is prevalent on the government side very much. That is a selection of people to go to the United States in terms of their political background. The AFL and the AFL influences within the AFL-CIO were very suspicious, as you know, about So Ho people going over there. They felt as though there was a mark on the whole organization because they were unwilling to discriminate against communists. What was the relation between the American Trade Union Movement, and these people who came over?

LEVINE: The idea of that labor study's team was to establish a continuing liaison. They realized that there were no communications to speak of between the So Ho Unions, So Ho, itself, for that matter, and the AFL-CIO. If there were any communications, it was at the constituent level. It was at the affiliate level. For example, there have always been decent relationships with the electrical workers, that is the CIO electrical workers, and with the autoworkers.

Q: The IUE (International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers) and the UAW (United Automobile Workers)?

LEVINE: That's right. There had always been decent relations between the coal miners and the UMW (United Mine Workers), but the UMW was no longer in the AFL-CIO. They were always cussedly independent anyway. The railroad brotherhood and the Japanese railway unions had relationships. It wasn't entirely a blank, but at the national level there was the stigma and this alienation.

Q: Was an AFL representative there at that time?

LEVINE: Deverell had been there.

Q: Dick Deverell? Did he take any position on this?

LEVINE: No, he was gone by that time. Deverell had taken a very strong position, a very strong anti-So Ho, when So Ho declared its neutrality.

Q: Neutrality was anti-American.

LEVINE: But everybody knew that Deverell was an agent of Jay Lovestone. Everybody knew that.

Q: May I pause for a moment? Sol, after this pleasant Chinese dinner interlude, let's continue. You were still, as you said at dinner, only up to 1953, but actually you have gone further.

LEVINE: I really want to tell you about the role of Henri Sokolove.

Q: This was Henri Sokolove, later the labor attaché in India, but at that time a USIA officer in Tokyo. He worked with you in getting the team exchange. I should mention for comparison purposes that Henri Sokolove was an old Chinese Asian expert, who was interviewed. I interviewed him a couple years ago but he didn't speak much about this. I think he just mentioned it as having been part of his experience, but I didn't get any of these details you have been mentioning now. So please go on.

LEVINE: Once we had that Japan study tour, it really opened up a whole process of exchange, particularly from constituent union or affiliated union to an affiliated union. Then there was a steady stream of teams that went for the next several years. Henri was key in getting that whole project going, approved and administering the thing, if I remember correctly. That was a joint thing by the Department of Labor and the State Department. Now there was a guy named Harry Pollock.

Q: Harry Pollock later also became an official of the State Department headquarters, but I think at that time he was a trade union representative?

LEVINE: Well, he was, but then I believe he succeeded Henri.

Q: Yes in USIA (United States Information Agency).

LEVINE: He was also involved in the exchange team. He and Bernie Kosh, who, as I have explained to you, was heavily involved, along with me, in getting the whole thing started. He got into a considerable disagreement over what the emphasis should be.

Q: It would be interesting if you can go into the substance of that a little bit, because we have had many cases in which there was disagreement between academics and State Department people, academics and labor officers, and among people who have different outlooks on the American labor movement. Now, Harry Pollock was AFL-CIO. He came originally from the CIO, but he owed his job a little bit to support from the AFL side also. He was more in a fickle trade union line, whereas Bernie, of course, was, from their point of view, a left-winger.

LEVINE: At the beginning, they got along very well together. The arrangement was for a number of these teams to come first to Illinois for some sort of orientation, and then go on from there to various visits. They usually lasted several weeks with each team. We, at Illinois, were supposed to arrange for the itinerary and the visits.

Q: Did they go as a team or assignment to an area?

LEVINE: They went as a team. Maybe there were some cases where individuals went off here, there, what have you, and were guests of locals. Now one of those years I spent at MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), 1962-1963. I sort of received them in Boston as they would come through. During the early phase, Bernie and Pollock---See, he was involved, I think, at that time, in the AFL-CIO side. He was a very cooperative, helpful counterpart, but after he went to work for the government and went to Tokyo, I can't remember the timing, and I really honestly can't remember the exact substance of the argument, but there was some criticism coming out of the Labor Department. Maybe the AFL-CIO, about how Illinois was handling, what they were telling some of the teams at the orientation. A little too much criticism.

Q: You remember I asked you whether they had opposed Soho being so closely involved in a U.S. finance program. The reason for that is Lovestone's general attitude toward Soho. Did that have anything to do with it?

LEVINE: There were sufficient people in Soho, but, on the other hand, these people were now being handpicked, so to speak, with the approval of U.S. officials in Tokyo, subject to okay in Washington. There had been this alienation, but now it had been broken through. While the suspicion may have lingered, I think it shifted to sensitivity, at least in one respect, that we weren't telling them the right things at Illinois during the orientation.

Q: I'm going to ask you later about names of people, still ____________________________, who might be able to give more substance to that disagreement because it is important, I think, in understanding the attitudes of the U.S. government in the labor role. Let me just ask you one question about that. So far as you know when you were orienting the people in Illinois, at the university, did any local trade unionist get involved in that orientation?

LEVINE: Yes, in some cases. We took them to local union meetings in Campana, Urbana, in a couple instances or we brought unionists in. I remember there was one episode over the question of the telephone satellite, whether or not it would be government owned, or part of AT&T, you see. The decision was to allow AT&T to run it. We had a professor there who was very, very critical.

Q: Erickson?

LEVINE: No.

Q: Was Erickson involved in that?

LEVINE: He was a much more left-winger than Erickson. There was a professor at the university of Illinois, who was a professor of communications, named Dallas Mike.

Q: Dallas Mike, yes.

LEVINE: Everybody in Washington knew that Mike was a left-wing pinko. If I recall, Bernie invited him to come in. This was a team of people from the telephone/telegraph union, which was a very important union in Soho, and still is. The president of Rengo (Japanese Trade Union Confederation) today comes out of that union.

Q: Rengo, let's get that in.

LEVINE: It is the new federation established, in its present form, about five years ago.

Q: Which has relatively good relationships with the AFL-CIO?

LEVINE: Oh, yes. It has success in both Soho and Douay. ______________________ really has eliminated the Communist element. It is sort of a mild socio-democrat, but very important politically in engineering this recent coalition of opposition parties. Now they are in a big dilemma about where it should stand in the second coalition government, and what stance to take toward the socialists. So much for that but it was very important. They were eager to hear discussions on the question of this tele-satellite. They got an ear full and Washington hit the ceiling.

Q: Because Dallas had been invited to speak to them, or because there was nobody to answer Dallas' point of view.

LEVINE: Probably both. I don't recall the details, but I don't remember anybody rebutting it. The Japanese trade unionists, of course, were socialists and were in favor of government ownership. They were delighted to hear this point of view coming from an American. It was not the official line, even though it had been a matter of public debate, as you recall. That was one issue. Another issue that riled up was over follow-up studies. Bernie was very eager, for academic purposes, to have some sort of systematic follow-up, to find out what the exchange experiences meant to the exchangees, who were trade unionists. He wanted to have an interviewing program, and questionnaires and so forth, but the request was turned down. I don't remember whether it was turned down by the State Department or by the Labor Department or both. It was turned down, although this was never stated, probably because Bernie would carry out the research. That sort of tension came to a head one day when we were in Tokyo, having lunch with __________________, by this time, had seceded Honoree and was defending the program. Bernie raised these various questions. I wish I could recapture that. We might have it in the Department.

Q: Did you say that Bernie was defending the idea, of course, and Harry was asking questions or was critical?

LEVINE: No, I think it was the other way around. Bernie was, I think, essentially saying, "Why didn't you back me? Why didn't you come to my rescue?" Harry found himself in the embarrassing position of a friend versus the organization. It was sort of a shouting match. It was really embarrassing.

