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

GEORGE CABOT LODGE

Interviewer: Morris Weisz
Initial interview date: February 24, 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW

Q: This is Morris Weisz interviewing George Cabot Lodge on his work in the government and since then in the field of international labor. Today is Wednesday, February 24, 1993, and we are seated in George's beautiful hotel room in Washington, D.C., and he has been kind enough to give us some time to be interviewed for our Labor Diplomacy Oral History Project. George, would you tell us your background and how you got into the Labor Department and into international work?

LODGE: I was a newspaper reporter after graduating from Harvard College in 1950. I went to work for the Boston Herald as a political reporter covering the state house, and I was firmly convinced that my life was going to be in journalism. One of the reasons was that I had such a bad stutter that I could hardly speak, so I concluded that I had to do something which involved writing rather than talking. One day I interviewed the Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, when he came to make a speech in Bangor, Maine. He landed at the airport in Boston and I drove in the car with him from Boston to Bangor. I remember I asked him 96 questions. I had them all written out from having researched his life in the newspaper morgue. At the end of the interview he said, "Listen, I need a speech writer, so why don't you come down and write speeches for me?" For a variety of reasons, which I won't go into now, that sounded appealing. Among other things, the pay was three times what I was making as a newspaper reporter, so at great personal sacrifice so to speak I went to Washington.

Q: You were married at the time?

LODGE: I was married. I had three children. I came down and within about a month miraculously I found myself Director of Information in the Department of Labor, which was a very big job for somebody like me who at the time was 27 years old. I had flags behind my desk and field offices and lots of staff and we put out all the publications of the Department of Labor. Then in June of that year--I went down there in about February--it was the famous year that the Russians came back into the International Labor Organization (ILO) after an absence of, I guess, since World War II.

Q: Would this have been 1953?

LODGE: This was 1954, I believe.

Q: Oh, yes, Wilkins had been the...

LODGE: Wilkins was the Assistant Secretary. So the Russians came back into the ILO, because all of the data on forced labor in the Gulag was beginning to come out in those years, and it was coming out through the ILO, so that the ILO Conference that year was peculiarly exciting politically. There was an item on the agenda to pass a convention on forced labor on the basis of all of this documentation. So the Secretary, Mr. Mitchell, was concerned about the debate and the controversy. The Russian delegate was a very distinguished Russian diplomat, Amosas Aritunian (phonetic), who I think later went on to become the Soviet Ambassador to Canada at a time when Canada was the place where

the Soviet North American spy ring was organized. Aritunian was one of their real hotshots. The Secretary was concerned about the delegation, so he said to me one day, "Look, you better go with the delegation to Geneva." And I said, "But what am I supposed to do?" And he said, "Well, I don't know. I can't make you a member of the delegation because you don't know anything. Why don't you just..."

Q: If I knew Mitchell, he did not say, "You don't know anything."

LODGE: Well, implicit was... I mean I had no portfolio which would justify my official presence on the delegation. I wasn't an expert in anything, and so he said, "Why don't you just go and make yourself useful." So I read everything I could read on forced labor and I remember getting on the plane at Idlewild Airport, as it was then called, with a trunk, literally a trunk, full of all of this data coming out about forced labor in [the Soviet Union].

Q: Excuse me, the head of our delegation then was our Assistant Secretary for International Labor Affairs Ernest Wilkins?

LODGE: That's right. So I got on the Swiss Air plane, and as you remember in those days Government officials went first class, so I was sitting in the first class cabin of Swiss Air, sopping up vodka, when who should come and sit beside me but Warren Burger, who was then a young assistant to...

Q: A member of the Delegation [to the ILO Conference]?