Q: There is enough here so that if there is anybody around who can give me the story, we will get it if necessary.

LEVINE: Perhaps I was the only witness to the affair.

Q: Oh, I would want to get Bernie's view on it, if I could see Bernie.

LEVINE: He may have a much more vivid, and different recollection about what was going on.

Q: He may even have some of the documents involved. That would be interesting.

LEVINE: There were proposals made to carry out the follow-up study.

Q: They were never done?

LEVINE: Something very skimpy was done. I think he actually published an article about it, but it wasn't a very definitive or scientific treatment. It was a disappointment to the program, but the program did carry on for several years. We have all the data about how many hundreds of unionists were involved.

Q: Was there ever any summary report prepared, or anything?

LEVINE: Yes, we would write an annual report about the activities. Those would be in the files too.

Q: You mean in your files or in the files of the State Department, or labor?

LEVINE: The only files we have are the files from the University of Illinois Institute. They were often copies of materials we sent to Washington.

Q: One of these days, we may get in touch there. In any event, I would like to interview a couple of the people there, if I get there. Let's proceed with your experience.

LEVINE: I just wanted to comment on our honorary role, and Pollock was there too. The government did not have any particular role, as far as I remember, in shaping our pure exchange program between the University of Illinois and Keio University. That happened to involve the leading scholars from Japan and some from the U.S., dealing with U.S./Japan, from Paris, in the Industrial Relations Bureau. Virtually all of those guys became very eminent. That was a project financed by the Ford Foundation. We called it the Keio Illinois

Project.

Q: Solely devoted to labor issues?

LEVINE: Solely devoted to labor issues.

Q: How are we defining labor issues?

LEVINE: All those things.

Q: Oh, all those things. So, labor issues in the board of ______________________________. Safety, health, that type of thing.

LEVINE: If you wanted to study them. I'm just trying to remember all of them.

Q: Labor's attitude toward military policy, any questions about the politics of Japan's defense posture, anything like that? Should we go into that?

LEVINE: Really concentrating on the political facts, but we are certainly of ____. Most of the Japanese who came did their work at a master's level.

Q: Illinois was involved in this and what other universities?

LEVINE: Nobody, except for Keio.

Q: No, I mean American universities.

LEVINE: Nobody, except we invited---

Q: What other scholars other than yourself? Scalapino? He is out of it by then, yes.

LEVINE: No, we never invited him. Within Illinois, of those involved, the most successful member eventually was Bob Cole. He became a sociologist, and today a professor of sociology in business at Berkeley, University of California. He was a prize case. Another one was a young assistant professor, named Bob Evans, who was at MIT at that time. Later, he became dean of liberal arts at Brandeis University. He is still at Brandeis. He is still very involved in Japanese market studies.

Q: I mentioned a guy I knew there, who was from the labor education field, an old Democratic socialist, Herman Erickson.

LEVINE: He was never really involved in Japan. If Herman had any foreign interests, it was in Europe, particularly Sweden, Norway, but not in Japan, that I recall. One of the others who got involved within Illinois was Phil Garmand. We finally induced Phil to go back to Japan.

You know that he was born in Tokyo.

Q: Yes, I know. Did he remember any Japanese?

LEVINE: Yes. _________________. He had the funniest attitude about his Japanese background. It was as if he were ashamed of it. He didn't want anybody to know. He had been the closest friend of Ed Reischauer. Years later when Reischauer was writing his memoirs, Reischauer wrote to Phil and said, "Can you remember anything about so and so?" Phil wrote in longhand a 10-page letter, both sides of the sheets, describing everything to a tee, and remembered names of kids and people, when they were six years old in Tokyo, sixty years before. Phil sent me copies of this stuff. I was in Australia. He thought somebody should see it. I wrote back, "Phil, you ought to be writing your memoirs." Reischauer used all that stuff.

Q: Let me go into it. There is some source material here, perhaps. We haven't defined Philip Garmand. Philip Garmand, who I knew during the war, and the war production board, was an excellent researcher. He was one of the few good researchers who was also good in the administrative sense.

LEVINE: Also out of Wisconsin.

Q: Also out of Wisconsin. He worked closely with a colleague, whose name you will recall, who was also in the war production board and who was in Malaysia. Bill Chalmers was his name. This is a very disappointing thing to find out about Phil Garmand. I knew he had been born of missionary parents in Tokyo. I never knew he remembered Japanese. It would be so interesting.

LEVINE: He would talk in Japanese. The students would say, "He speaks Japanese just like my grandfather."

Q: Really. That's right because it was a long time ago. Well, then, I ask you, do you have that memoir or who has it?

LEVINE: I have it somewhere. My personal papers I still have, and I must have that.

Q: It would be nice to get it solved because this is an interesting aspect. Phil, of course, died a few years ago, didn't he?

LEVINE: He died about five years ago.

Q: Chalmers, even before that.

LEVINE: Chalmers about 10 years ago.

Q: Possibly his papers would be in Illinois. I am mentioning this for the tape so that the student would know to go for it.

LEVINE: Phil's widow is still alive. She may have some.

Q: I may get in touch with Marty Wagner. He is still there, isn't he? Maybe he will be able to get them.

LEVINE: Yes. He sees Norma, which is her name.

Q: Oh, really, good. Wagner is head of the whole institute. He worked at the NLRB (National Labor Relations Board). I have an opportunity to call him sometime.

LEVINE: There is another one that I could mention. These are things that didn't happen. That whole 10-year period that we had the Keio/Illinois project, Wagner was the director of the Illinois Institute. We tried to prevail upon him to go to Japan, at least for two to three weeks so he would get to know his counterpart, but he wouldn't spend a nickel. If you knew Wagner well, everything had to be completely utilitarian. He was the morrow.

Q: Also like many of us who come out of the NLRB so oriented toward U.S.

LEVINE: I don't think this is the case.

Q: He just didn't want to spend the money, really?

LEVINE: That was his excuse. I think he realized that, if you are going to do it, you have to take it seriously. That meant more than two weeks. It was a real challenge. Martin Wagner was a Rhodes Scholar. He spent a year, or whatever it was, at Oxford.

Q: Two years.

LEVINE: To this day I don't think he has ever returned to Europe. He doesn't want to go back.

Q: This is a discussion that is off the subject. I put him in the category of the pre-1960 Jack Barbash, who felt that there was so much to know about Americans that he didn't want go over there.

LEVINE: Unlike the story I told you about Bob Fleming and _________________________________, we had complete support from Marty Wagner to go ahead with it. He was very proud of that project, and he said to me, "The most important thing we have ever done at the Illinois Institute was the Keio/Illinois project." Not many people know that, not even people in Illinois. It involved leading scholars from both sides. That was the opportunity to really study Japan, if you were American, or to really study the U.S., if you were Japanese. They have all put it to very good use.

Q: With this conversation, you have given a new dimension to our project, which is called *labor diplomacy. Whether it is entirely government or part-government, part-university, or entirely university, it still definitely illustrates the fact that the relations between two countries can be operated on at a university level with great influence. I gather that from what you say of our people on Japanese development and of theirs in the industrial relations field to us too, much later on.*

LEVINE: Fulbright was important in this too, in providing additional fellowships, __________________________ like that, and travel money for a number of the grantees, but the main money came from the Ford Foundation. As I recall we kept Lou Silverberg informed about that.

Q: Lou Silverberg was a longtime labor attaché.

LEVINE: He knew a lot of the exchangees who went to Illinois, and it became very---

Q: Unfortunately, as you know, Lou died about 20 years ago. I have been in correspondence with his widow and his daughter.

LEVINE: Miriam.

Q: Miriam had wonderful---

LEVINE: _________________________

Q: The daughter, right? She was my translator on one of my trips. She is bilingual, and I have been in correspondence with her for her father's papers.

LEVINE: We almost hired her here in Wisconsin.

Q: In Wisconsin? Too bad.

LEVINE: I don't know what went wrong. I wasn't here the day she came.

Q: I do want you to know that she has sent us a nice letter and we hope to get documents, if there are any _________________________________. Of course Silverberg, in spite of the fact he was one of the people who did not learn Japanese, but from your point of view, he---

LEVINE: ________________________ to the _________________________ in the Keio/Illinois program. He would meet with them, either before they went or after they came back, to discuss American conditions. He was very helpful. They were all quite grateful for his insights and information, so he was helpful in that sense.

Q: Did he suggest before they went out what they might look for and whom they might see?

LEVINE: He may have. I wasn't there. They weren't unknowledgeable. They knew a fair amount. Lou Silverbert was not systematic, dropping by the office, or he would have them over for tea, something like that.

Q: I would like to explore with you one question that keeps cropping up in connection with the exchange program. You had, of course, people going from the universities in Japan, and from the Trade Union Movement on the teams, and Americans coming over. I can understand that the American experience may be of some value to foreigners, but to what degree do you think that American institutions and their operations, like how you take a case to the NLRB (I mentioned this because that was Ruth's thing), or how the National Labor Relations Act operates, or how we enforce this type of act. Is that relevant to foreigners and to what degree?

LEVINE: Yes, particularly to them.

Q: Why?

LEVINE: Because, particularly in the case of Japan, because they have institutions, which are somewhat paralyzed.

Q: Oh, because of the occupation.

LEVINE: There were reforms that were in place, now, less than 20 years, maybe 15 years, when this program began. Most of them were very serious about what were the similarities and differences between how they handled unfair labor practices in the U.S., ______________________________ unfair labor practices in Japan, or mediated disputes. Tell us about this practice of arbitration. We don't have it in grievances. They were practical trade unionists.

Q: I want to leave this aside until we get to India and Australia, in both of which you had experiences. I want to raise this question again because I want to put it to you that as relevant as that was in Japan, so was it irrelevant in India, and much less relevant---

LEVINE: You remember the India thing.

Q: I know, but I want to get your response. I will give you my views. Let's not do it now, though. I want to get you out of Japan and into the other countries.

LEVINE: Australia more recently.

Q: You obviously love the Japanese studies' area and all that, and you wanted to get back as often as you could. You did manage to do that. How many trips actually did you make?

LEVINE: I think this last trip was our 27th trip to Japan.

Q: Each time you were involved in labor---

LEVINE: Every trip was a professional trip. We have never taken a vacation to Japan.

Q: You never paid your own way. You followed the Foreign Service practice: Try not to pay your own way.

LEVINE: Always from grants or funds, or something that paid, at least, for me. This last one we went here. This is another level of U.S. government. I'm looking for---

Q: You went to Hikone?

LEVINE: We went to Hikone.

Q: This is not where that wonderful resort is? That was Hakone.

LEVINE: That was Hakone. Hikone is on the big lake, but I wanted to show you---I guess, I have it upstairs.

Q: It doesn't matter. Sol, they are showing me that for a man who goes on the funds, he has plenty of fun. I can see that.

LEVINE: We lived in the shadow. See and here is the castle up here. We lived right down there. This is run by the state of Michigan, this program.

Q: Oh, really?

LEVINE: Yes. It is to my knowledge the first and only program run at the state level between a state of the United States and a prefecture in Japan. The prefecture in this case is Shiga. Rather than a U.S. federal government practice Japan's central government exchange is at a state level.

Q: What is the political and economic purpose of such an exchange at levels so low?

LEVINE: Let me tell you. Shiga's interest is a very long-term interest. They want American investment coming into Shiga Prefecture. They were hoping it would come from the big corporations of Michigan. They have had a ____________________________________ assisted city relationship for 25 years or something. The government of Shiga became the first Secretary of Coalition______. Takimoto is his name. ______________________ idea about "Let's make something of our relationship with Michigan." Michigan responded, interestingly enough, and said, "Yes, let's have an exchange program." Shiga went ahead and built two big buildings, which they gave to the state of Michigan to be the Michigan Center for Japanese Studies in this town of Ann Arbor. Michigan put up several hundred thousand dollars in their state budget to help support this, mainly with scholarship money, and to pay for _____________________________ and so forth. Then it became a hot potato.

Q: We're giving money to the Japanese.

LEVINE: I never heard of this before. Last year the governor of Michigan said, "I don't want this as an issue.

Q: This is a new Republican governor?

LEVINE: This is the new Republican governor. He pulls it out of the bucket and instead establishes a private Michigan/Japan Foundation.

Q: ________________________________ private.

LEVINE: It's a private organization, accepting contributions from all the big companies.

Q: And unions?

LEVINE: I don't know if he has gotten interested in the unions. I doubt he has gotten a nickel from the unions, but apparently the big corporations, GM, Chrysler, Ford, were all willing to give something.

Q: Are they contributing enough to make up for what---

LEVINE: Presumably, they were going to raise enough money to cut the ______________________ item in the Michigan budget. This year they announced that they were cutting it in half. The center is in great trouble politically. Will it survive? Shiga is trying to come to its rescue. They are trying to get enough out-of-state enrollment, so that out-of-staters will pay for this Michigan center.

Q: Let me ask you the obvious question: Why was it in Michigan's interest, even under a Democratic governance, to spend state money on this?

LEVINE: The main argument was that there should be Michigan kids learning Japanese, and learning about Japan by those who would work for an American corporation. One pledge they got out of the "Big Three," was that they would hire numbers. If you know the announcement about the new negotiations, you ask---

Q: The trade---

LEVINE: Micky Canter dropped the demand for targeted figures. They wanted to be able to count the number of automobile showrooms and have American cars. The Japanese said, "We want to be able to count how many American salesmen have studied Japanese, who came over here to study Japanese, and how many have attended seminars on how to do business in Japan." It is so much bull shit, but this is the level at which they are operating.

Q: You said that under the auspices of this foundation you went to last time---

LEVINE: Under the auspices of the state of Michigan. It is administered out of East Lansing, Michigan State. There are 15 Michigan public universities who participated.

Q: Since I want to get you out of Japan for these other things you did, can you summarize the 27 trips you had? In general was it mostly for academic purposes? Can you evaluate, or comment on, the type of American's governmental representation, either in the April---areas in which the U.S. government was more or less effective, how they used it in universities, etc.?

LEVINE: All my trips have been for academic purposes. I never served as a consultant for anybody in any capacity that I can recall, either for the government or for a private organization.

Q: Is it a matter of principle or it just happened?

LEVINE: As a matter of principle, I think I developed enough of a reputation that I didn't get any invitations. I didn't become a consultant like certain guys, say James Beglin or a few other people, who became very rich, consulting with American corporations. No, I never did that. I remained a pure academic, interested in learning about what was happening to industrial relations in Japan, because the theory is that it is dynamic and ever changing, just as it was in the U.S., or in Europe, Australia, or what have you, it should be doing so in Japan.

Q: Your CV (curriculum vitae) you have been the U.S. expert on Japanese?

LEVINE: There are several people, of course, who are quite prominent and command greater attention, but yes, I am quite satisfied. I get enough work already.

Q: By the way, do you lecture there in the Japanese language?

LEVINE: Sometimes, but mostly in English because they want to hear it in English. It is difficult and it takes too much preparation.

Q: Do you still have to practice?

LEVINE: Yes, if you are away from it for one week, two weeks, you get rusty.

Q: I read, I think, in Reischauer's book that even he does exercises. It is fascinating.

LEVINE: It quickly disappears, and you forget expressions, vocabulary, or phrases. Your second question has to do with the impression of the U.S. government's personnel.