LODGE: Yes. He was an Assistant Attorney General; later, of course, he went on to become Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. So there we were sitting next to each other, enjoying the hospitality of Swiss Air, and he said, "By the way, do you know anything about the ILO?" And I said, "Boy, do I know anything about the ILO!" and I gave a speech growing out of all of the briefing documents that I had been collecting, telling him about the ILO. He said, "Because I am..."--I forget what his title was, but he was an assistant delegate or something like that. So we got to know each other very well in that Swiss Air plane, and when we got there, of course, the rest of the Free World was looking to the United States for leadership. The French and the British and everybody else were saying, "What are we going to do about this very important debate coming up on forced labor and who is going to say this and who is going to say that and so on?" Well, for one reason or another, Mr. Wilkins wasn't feeling well. He had a bad stomach problem and he was in his room. He had a difficult time, I think, in those early years making a decision. The debate came nearer and nearer, and we in the U.S. Delegation were not very well organized. So I said to myself, "What am I supposed to do now?" and I remember calling Mr. Mitchell and saying, "You know, we have a bit of a problem here. The Free World is looking to us for leadership, and we are not really very well set up." (Pause in the tape)

Well, so anyway, I was involved in writing speeches for Warren Burger and the others who were leading the debate on force labor and...

Q: Was Phil Delaney there?

LODGE: Phil Delaney was there for the AFL-CIO. So that's what I did and then a year or so later--I don't remember exactly, in 1956 perhaps.--Mr. Wilkins was ill and resigned and the Secretary appointed me Assistant Secretary. At the time, I said, "Are you sure that you want to name me to this job?" because at that time I still had a very bad stutter. I said, "How am I going to lead the Free World against the forces of evil, if I can't speak?" He said, and I'll never forget it, "Don't you worry about it. I don't worry about it." So I said, "Okay."

I remember the day I overcame my stutter. We were at an ILO Conference in June of 1956. Amosas Aritunian (phonetic) was still the Russian delegate, and he was making a speech in which he referred to the Taft-Hartley Act as "the slave labor act." The rule was that if the Soviet delegation or any of the other delegations took a crack at the U.S. and named the U.S., we had to...

Q: to make an immediate reply.

LODGE: ...we had to stand up and say something. So I said, "Okay, here it is." Up goes my hand and I climbed those stairs in the old League of Nations Building there, you know the Palais des Nations. It must be fifty feet up to the podium, and there's Aritunian like a bear behind the podium glaring down at me. To this day I don't remember what I said. I don't remember anything except coming down from the podium and coming back to the U.S. desk and I asked... Who was the nice fellow from State who advised the delegation?

Q: At that time?

LODGE: Do you remember?

Q: I don't remember. It wasn't Dan Goott?

LODGE: No, it wasn't Dan Goott. No, it was... Anyway, the State Department man was sitting there, and I said, "How did I do?" and he said, "Well, you did okay." So I guess I didn't stutter. But from that moment on, it became possible for me to sort of control it. In any case, that is how I became Assistant Secretary.

Q: Could you comment--because nobody has as yet and of course we don't have Wilkins--on the attitude of the U.S. Government and of the U.S. trade unions and employers on allowing the Russians to come back in [to the ILO]? You said that Phil Delaney represented the AFL-CIO and, of course, you know that when this began the AFL and the CIO were separate. There were two different attitudes, the AFL's and the CIO's. Could you comment on that?

LODGE: Yes. Well, there was considerable antagonism, of course, especially on the part of the AFL, and on the part of the employers. Who was the employer delegate? McGrath? Was that his name?

Q: I think so, but I'm not sure.

LODGE: The Soviets were staying in the Hotel Richmonde, I think, and they had the Russian flag outside the hotel. No, that was a later time. His suite was over the front door where the flags went out, and he wouldn't let the guy go through his room to put the flag on the pole in front of the hotel. Anyway, there was a great deal of antagonism because both the labor and management representatives said that the Soviet and satellite delegations were not tripartite, that they had no free labor movement, that they had no free employer movement and so everybody was a government representative, which was, I suppose, true. So there was a kind of a fiction that we decided to sustain, the idea being that it was better to have them in the organization than outside it.

Q: That was the [U.S.] Government's position.

LODGE: That was the Government's position, and since they [the Soviets] were in the U. N., I am not sure we could legally have kept them out, even if we had decided that it would have been a good idea. But the Government position was that they should be in. Now every year there was a credentials battle, which the employers and I think the labor delegates as well initiated, to expel the Soviet and satellite employer and worker delegations, so that they would have just a government representative. And I don't remember the ins and outs of it constitutionally but I remember Mr. Jenks, who was the ILO lawyer...

Q: The Secretary General? Lawyer?

LODGE: Yes, Jenks was... David Morse was the Director General and this marvelous British lawyer Jenks, who had been around forever...

Q: And who ultimately succeeded Morse.

LODGE: I guess he did, yes.

Q: For a brief time.

LODGE: Well, his arguments about the Constitution of the ILO eventually won the day and the Soviets and the satellites were allowed in, I think, with all of their employer and labor representatives. There was, of course, the point that in many other countries, as well as the Soviet Union, the employer delegations and the worker delegations were hardly free. Indeed, there was the suspicion that even in some of the European countries, the employer and the worker delegates did what their government told them to do. In some ways, I suppose, we and the British were practically the only countries in the world that

were pristine in that respect, and we certainly were, because as you undoubtedly recall, countless times we would vote three different ways, if that was possible. There was very little control that the American Government had over the American employer or worker delegate.

Q: As I recall, your relations with Phil Delaney were very good on the personal level, were they not?

LODGE: Oh, indeed. Oh, indeed. I loved Phil. In fact, he bought my second hand car when I left Washington, and I don't think it worked very long afterwards. (Laughter!) But he was a great guy and we had a wonderful time together. And Mike Ross...

Q: The CIO man.

LODGE: Mike Ross of the CIO and I used to have wonderful times together playing chess. I remember we played chess all night long one night and you remember he was gassed during World War I.

Q: He had that terrible cough.

LODGE: [He had a] terrible cough and smoked incessantly. It's amazing he lived at all. He was just a wonderful human being.

Q: If you will, speak for a moment about the relations between the government and the worker and management delegations. You had different views on many subjects but got along reasonably well. You had caucuses and things like that. To what degree were the Labor Attachés involved in that at all?

LODGE: As I recall it, the governmental relationships with the labor people were far better than the governmental relationships with the employer people, because--now it is coming back to me--the employer people thought that the United States should get out of the ILO because of the presence of these Eastern European countries and on the basis that the ILO was a fraud. So we had this constant battle with the employers on that issue, which we did not have with the labor delegates. They accepted it. So the differences were very minor really with the labor people and very fundamental with the employer people. Now, your question was concerning the Labor Attachés.

Q: I am going to get to the question of the appointment and designation of Labor Attachés later, but at the ILO they...

LODGE: In those early years, as I recall it, there were not very many Labor Attachés in the first place. It was you, I guess...

Q: I was not a Labor Attaché. I was in the Marshall Plan.

LODGE: You were with AID, weren't you?

Q: With the Marshall Plan in Paris.

LODGE: With the Marshall Plan, yes. So, to tell you the truth, [as far as] the presence of Labor Attachés at the ILO [was concerned], in those early years there just weren't very many of them.

Q: Nowadays they occasionally have an expert in a particular region on the delegation. At that time they did not.

LODGE: No.

Q: Did Phil Delaney speak on the question of the Gulag and Soviet camps?

LODGE: Oh, yes.

Q: Because he used to have a speech [on the subject].

LODGE: Oh, yes. He used to make great speeches.

Q: Some of which I wrote incidentally. He was a dear friend.

LODGE: He made great speeches. And I think Victor Reuther came sometimes and Walter Reuther.

Q: Oh, yes.

LODGE: And I remember one time George Meany came.

Q: As members of the delegation.

LODGE: As members or as distinguished visitors or something or other.

Q: But the head labor delegate was the permanent person as it were, the permanent secretary. That was Phil Delaney.