Q: I don't want you to criticize or praise individuals. You may, if you wish, and you have a little bit, but I want the types of people who have been successful and the types who have not been successful. What sort of training should we be giving people? You already made the point of how important language is. What other training about understanding Japanese society, things like that?

LEVINE: There is no question over the years they became better and better prepared. They would spend time at the Foreign Service Institute studying Japan or the Far East, or whatnot. This was true of people like Lester Swieznack and Bob Immerman. Immerman was out of Wisconsin. I don't know if you know that.

Q: Yes.

LEVINE: His mentor was at the funeral the other day. Did you meet Bob Nolvahill?

Q: I may have. I met so many people. He was Immerman's or Swieznack's? Because Swieznack went to---

LEVINE: Immerman came here as an undergraduate and his major was Spanish. Bob Nolvahill, who was a good friend of Chad's all these years, was Immerman's professor. When Immerman went into the Foreign Service, he had a master's degree or a Ph.D., I'm not sure. He was destined to work in Latin America. I think he went to Latin America. I'm not sure.

Q: I don't know.

LEVINE: Ask him.

Q: This was Immerman, who was, from Levine's experience, probably the best, all-around.

LEVINE: The most competent. He took it very seriously. He was that type of guy. Anyway he concentrated and learned the language.

Q: He became a Japanese expert after being a Spanish one. That I didn't know.

LEVINE: Right. To have had the experience of studying foreign cultures, first Spanish, and the experience down there probably helped him in his Japanese experience. He became the best informed of all of them. As I think I may have mentioned to you before, he was the first labor attaché that I could turn to for a source of original information. He knew what was going on. He knew enough about the Americans to tell the Japanese what they needed to know.

Q: He was one of the few you knew, who could back and forth, rather than only one way.

LEVINE: He happened to hit it off very well with the academics in Japan. You have to remember that by this time, late 1960s, early 1970s, the most important institution in Japan for labor studies was the Japan Institute of Labor, which had been founded in 1959 or 1960. The first chief was Nakayama, whom I mentioned before. I take it back. It wasn't Nakayama. It was another guy, who died, but Nakayama became the second one, a year or so later. My test of how a labor attaché or a labor officer in the American Embassy really stood with the Japanese was how well he had been accepted by the Japan Institute of Labor. Well, Lou Silverberg did pretty well because he was an important source of information. Immerman started off as Lou's assistant.

Q: When I arrived there the first time in 1956, he took me around on trips to Hakone and other places.

LEVINE: When Lou left, he succeeded.

Q: There were a couple in between and then he became---

LEVINE: Who he succeeded I can't remember.

Q: I can't either and I don't have the book. We have a book giving that background. Aside from the labor field though Secretary Hodgson, Secretary of Labor, who became ambassador, told me he was invaluable in other areas too. I guess he did a whole lot of translating for him.

LEVINE: No, you can't be an expert in any one field without knowing what the entire context is.

Q: He really praised him.

LEVINE: Hodgson needed it. He was such an ignoramus, although a sweet guy; don't get me wrong.

Q: I'm very interested.

LEVINE: He was always very nice to me and I shouldn't be critical.

Q: Nice to me, as a result of Immerman introducing me.

LEVINE: I never considered him a giant in the field.

Q: Especially since he followed---Did he follow Reischauer? In any event, did he precede Reischauer? He came in 1960. No, Reischauer came in 1961, under Kennedy.

LEVINE: Yes. He left in the Johnson administration.

Q: Hodgson came later.

LEVINE: Hodgson came with Nixon. After Immerman, I wasn't particularly close to the embassy. Immerman became a good friend because he was a guy I could discuss things with.

Q: Did you normally, when you went on all these trips, touch base with the embassy in any way?

LEVINE: Always, I would look up the embassy ___________________________ contact.

Q: For instance, this last trip?

LEVINE: No, I didn't bother.

Q: You didn't even show up?

LEVINE: No.

Q: This is a tragedy for the embassy, you know.

LEVINE: I felt that after Swieznack and---Was it Warner?

Q: Yes.

LEVINE: He wasn't particularly interested in who I was or what I had to contribute.

Q: You mean you didn't make an affirmative effort?

LEVINE: He invited Betty and me to a party one time but we were just another part of the mob.

Q: A visiting dignitary.

LEVINE: He had no real sense about the history, but, you see, Bob still goes to Japan to teach. He has a regular arrangement to teach at a university in a place called Kameegee. I think he goes every January and gives a course.

Q: In labor or something else?

LEVINE: Maybe diplomatic history, U.S./Japan relations. Even in the years that he served in the U.N. as the assistant---

Q: Yes, that is when I saw him last. He was an assistant to---

LEVINE: Walker?

Q: No, it was something else. We will think of it.

LEVINE: Anyway he had been a general. It was when he retired and Columbia picked him up. I think, at Columbia at first, he was the visiting diplomat, for a year or two. Then they made him a regular research associate.

Q: I have been looking around for him. I am going to get in touch with him about interviewing him.

LEVINE: After Swieznack, ___________________________, because he became a student and we were good friends. I had him in a course. He always sent me reports, and they were useful. He was not knowledgeable about Japan, however.

Q: Although anything you say will be chiefly accepted, I am not as interested in this as I am in the types of efforts the government should make in recruiting, training, and educating, and keeping people in the field. For instance, we worry about keeping a person in one area for a long time. How much does it pay to shift around as rapidly as some have been shifted from assignment and area, to another, or is it better to concentrate in one area and just have an occasional assignment outside?

LEVINE: You are talking about subject area, rather than the geographic area.

Q: Right. Although geographic area is also important, because there is a feeling that if a guy spent his whole career in Asia, he doesn't understand what is going on in another area.

LEVINE: No, there has to be some degree of rotation, and back and forth. I don't have any particular system on how long it should be.

Q: Nor the application in the labor field, as to whether it is good.

LEVINE: As I said before, it was illustrated by eminence. To really be good in the labor field, you have to know far more than the language. You have to know a great deal about the sociology and the economics, the politics. You have to have some sense of the whole cultural history. You are really asking for a very large order. Now should you shift from one thing to another? I think the labor field itself is one that requires shifting around, so that if a guy knows this whole range of stuff and makes his business to keep up to date about it, he will find satisfaction within the field. It should serve the government well, if you can find these people. Now we have the same problem in the academics. It characterizes specialization versus broad ___________________________________ basis. This is the whole problem with industrial relations. How narrow or how wide should the training be? Should all the expectations be about what the student should acquire, or master? It is constantly changing, and it has to be monitored.

Q: We have this problem, the extremes of which can be described by such a fascinating continuum. One extreme being the guys who enter the Foreign Service, and the broad range generalists, you know, every one of whom hopes to be an ambassador of one type. Some of the people characterized by one guy, who was offered an appointment as a political counselor or something, who had been the labor attaché, had said, "My ambition in this department is to be the best damn labor attaché in the world, not to become an ambassador." There is a place for both. That person had an ambition in the direction of being so fascinated by labor that he wanted to go from the labor reporting officer in the little country to being the top notch labor counselor, not concerned, but understanding, with any other aspect of the country, other than the labor field.

LEVINE: Well, as long as he is flexible and is willing to keep on learning, that is okay.

Q: Or as long as we have both types in the service. Anything else you would like to say before we go away from Japan and go into your many other areas? You'll think of something later and add it.

LEVINE: There are a lot of episodes that I could tell you about.

Q: If you think they are instructive to the U.S. Government, ________________________ please tell me.

LEVINE: As time went on the role of American government becomes less and less critical for understanding what is going on in Japan, or, if it is important, it shifts to other things, like to trade.

Q: At this point, I just want to introduce us by saying that, in connection with your academic work in Japan, you have become quite a world traveler and a world researcher in the field of industrial relations, especially, but labor generally, in many other places. Did you do this extra travel as a result of other foundation grants, or personal interests, or were you actually a U.S. government, what we call "Am Part," American participant?