LODGE: And then Rudy Faupl.

Q: Yes.

LODGE: I don't remember when the... See, Phil Delaney came to work for the Labor Department sometime in...

Q: That's right and then for State.

LODGE: He was Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor with me.

Q: Right.

LODGE: That's when I sold him my car. Then Rudy Faupl [became the labor delegate]. That must have been in 1958 or so.

Q: I see. Well, you went every year to the ILO.

LODGE: Yes, and then I was elected Chairman of the Governing Body in 1958 or 1959. 1959, I guess. As Chairman of the Governing Body, I went to all the ILO regional conferences. I can tell you some great stories about that. The African Regional Conference, I remember. I guess it was in 1960. Phillip Heller was the wonderful Labor Attaché in Guinea and I had been responsible for hiring him. I'll tell you about that too, when Norman Thomas came in and told me I had to.

Q: He didn't tell you that. I can explain the circumstances.

LODGE: He recommended him.

Q: He recommended him. He wrote to me and said, "How can we get Phil Heller, who had been fired under the Marshall Plan, appointed again?" I suggested that he write a letter to [Secretary of Labor] Mitchell with a copy to me. I then sent a note upstairs [in the Labor Department] saying, "This is a good fellow. We fired him from the Marshall Plan. I think you should do what you can to help him. And from that point on you can pick up the story. But Norman [Thomas] didn't demand it. He was very wonderful.

LODGE: Well, when Norman Thomas made a recommendation, if you recall, it was pretty close to a demand.

Q: That's why I told him to write to Secretary Mitchell.

LODGE: He came to see me and he told me about Phillip Heller. I remember I said, "Now, where does he want to go? Paris or Rome or somewhere?" [Thomas replied], "Oh, no. He wants to go to a developing country. He wants to go to the toughest spot you've got."

Q: And you sent him to one.

LODGE: At that time Sekou Toure was in charge in Guinea, and he was a Marxist or at least advertised as such. Our Ambassador there couldn't get anything done. He couldn't even get to see Toure. He couldn't get eyeglass prescriptions fixed. He was holed up in the Embassy.

Q: You mean the Ambassador or Phil?
LODGE: The Ambassador. This was before Phil went there. So Phil came in to see me and I said to myself, "Here's a guy who speaks fluent French. He's a Marxist scholar. So..."

Q: But very anti-Communist.

LODGE: And very anti-Communist. "...so what better place to send him than Guinea." Well, you can imagine the problems that we had with the clearances, and the F.B.I., and Bob Murphy in State. It took a direct intervention by Secretary Mitchell at the White House for us to get Phillip Heller appointed. He went out there. Sekou Toure heard that there was a French-speaking Marxist in the American Embassy, and he sent down word that he wanted to see this fellow. And do you know that, as far as I can recall, every week for years Phillip Heller would have dinner with Sekou Toure. They would give him a bag full of the broken glasses and the prescriptions to be filled and stuff, and he would take it up there. But he was the only contact that the American Government had with that Government for years and I guess they kept him there...

Q: Until he got sick.

LODGE: It killed him. I mean he got hepatitis there. Isn't that right?

Q: Well, he had a number of things, but the bad thing that turned up when he came back was a kidney [problem], and he didn't last too long. He had to have dialysis.

LODGE: What a hero!

Q: I can see that we are going to take up all your time today, but this is very important. We have been interviewing a whole lot of people from the early period, because they are the ones who have been dying off, not including Phil [Heller] by the way, who died before we started this project, and what we find--and there's a whole lot on the Marshall Plan period from people like me--what we find is that the Labor Attachés, especially those who came from the labor movement like Heller and from the Socialist movement, did have certain great advantages. There were some disadvantages too, when they started getting involved to the degree that they did in the internal situation, which wasn't the case with Phil Heller in Guinea, but most of the time they had an appreciation of the political aspects.