LEVINE: Again a lot of it was done under the Fulbright program. I think my interest in proposing that I go to other countries, because I took the initiative, stemmed largely from the realization, particularly out of teaching students who came to Illinois in the institute program. These were students from various countries. They wanted to have a better understanding of the American experience, and the Japanese experience, in relationship to their own experience, or whatever. I don't know if this was quite valid, and, therefore, I should know something about these other countries, based on some firsthand knowledge, rather than only reading about it. I had already learned that you see things more sensitively, if you have been there, and spent some time there, a few months at a time, at the minimum, and always distrust those reports coming from people who were the one-week expert or something.

Q: The advantage of staying longer is that you learn more, but the disadvantage is that you have more doubts, after a period of one week.

LEVINE: Yes. You learn not to trust yourself. That is true. We first applied this notion when we said, "As long as we are going to Japan, let's try to schedule in some other countries."

Q: When you say "we," you mean, Betty and yourself.

LEVINE Betty and myself.

Q: Was she a partner in all this research, or she did different things while she was abroad?

LEVINE: We had a family.

Q: You had four kids?

LEVINE: We thought that the father and the mother were important to attend to it. We took the kids with us. Our first trip was in 1959, where we went around the world, from Illinois to Japan. We went to Paris, Geneva, Rome, then we went to India. You weren't there yet. We went to India for several weeks, as I recall, then onto the Philippines.

Q: Did you work there, or just learn there?

LEVINE: Learn there. I talked to people. These were not serious studies in the sense of gathering data.

Q: What about the financial aspect? How were you paid?

LEVINE: In those days the dollar was worth a lot more. Somehow or other we would stretch it. You could fly around the world for virtually the same cost as going round trip from here to Tokyo. You might as well do it. Wherever we went we had friends who would take us in or find places for us to stay. Certainly they were not serious types of academic trips, but they were getting acquainted trips. It was very valuable.

Q: You took an around the world trip with a long period in Japan.

LEVINE: It took us two months to get to Japan. Then we stayed in Japan, I think, for six or seven months.

Q: And then came directly home? Back to Illinois?

LEVINE: Back to Illinois.

Q: I guess, at this point, we should point out that you were in Illinois for a long period of your career and in 1969 you shifted here to Wisconsin.

LEVINE: Right. I was in Illinois for 20 years from 1949 to 1969 and did the bulk of my serious studies in those years. After that the first time we really went elsewhere, I think it was in 1968 when it was arranged that we would go down to Singapore for a three-month period, and that I would teach a course at the National University of Singapore.

Q: Who was your sponsor there?

LEVINE: That, I believe, was when I had a joint Fulbright to spend part of the time in Japan and part of the time in Singapore.

Q: Was your Singapore contact this man, who was a judge in the court, whom I got to know?

LEVINE: Judge Town. I met Judge Town. The most important person in Singapore at that time, from the labor field was a trade unionist named Kanda Sami, who was the head of the Postal Workers Public Employees. Kanda Sami had been a good friend of Bill Chalmers. Bill Chalmers had been in Singapore. He was in Singapore, I think, in 1965-1967, somewhere in there, for a year or two. He wrote a book about Singapore industrial relations. His was the freshest thing out. It was the only thing written by an American about Singapore. Bill's coaching, before I left, was very important for preparing me for Singapore. There I had a good chance to look into the structure of things, national trade union, Congress.

Q: Did you get to know Nerone?

LEVINE: PB Nerone (sp) was up in Malaysia, but I got to know PB Nerone (sp) at a conference, somewhere in the U.S. I am trying to remember. He came here, and was a good friend of Red--- He was here in Wisconsin. He died years ago. I will think of his name. He was an expert on Indonesia and Southeast Asia. He brought PB Nerone (sp) to some conference, maybe here in Madison, I can't recall.

Q: The one I recommended in Singapore was not PB Nerone (sp?), but Nair.

LEVINE: Nair, yes. Devon Nair, who became the President of the NTUC (Japanese Consumers Cooperative Union), as I recall. When I went back years later, he heard I was in Singapore and he wanted me to come see him. I thought, "Oh, boy, I'm going to get the inside story." You know what it turned out to be? He said, "I have an 18-year-old son."

Q: He wants to send him to the states.

LEVINE: He wanted to send him to Wisconsin because the 18-year-old son had gotten mixed up with a Filipino girl. Mrs. Nair didn't quite like the idea. She was a traditional Indian lady. They wanted to get him out of this whole area. This was after several years of Nair damming the United States for being so corrupt and so immoral, and everything else.

Q: I think he made his own compromises, a relief on you.

LEVINE: He wanted me to get his son into the University of Wisconsin. He never came to Wisconsin. He wound up somewhere in the states, but I can't remember where.

Q: Were you there long enough to get a feel for how people like Nair had to reconcile their old independent trade union beliefs with the problems?

LEVINE: I have learned about that, mainly from Kandasome, who was Indian by background. He was the third leader. There were three great leaders, Leequido, Nair, and Kandasome. When the moment came, Kandasome almost crossed the aisle. He realized that if he crossed the aisle and voted for the opposition (this was in about 1963) he would wind up in jail because they would arrest the whole opposition. He withdrew from the whole thing essentially to work for the ICFTU (The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions). For the rest of his career, maybe even today, he goes on troubleshooting for Macur, to help clean problems in the Pacific Islands or those areas. Maybe, nominally, he remained the head of the Postal Workers---

Q: You mean the PT TI, The Asian Group?

LEVINE: Yes, The Asian Group. [Ed: The Asia Group LLC is a strategy and capital advisory group based in Washington DC with an affiliated office in Hong Kong.]

Q: He was associated, also, with Macur's educational work in New Delhi. That is where I got to know him.

LEVINE: He did all this international type work.

Q: A nice fellow, I thought.

LEVINE: A nice guy and he was peppy, but he decided that he just didn't have the strength to challenge the opposition. He abdicated and left with the Devoneer. Nair became Lee's man. That was so funny. I really thought he was going to divulge all sorts of things to me. He became president of Singapore, you know. Then, he was kicked out as a drunk.

Q: Oh, I didn't know that. Recently?

LEVINE: This would have been early 1980s.

Q: I thought they retired him.

LEVINE: Yes, they retired him as a drunk. That is how they got rid of him. He became an embarrassment, they said. So that was the end of Devon Nair.

Q: So you stayed only three months there.

LEVINE: At that time. I went back to Singapore, two or three more times, over the subsequent 10 years. I take it back. I had been in Singapore in the early 1960s, just for a short period, for a few days. Bernie Koch and I went around the world, by way of Geneva. I can't remember, but we went to Singapore, to---We were involved with MUCIA. Do you know what MUCIA is? Midwest University's consortia for international activities.

Q: I sure know it, because they helped get me my grant to go to India in 1979.

LEVINE: It was just being organized in the early 1960s. Of course, Illinois was a member of it. I can't remember the details, but somehow or the other, we got them to finance us to go by way of Europe, Geneva, and then to Singapore, and to the Philippines, to look into the possibility of university-based research projects. It was there in Singapore that we arranged for Bill Chalmers to go there. He got some grant from the Ford foundation to go to Singapore. Then we went onto the Philippines. Nothing much came of it, and we wound up in Japan, mainly in connection with the labor team. That was another illustration; if you were going to Japan, you could make a round-the-world trip out of it. I went back again, on my own, I think, in 1973, and 1978, and maybe 1981, for visits, several weeks at a time.

Q: When we had you in India, it was at a time, I thought, when you were coming from Singapore?

LEVINE: Yes, that was 1968. That was that first substantial time in Singapore.

Q: Is that before your children came, or after?

LEVINE: It was after our children came. Our children had been there, earlier in the summer. They took off from Singapore. We followed them, I think, at the end of the summer or September, I can't recall. We went on from India to Tehran, and then from Tehran up to Moscow, and to Leningrad, Stockholm, places like that. That was a great trip. In terms of serious study, I kept in touch with the Singaporean system at each time. I was mainly interested in the wage determination system. It was a very centralized system run by the government.

Q: Did you do much writing on Singapore, at all?

LEVINE: A little bit, but not terribly much. This is where I discovered that if you really wanted to be an expert in writing about a country such as Singapore, you had to live there, for a substantial amount of time, continuously, and get to know everything. I felt that it was too much pretension. I did some comparatives. I remember I wrote an article that I presented, as a paper at the IIRA (International Labor Employment Relations Association) in Paris, maybe, I can't remember.

Q: Paris would have been 1979 or so.

LEVINE: No, it was earlier, I think. Anyway, there was a comparison of Japan, essentially, on wage determination mechanisms, wage mechanisms, U.S./Japan, Singapore and Australia. When that session ended suddenly I was surrounded by all the editors from various journals, who wanted my paper. This had never happened to me before. I ended up giving it to Ben Roberts of The British Journal. He published it but John Neiland was sort of pissed off. He thought he was entitled to it. I gave something else to John later.

Q: The other countries I associate you with are India, where also, you didn't spend too much time.

LEVINE: The Indian stopovers were relatively brief, and I never felt that I became that competent about Indian affairs and Indian labor matters.

Q: Did we put you in touch with the Sheeran Center, which is what I should have done?

LEVINE: Yes, you did. I relied heavily on you to make sure that I met the right people. I spent a week in Bombay, a week in Delhi, and a week in Calcutta. We went to Jamshedpur.

Q: Oh, you did go to Jamshedpur?

LEVINE: Let alone Agra and some other side trips, but Jamshedpur was important.

Q: Yes, Jamshedpur was important, and I wonder if you had any observations to make about the labor training there that was done by the Catholic Fathers.

LEVINE: There was a guy named McGraff.

Q: That's what I said: the Catholic Fathers, Ed McGraff. I should tell you he has replied recently and has gone back to the only state that is worse, in terms of conditions, to Araceae, to set up a similar institution.

LEVINE: In his retirement! Boy, what a dedicated man. He came here, you know. He was a lovely guy. What was my impression of his training? It was one of the few places in India that was doing anything systematic. He was trying to keep in very close touch with what the American institutes were doing, so that they would have a model to go by. I felt very comfortable there.

Q: I should tell you, however, that---

LEVINE: I gave a lecture or two; I can't remember.

Q: He felt he was training people to be labor experts, and then when they went out the only jobs they could get were management. Usually, it's the iron steel industry, but I told him that that was no failure. I told him that the unions weren't wealthy enough to hire trade union experts, the more and better educated the management people were; it served a purpose.

LEVINE: India adopted that legal requirement for a labor officer---

Q: In any plant that had more than 50 employees.

LEVINE: That's right. They were supposed to be neutral.

Q: It was hard to keep them, but some of them were so good. The fact that the legislation existed, and you could point to the necessity of hiring people and the training materials that were put up, at least, opened up the possibility of a good program.

LEVINE: Listen, I had a student named Seigal.

Q: J.P. Seigal?

LEVINE: Not the management guy, another Seigal.

Q: J.P. was the management guy.

LEVINE: He took a degree at Illinois and went back and got one of those jobs at Telco or Tisco. Telco, I guess, it was.

Q: Telco was electric, and Tisco was the iron and steel.

LEVINE: No, it wasn't the iron and steel. That was one reason I went to Jamshedpur: to visit Seigal, because he had sent me a letter, pleading for me to come visit him. He was miserable there. What he really wanted me to do was to find him another job. He wanted to get back to the United States.

Q: One of the happiest circumstances about my disappointment with what happened with people being educated in the United States and staying here is the program I saw a week or so ago. I think it was PBS, where it illustrated the new Silicon Valley being established in Bangalore. That is a hopeful sign because as it was every time we sent one of these engineering students to the United States or their parents sent them, goodbye. They married an American girl, etc.

LEVINE: I had a student named Madda. He came here from India, by way of Canada. He had gone to McGill or something for a master's degree and then he came to the business school to International Business. He was interested in Japan. I thought that was great. He studied Japanese, took all the courses, he got all prepared. He took all of his regular courses, and then he applied for a fellowship to go to Japan for a year, which he won from, I believe, the Social Science Research Council. The damn government in India intervened and said, "You were sent to North America. You cannot go to Japan. That is a violation." These were bureaucrats.

Q: They didn't have anything to offer him.

LEVINE: He even went to India to try to talk them into this. They refused to budge. He came back. They had darkened his hopes. The choice was, if he went to Japan, he had to give up whatever support he would have in the U.S. He wasn't willing to risk that. So, he gave up Japan. He never finished his dissertation. The last I heard, it was teaching at Allegheny College in Pennsylvania, and still hoping to write a dissertation. That was seven or eight years ago. I don't know what has become of him. He was my great failure. I never felt that I could write anything serious about India because I didn't know enough in depth; however, I felt I could talk about India, in courses. These were comparative courses. I always felt that a comparative analysis was extremely helpful to anybody in the field of industrial relations, or in the field of international business, or international social science, simply because the student begins to perceive the varieties of institutions that can develop around similar problems.

Q: That is an important function to know: the variety of institutions, and how they deal with one another, and what one country has against another. I am concerned, however, about the tendency among Americans, and many others, also, to feel as though a system, not an objective, but a system of the cleaning of industrial peace, or obtaining a good contract procedure, or something like that. The idea that you could transfer from the Americans or any other society a system and say, "You should have a system of electing ________________ of collective bargaining agency, and a vote" as they did in India. What concerns me, and I would like to get your view on it, is a tendency to think that the Americans, especially, but not exclusively, say, "We have a good way of doing this in the United States why don't you try it here?" Instead of saying, "We have a good way of doing things in the United States," within the context of our situation, "What is there in your situation that allows you to borrow and adapt so well?"

LEVINE: This sort of bears on the question that you raised before, about why did the Japanese find the details ____________________________, let's say, the NLRB procedures, interesting enough, to pay attention.

Q: You said it was because we transferred the context there.

LEVINE: Yes. Whereas in Australia, they seem to find it boring. The Australians had devised their own solutions to similar questions, which were departures from the British, which they were supposed to have inherited. They felt that they had developed a system, which was superior to what the British had given. It certainly had to be superior to anything the Americans did. They were not particularly interested, although people like John Neiland, who I have mentioned, or Russ Lansby, and a few others, did take a great deal of interest because they are comparativists. They have to understand the detail in order to grasp the outline. The detail is necessary to know if you are going to outline what the system has done by general principles.

Q: I'll give you a copy of a letter I sent Tom Thomas Kochan about next year's IIRA meeting, at which I propose that they discuss this question of the possibility of transferring one country's system, or parts of the system, to another. You will see what I say about it.

LEVINE: I would like to see it. Tom has been very involved with foreigners, but I'm not sure that he has spent enough time and energy in understanding foreign systems.

Q: No, this was written to him in his capacity as IIRA, incoming President, where he said that one of the subjects for the Congress next year should be this question of transfer system. I threw a whole lot of cold water on that.

LEVINE: Maybe he would have put it that way, had he really had much more substantial exposure to studying systems, other than the Americans. He has had a lot of brushes with foreigners. He shepherded a lot of reports, and has seen a lot of papers, but what he had Katz write about, let's say, the Japanese system in their new text book, is just hogwash.

Q: Do you know you are on tape?

LEVINE: I don't care. He was a student of mine. He missed the whole point of comparative studies, by dwelling on what they happened to dwell on in that textbook. I wouldn't assign that stuff because it is misleading. I don't care if he hears this or not. I would tell this to his face.