LODGE: Absolutely. I was telling you about the African regional conference, where I was the Chairman of the Governing Body, so I presided over the conference. The first day some of the Communist representatives from Ghana or somewhere produced this document which purported to be a top-secret paper from the British Foreign Office, in which the British Government was describing how it was going to use African trade unions to promote its nefarious business.

Q: Through the British Council probably.

LODGE: It looked just like a British Foreign Office document, red borders, top-secret, and all the rest. So the conference was in utter confusion with this document circulating around. Well now, I remember Phillip Heller was there, and he said to me, "You got to come with me one night, because I think I know how we can fix this." So we went--and I don't recall exactly why--but we were sort of pub-crawling in Lagos, which was where the Conference was, and he was introducing me to all these people, these friends of his from the Ghanaian labor movement who were there. I guess I was sort of a front man for Phillip to allow him to do whatever he was doing, but anyway the next morning somehow it was discovered, by virtue of Heller's intervention, that the typewriter on which this thing had been typed was discovered and connected to the Ghanaian Communist Party, so that was disclosed and the Conference went on. But that was something that he did. He was a great guy. There were lots of people like that. I'm trying to remember the guy whom I last met in Vietnam, who was Labor Attaché there.

Q: John Condon?

LODGE: Yes, John Condon.

Q: He became an ambassador later on. He is now living in France, and I have been getting letters from him.

LODGE: Oh, did he become an ambassador?

Q: He became an ambassador in some Pacific islands and then retired.

LODGE: Well, you know we could talk about the role of the...

Q: Well, he is a person who had, so far as I know, no political background, but he had experience in negotiating labor [agreements], for the Army incidentally, and came into the Labor Attaché Corps in that way.

LODGE: Well, you see, it was during my tenure as Assistant Secretary that, I don't know how many, but many, many of those men were hired. It was in that time period when all of these developing countries of Africa and Asia were becoming independent that the need for Labor Attachés was realized, because the leaders of these countries were all trade union people because of the colonial tradition. So I had an opportunity to hire, I don't know, a dozen Labor Attachés including Condon and Heller and a fellow from the Teamsters, I remember.

Q: I don't remember him. But that has to be stressed and you'll be interested to know, especially since you came from a Republican background and Phil Kaiser from Democratic one, he was--I interviewed him--he was making the same points about... He succeeded you, didn't he, as Assistant Secretary?

LODGE: I guess, he did.

Q: Yes, he did, because there was a little overlap. You stayed on for a little bit longer.

LODGE: No, no. George Weaver succeeded me. He was before me.
Q: Phil [Kaiser] preceded you and he was making the same point in his [interview]. Yes, George Weaver succeeded you.

LODGE: Yes.

Q: And Phil Kaiser, of course, was there at the beginning of the Marshall Plan. He had more to do with the designation of those early [Labor Attachés]. Well, you certainly are supporting the general view that the employment of people with this type of background was helpful...

LODGE: Oh, it was critical. Take David Burgess in India and the role that he played in bringing to the attention of the United States Government the role of those Indian trade unions, because, as you know, before that time, diplomatic relations were carried on between the Embassy and the Palace, so to speak. There wasn't anybody who knew much, if anything, about what was going on in these critically important labor movements. I recall the controversy, the fights, that we had with State in terms of getting this perception included in the way the State Department looked at things. I often thought that it was bureaucratically fortunate that the Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs wasn't in the State Department, because being outside enabled me to get access to, for example the Operations Coordinating Board of the NSC, on which I sat.

Q: And the Board of the Foreign Service. Did you sit on the Board of the Foreign Service?

LODGE: I think so, yes.

Q: That's an important place.

LODGE: Very important. So being outside and having Secretary Mitchell such a strong supporter, I think, was probably a good idea, because I think there was considerable resistance in the State Department to the recognition of this new phenomenon and they were nervous about it. Of course, in the ILO, [there was] the whole Bricker Amendment issue, which the State Department was very sensitive about and which prevented us from supporting these conventions against force labor and against discrimination. I forget which one it was, but I voted for one convention on abolishing forced labor. The position paper from the State Department said the United States will abstain, because it is matter for the states. Well, if I had abstained, there would have been two countries abstaining; the Soviet Union and the U.S. would have been abstaining on a vote on a convention to condemn forced labor. I said to myself, "I'm not going to do it. I'm just not going to do it."