Q: Many people have.

LEVINE: It is some sort of superficiality that he tries to pass off as---Am I being as sorry and bad as Jack was.

Q: No, you are a little bit more frank. You see Jack adds to that, that these people have done research. That research has to be studied and answered, whereas your response is, "It's hogwash, and I'm not going to assign it as reading." Jack would be inclined to respond to it by saying, "Look, they invested a whole lot of time in all this research, we have to think of it, maybe---" Like Jack felt---We are not talking about Jack Farr, ___________________, We are just lost and feel sad about losing. Jack felt as though econometrics and number crunching that you and I did----. He looked down upon those systems so much, there must be a way of using number crunching techniques for good purposes. He tried to identify that rather than denigrate number crunching as a system.

LEVINE: I would disagree with him. I would say that my criticism lies more in the fact that they have generalized about matters that they only know superficially. Their generalizations don't seem to be particularly valid.

Q: You are talking about McCursy, Katz, and Thomas Kochan?

LEVINE: Not particularly. I'm really talking about the Henry Katz and Thomas Kochan textbook, selective bargaining and industrial relations, in which they have a chapter or two on foreign comparisons. Those foreign comparisons, as far as I read them, were rather useless. If you are going to use comparisons, you have to be prepared to know what you are comparing. You have to know in depth. This is why I was always hesitant about writing anything about India or Philippines, or what have you, because my knowledge wasn't profound enough. It was too limited. If I was superficial, they are a dozen times more superficial. Now a lot of people run off to Australia. They can master the Australian situation, after all, it is all done in English, if you can understand that English. New Zealand is another case. They think they can wrap it all up in a few weeks. The New Zealand system has now changed considerably. It is a very complex institution.

Q: What about Australia and New Zealand, which you also visited. Did you have extensive experience there?

LEVINE: I visited Australia, I think, four or five times, ranging from two months to six or seven months, something like that. Each one gave me a chance to find out much more than I had known, but I never did systematic research, as I had done in Japan, or in the U.S. Therefore, I couldn't make the same sort of comparisons that I would like to have seen done.

Q: Are you in the practice of recommending more detailed study to be made by your students, and guide them in the research in those areas?

LEVINE: Absolutely. There are lots of questions that need to be delved into, far more deeply than has been the case so far. For example, currently I have a student who is studying the origins of lifetime employment in Japan, the concept of lifetime employment in Japan. This has never been done before, at least in English. He is exploring the actual practice, at a case level, of long-term tenure, going back 75 years, in certain companies that are supposed to be well known for this practice. He has data, which he can quantify, but what happened to the personnel and how long had they actually worked in the place?

Q: Is it true that it is all a camouflage for letting them go at the age of 51?

LEVINE: Well, that's one of the things. It is a camouflage, as long as you have a full employment economy that is expanding. Once the economy begins to contract, it's not only the age of 51, but a lot of the older people do get it in the ___________________________.

Q: That should be compared to the IBM experience. IBM had a good system of a lifetime, and then when the recession comes, the---

LEVINE: Very similar, and he will do it eventually. That is the other thing, where did the term come from? Who coined it? He finds out it was a foreigner who popularized the term. He finds that the courts in Japan first began to use the Japanese term about 1952 or 1953, as a way of reversing the dismissal that took place under the Red Courage. There was so far Red Courage in Japan, about 1950, where companies dismissed at least 10,000 trade union leaders. Some of them were activists. Some of them went to court on the grounds that their constitutional rights were violated.

Q: Their constitutional rights to lifetime employment?

LEVINE: Their constitutional rights to work. That is in the constitution the right to work and the right to enjoy a bright and happy life. That is in the constitution. The courts found in their favor, in their case, on the grounds that management does have the power to lay off people at will, an employment at will doctrine, provided they use every other cost cutting device first, other than laying people off, and dismissing them. Cut their own salaries, if necessary. The constitution, essentially, guarantees work, except as a very last resort. So that puts a very different twist on why this thing took hold. It throws a new ____________________________ ash can on these cultural arguments about loyalty, and subservience.

Q: And the company song.

LEVINE: All that bull shit, which is what we suspected but, for the first time, somebody is digging this out. He knows Japanese. He is an interesting case. He started off in the Japan field, as a candidate for the priesthood, as a Jesuit.

Q: To join that father out there, what's his name?

LEVINE: Father Beaulong. He went to Shofar University and to their seminary. His problem was that he fell in love with a Japanese girl and he married her. He had to quit, and then he came to Wisconsin.

Q: No Japanese ________________________________?

LEVINE: He was practically bilingual. He spent nine or ten years in Japan, before he came back here.

Q: Oh, that raises a question of another Japanese speaker, married to a Japanese woman, a labor attaché, whose wife's name was Tetsko. I have forgotten his name. He was a labor attaché.

LEVINE: In Japan?

Q: In Japan for a while. He spoke perfect Japanese, I understand.

LEVINE: What became of him?

Q: He died. He was a very ardent Catholic.

LEVINE: Died young?

Q: He died rather young in the 1970s. He was the labor attaché to the OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) *mission. Do you remember him?*

LEVINE: No, but I remember Nakamura.

Q: He was the Japanese guy who was the OECD guy.

LEVINE: Do you know where he is now?

Q: No.

LEVINE: He is in Bangkok.

Q: He is an old friend of mine. What is he doing in Bangkok? Still with the labor ministry?

LEVINE: No, he is with ILO (International Labor Organization). He is assigned to the ILO in the Bangkok office. His regular job was with---

Q: Pfeiffer was the name of the guy. Did you know him?

LEVINE: I never knew him.

Q: Well, it was after your day there.

LEVINE: Yoshio Nakamura was a---

Q: Well, I saw him in Japan. He was working for Ministry of Labor.

LEVINE: He rose to a fairly high post.

Q: Now he is with the ILO?

LEVINE: Yes, for three years. I was just told that a few weeks ago.

Q: Let me just ask you to comment on one other thing. Then I'm going to ask you about your relations with U.S. Government personnel and the other travels you had. I raised it with Thomas Kochan in this letter on comparison and transfer of techniques. Count, if you will, the seeming attraction that Australian management had with our system of collective bargaining agents. Of course, they are subject, just like the Indians are, in another respect, to this continual bargaining wage level decision making, where a craft gets a raise in their wage, and then the industry can come in to raise the levels of other crafts for _________________ because of the relative ______. Then the craft goes in for an extra amount of money. The management people in Australia seem to be very attracted to the idea, understandably, of having one bargain with one bargaining unit, and drive it in agreement for a specific period of time, "like you have in the United States," with collective bargaining.

LEVINE: A lot of it has taken hold.

Q: Yes, a lot of it has taken hold, especially among management people, but it was an artificial attempt to transfer the context of American system into Australia, which had a different background. I said in the letter to Thomas Kochan, it is like my first experience with Australia before I ever dreamed of going there, when Senator Taft introduced an idea of having compulsory arbitration, because, by God, they have Australia and New Zealand. Let's adopt it here at the time of the Taft/Hartley Act. The Labor Board didn't know what to do with that idea, so they asked me. I was in the research staff to just look into Australia/New Zealand. I put out a little report in which I pointed to the fact that part of the context of this was, practically, to have compulsory unionism, specifically in New Zealand. Inferentially and immediately that was dropped. What was there from your point of view?

LEVINE: I'll tell you. I got very much into prize bargaining, this whole concept, this last time, two years ago. We were there for about four or five months in 1992.

Q: Were you teaching there?

LEVINE: Yes, I was a visiting scholar.

Q: At Meinich?

LEVINE: It was at Swinburne. Now it is Swinburne University of Technology, formally Swinburne Institute of Technology. Swinny is the poor man's school, but there is something very interesting about Swinburne, compared to Melbourne and ______________________. It is a seedy place, but it is much more like an American university.

Q: Where is it located?

LEVINE: In Hawthorne in Melbourne.

Q: That is a good poor neighborhood.

LEVINE: It's a lower middle-class area. We didn't live too far from there.

Q: Could they support that many universities there?

LEVINE: Swinburne, I think, is one of the largest universities, certainly in Victoria, maybe in all of Australia. They had all sorts of night classes and part-time students and special programs. It is sort of the NYU (New York University) of Melbourne. They have some good faculty members. These are usually people who should have had tenure but didn't quite make it. At any rate, Goldie always got a kick out of my calling it "Swinny." Incidentally, we lived, for a second time, in their backyard. We lived two to three blocks from the Isaacs. We went back to the same place. Therefore, we were close neighbors once again as if no time had passed.

Q: Have you ever, ever met anybody nicer than the Isaacs?

LEVINE: No, they are marvelous. We went up to their place a couple times.

Q: They are selling it.

LEVINE: Oh, are they? They were talking about it. They had gotten rid of all the cows.

Q: They put it up for sale. One of their cows is named after me. Anyway, you were telling me how you got into this.

LEVINE: The raging question had already become enterprise level bargaining. What they wanted to know was all about the Japanese experience, and whether or not they had heard about enterprise unionism and enterprise level of decision-making, and so forth.

Q: When you say, "they," management people, or both?

LEVINE: Much more management. I am trying to remember if I had much contact with the union, very little. We had Bill Howard. Ross Mauer had a seminar once a month with some union people. I was the speaker two or three times.

Q: Was Bill still working there then?

LEVINE: By that time, Bill was retired from ___________. He and this guy, Ross Mauer, whom I have known from Japan, is an American. They have these enterprises going. They do these seminars for unionists or whoever else wants them.

Q: Incidentally, Bill Hauer, whom I do like very much, is sort of a parched---

LEVINE: Well, sure. He is a curmudgeon. He takes issue. He is a cynic, and all that, but he is a lovely guy.

Q: Also, he is very knowledgeable.

LEVINE: Very. You know, John Neiland once said that Howard was the most insightful of all the Australian scholars, and knew more than anybody else, but got a lousy deal from ________. They never gave him a full-fledged certificate. I gave several presentations, mainly to management people. There was one big conference toward the end that Swinburne ran on this topic of enterprise bargaining at the Japanese experience. My point to them was not to exaggerate the enterprise nature of the relationship, but the literature was wrong. The literature, like Thomas Kochan and Katz, frankly, is wrong in emphasizing the exclusivity of the enterprise level relationship.

Q: In other words it wouldn't cure the problems that they had in Australia.

LEVINE: No, it wouldn't. I went on to say there is a whole structure within which this takes place, and it couldn't happen without the structure at the national and regional and industrial level. I told them they couldn't forget those things. I tried to illustrate the relationship. I said that in many ways it is sort of the reverse image of what you have in Australia. You have the same elements. You can't ignore the enterprise level simply because everything is happening at the national, court level. On the other hand you shouldn't do the reverse in the Japanese case. That essentially was my message to them. Whether they believed it or not, I don't know. They were certainly looking very hard for some sort of international parallel. Of course, Japan was the successful case for them. Look at the rapid rate of growth and the trade surplus. Although Australia is trusting in their funds, there is a surplus against it, but the Americans were already being seen as some sort of a failure.

Q: Now, of course, they might look at it differently.

LEVINE: Maybe two years makes a big difference.

Q: Let's sum this up because we are coming to the end of the tape, and, certainly, to the end of your endurance, by asking you, with respect to these other countries, and some general observations, what is the place the government has in all of this, to encourage research.

LEVINE: For academics?

Q: No, for academics and its own purposes. Here, we have a political objective, which is much broader than just labor, in a country like Japan, and India, etc. What is there to be done in the labor field that will enhance U.S. objectives in that country? Whether it is peace, or trade, or whatever it is. I gather you are saying knowledge is important.

LEVINE: Knowledge is essential. I don't want to call it intelligence, but certainly understanding of the social, political, economic, cultural context. In most of these countries you can't avoid knowing the role of labor and the nature of labor; there are questions that come up. You have to know those things. Otherwise, your interpretation of that country is likely to be wrong, or haphazard. What specific purpose does it serve? I'm not sure it serves any specific purpose, except to convey the sense of what the country is about.

Q: How do you feel about the current issue of the degree to which industrial development should take precedence over human rights? What place do these things that are normally part of labor rights have? In other words the simplistic way of putting it is, Japan wanted to revolutionize the economy first, and it is failing, but in China we are having industrial development and trade take place before they have human rights. Whereas in the former Soviet Union, they are trying to help the people more with giving them an immediate shock treatment under democracy. Is there some balance there?

LEVINE: Sure there is a balance between economic development and technological development, and human rights. If there has to be a priority, of course, I would make human rights first. I'm not sure there has to be a priority. I think in the case of China it's probably been too sharply drawn around the episode that happened five years ago.

Q: Tiananmen Square. As if Taiwan isn't just as guilty of human rights violations.

LEVINE: There are many other cases for that. I am very wary of hanging the policy on one event or another event. There would have to be a whole sweep of development. I think it would have been wrong for Clinton not to extend the most favored nation privilege to China.

Q: Has this come out yet? Was the decision made today?

LEVINE: Apparently today. It was in the paper today. Most Japanese, themselves, will agree that what the Japanese did in the prewar period, in emphasizing economic development over human rights, was abominable. It got them in a great deal of trouble. They never want to see this happen again. I think one of the great lessons of postwar Japan is the fact that there has been a reasonable balance between the two concepts.

Q: They have a political structure, which requires them to balance out, etc.

LEVINE: It's been amazing that a constitution imposed upon them by an outside power has really been terribly effective. I think it is well upheld and observed. It could be better, in various respects, but I think the postwar Japan experience has been a great success from that point of view.

Q: Sol, we are reaching the end of the tape. You have to start out early in the morning, so let me thank you very much.

LEVINE: Any time you have a question that I can answer.

Q: It's five minutes to 11:00, whew. That's terrible. Thank you very much, Sol. Next time we see each other---

LEVINE: It was nothing.

Q: It was nothing. Don't worry, he says, a whole lot. Thank you very much.

LEVINE: Thanks for dinner.

Q: You're welcome.

LEVINE: When are you going to start looking into all of this stuff? Now, I know what you mean by analysis. You are going to have to start analyzing.

Q: Why do you think we are interviewing all these academics? The tape is still rolling, that shows you how dedicated I am. We want you to get the students to do it. As subjective as I am, all I want to do is get the facts in there and have some students work on it. I spoke to John Winmuehler, for instance.

LEVINE: Does he have students?

Q: Yes, he has students. He is still teaching, because they can't get anybody else.

LEVINE: I thought he retired.

Q: Yes, but he still teaches one course. I want to speak to Joe Elder, while I am here, one of these times, about getting one of these students interested in India. We now have transcripts of a number of people who served in India, from Henri Sokolove, until the last one, who is retired, for a period of 35, 40 years, as well as, a three-evening interview I had with our local employee, whom you may remember, Kushnin. Kushnin came to visit us, and I sat down with him three evenings late. We finished after midnight one night, in which he commented on the *various types of things done by all the labor officers from Sokolove, to Burgess, to Horowitz, Millen, Weiss, all those people. There is enough stuff in those interviews, which I am continuing now, for a good research piece, maybe even a Ph.D., on U.S. impact and vice versa on Indian industrial relations.*

LEVINE: Here in Wisconsin, the international comparative area is essentially in the hands of Strek.

Q: Yes, I haven't spoken to him.

LEVINE: I don't think he is here. I think he is in Germany, the last I heard. He is a sociologist. Whether he has students---.

End of interview