And I remember Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy came over to see Secretary Mitchell and demanded that I be fired. There was a big meeting in Mitchell's office and I was called in. It was the only time I ever saw Mitchell completely lose his temper. He just got so angry at Murphy for suggesting this. Then Mr. Murphy left and Mitchell turned to me and he said, "Well, how was that?"

Q: Such a remarkable person! Can we go off for a minute. (Pause in the tape)

George, I wonder, since we will probably be taping many more interviews with you, if you would mention now your writings, beginning with Spearheads for Democracy, which has a kind word for me in the introduction.

LODGE: That's right. Well, that book I wrote in 1961. I was reappointed to my job by President Kennedy and I stayed on a while and then...

Q: That was because of some ILO meeting they wanted you to go to?

LODGE: Well, I was Chairman of the Governing Body, but I was a very close friend of Bobby Kennedy. How I got to be that is a story all by itself. He was the Counsel for the McClellan Committee in the late 1950s, you will recall, and I was concerned that by exposing the villainies of some trade union leaders, he was tarring the whole movement with the brush of corruption. I didn't know him, so I went up to see him in his office there in the House Office Building. He, of course, was in his shirt sleeves with books all around him and very busy, two phones at his ears, and all the rest. So I came in and I was standing there shifting from one foot to the other and finally Bobby put his head up and he said, "Well, what the hell do you want?" He said, "Who are you anyway?" And I said, "Well, I'm George Lodge. I'm from the Labor Department. I'm concerned that this exposure you're doing here of the labor movement of these corrupt labor leaders will tarnish the whole movement." And Bobby said something like, "Why do you waste my time with that! Do I give a damn about that?" So I said, "Okay", and I turned around to leave. Just as I was about to go out the door, he said, "Hey, what are you doing Sunday?" I said, "Nothing." He said, "Why don't you come out to Hickory Hill and play touch football." Now that was in about 1958, I think. I was the captain of the losing touch football team from that day forth, and I became a very close friend of Bobby's. So when the Kennedy Administration came in, I was reappointed, partly, I think, because of my friendship for Bobby, but also as Chairman of the Governing Body, I had to fill out my term. They wanted me to stay. I somehow didn't think it was a career job being Assistant Secretary of Labor, so I didn't. In the last few months, I wrote this book, Spearheads of Democracy, with which you helped me and many others helped me. The idea was to set down the role of labor in developing countries during that critical time period from about 1956 to the early 1960s, when these ex-colonial countries were becoming independent.

Now in that book is a chapter, I forget the number, but it is called, "The Truth about the American Economic System." It has an interesting story connected to it, because, I think it was in 1958, I was in India and David Burgess took me around to see the Indian trade

union leaders. Along the way I was supposed to go on Indian national radio with Ashok Mehta, the famous and marvelous old man, who was the leader of the Indian Socialist Party.

Q: And the man I had a letter of introduction to from Norman Thomas, when I went to India.

LODGE: Really. A great man. Of course, I didn't know who he was. I was totally ignorant.

Q: But the fact that Burgess could get you in to see him is the interesting thing.

LODGE: Well, it was a radio show, where we were both supposed to be talking about economic systems.
Q: Was this before or after he had spent that year or long period in Hawaii at the East-West Center, because that influenced him considerably?

LODGE: I think it was after. In any case, I never took an economics course at Harvard. I knew nothing fundamental about the American economy, so on the way to the radio station, we stopped off at the Embassy and I went to see the USIA people to get a sort of a poop sheet on the American economy, because I figured I had to have something to talk about. So in the taxi on the way over [to the radio studio], I read this brochure about free enterprise and self-reliance and initiative. So I said to myself, "Well, I know about Ralph Waldo Emerson. This is just Emerson sort of warmed over." So I got on the radio and, mind you, I don't know how many millions of people listen to the radio in India, but it was a big audience, and I go on about the American economic system, free enterprise and free markets and free this and free that. Then Ashok Mehta says, "Now, Mr. Lodge, in your speech you said nothing about minimum wage; you didn't mention the Tennessee Valley Authority; you didn't mention the government programs to support agriculture; you didn't mention unemployment insurance; you didn't mention social security."

Q: He sure had been at the East-West Center before that.

LODGE: And he said, "Now, tell me. What are these things? Are they un-American?" So I said, "Good point!" And then he said, "Now, you people are the capitalists, right?" I said, "That's right." "And we're socialists." I said, "That's right." He said, "Now can you tell me what percentage of the gross national product is disposed of by government in the United States?" I didn't even know what the gross national product was, much less what percentage [was accounted for by the public sector]. He said, "Well, I'll tell you. 22 percent." Now he said, "India. What percentage of the gross national product is disposed of by the government in India?" Of course by this time I was on the ropes, you know, groggy. He said, "I'll tell you. 12 percent. Now, which country is the capitalist and which is the socialist?" I said, "That's a good point." So mercifully the program ended, after which he said to me, "Would you mind telling me why you people use this work 'capitalism'. Do you know what it means to the people who are listening to this program?

It means the local loanshark, the money-lender, the racist, the imperialist. It doesn't mean anything like your system in the United States, and yet you persist in using this word."

Q: Excuse me, George, but you could just as well have said, "What do you mean by socialism?"

LODGE: Well, of course.

Q: ...because he was very far from what we think of as a "socialist". So it's the use of that word that is attractive to the developing countries and the use of the word "capitalist" that is so unattractive to them.

LODGE: That's right. Unattractive. And he said, "By socialism we mean government with a social conscience. By my definition, you in the United States are socialist." Well, anyway, I came back to Washington and I went to see USIA. I said, "You know, you got to do something. Sending the likes of me on a program where millions of people are listening with that kind of crap to describe the American economic system, it's crazy!" So whoever it was said, "All right, if you are so smart, you write something up." So I wrote a paper called, "The Truth about the American Economic System", where I tried to say what it was. I sent it over to them and they said, "Oh, geez, we couldn't possibly print this. We are already in trouble with the Congress. They think we are a bunch of pinkos down here, you know. They would cut our budget to ribbons. We couldn't possibly use this." So I'm at a dinner a few nights later with Milton Eisenhower, who you remember was a great guy.

Q: Was he the head of the University of Maryland?

LODGE: Johns Hopkins. He became President of Johns Hopkins afterwards, but he was the President's brother. And I was telling him this story. He said, "Let me see the paper." So I sent it over to him and the next thing I know USIA is back on the phone. They said, "Hey, let us see that paper." So the next thing I know, USIA has done it up in a little brochure. Somebody in Congress hears about it, puts the whole thing in the Congressional Record, and says, "It's great." U.S. Steel buys I don't know how many copies, sends it around the world. So I say to myself, "What is going on here? The United States Government won't tell the truth about the American economic system for fear of what Congress will do. When they tell the truth, Congress says great. What is it that's at work here? And of course it is ideology. That is to say, it's a collection of ideas that prevents us from being realistic."

That was the beginning of my life's work since leaving the Labor Department. I have written the eight books since: The New American Ideology, The American Disease, Perestroika for America. All these books have really emanated from that experience when I was Assistant Secretary, where you see the critical importance of ideology and how the American ideology blinds so many of us Americans to our own reality and to the reality

of other places. Of course this was a particular problem in the late 1950s with the McCarthy thing and Scott McLeod and all the rest of them.

Q: That's fascinating. Will you supply for our records a list of the books, so we will have it with your interview and you've been teaching in the field also?

LODGE: What I teach about is essentially business, government and the international economy. I teach comparative ideology in effect. What I have been trying to do is to make ideology into a multidisciplinary discipline, so that you can look at a place like Japan and you can see it as a system: political, social, economic, cultural, institutional. You can see the ideas that hold it together and compare those ideas to Germany, U.S., England, Mexico, Brazil, and this gives you... (End of tape)

What I have been doing is trying to make ideology into a multidisciplinary discipline, to compare countries and to understand change within a country. Take the United States, for example, the dominant ideology in the United States has been what I would call "individualism", the accentuation of property rights, competition in the marketplace, the limited state and so on. For a long time in fact that ideology has been changing, that is in institutional practice, as Ashok Mehta point out to me, that ideology is not what we actually do. So I have been thinking and writing about what it is we actually do; what is the ideological reflection of what we actually do; and what is the consequence of having one ideology that we preach and another one that we practice?

Q: This is so applicable to the labor field.

LODGE: Absolutely.

Q: The adjustment to reality.

LODGE: But it is equally [applicable] to management, because if managers are going to be realistic, they've got to get what they preach and what they practice in harmony, and they've got to understand that these semi-religious notions, upon which many of them rely for authority, aren't there. They are just not valid anymore. They are not acceptable. And, of course, the ecological movement and foreign competition now have proven that. The union movement has the same problem. I remember I wrote a book with... Well, I'll remember [the name]. He's a British professor from the London School of Economics. We wrote a book for the Trilateral Commission in the early 1970's.

Q: Not Roberts.

LODGE: Yes.

Q: Oh, my lord. Ben Roberts.

LODGE: Ben Roberts, right!

Q: He's very ill now by the way.

LODGE: Is he? Well, we did this book about what was happening in the labor movements of U.S., Europe, and Japan. There was a Japanese [co-author] too. And I remember talking about what I regarded as sort of an irreversible trend in the United States away from what I would call "contract" toward "consensus", away from the conception of the National Labor Relations Act of adversarial, contractual bargaining, and that this [trend] was irreversible and inevitable because the American system was uncompetitive. It wasn't going to be able to compete with the systems of Japan and Germany, so it was either going to change or die. Well, this paper was submitted in draft to Lane Kirkland and people at the AFL-CIO. Of course, they thought I was the devil. And I remember Glen Watts said to Lane [Kirkland], "Lane, George is the messenger. He just bringing you the message. This is what's happening."

Q: Glen Watts was the Communications Workers Union?

LODGE: Yes. We all have this problem. Academics have a problem of confusing ideology with reality. The economists. But anyway that's far afield from...
Q: Do you know our new Labor Secretary Reich?

LODGE: Oh, I know him well.

Q: He is beginning to try to lead into the direction of practicality in some of the programs.

LODGE: I think he's a great guy.

Q: I think he sounds great. Let's see what he does.

LODGE: Yeah. He's very smart.

Q: Yes, and he's so articulate. Well, based on your views on ideology, what type or types of people should be in the diplomatic service in the general labor field? How do you select them? How do you train them? Any comments on that?

LODGE: First of all, let's start ideologically. They have to be open-minded and they have to be intellectually interested in what the labor movements of the world are interested in. They have to be people who are engaged by the kinds of issues that seize and interest labor people, without obviously being committed to any particular ideology. They have to be ideologically aware.

Q: That's important, the idea of commitment as against a sympathetic interest in.

LODGE: Yes, exactly, and they can't be ideologically hidebound, that is they can't be so dedicated to "individualism" that they have no respect for the "communitarian" or vice versa. I mean, they have to be tolerant in the larger sense, more tolerant perhaps than people dealing in other parts of diplomacy. And they have to be intellectually tolerant. It can't be just put on. It has to be sincere, because I think that labor people the world over see through fakes, and you are not dealing with diplomats for whom fakery is part of the deal. You are dealing with people who are trade union leaders, and they are not diplomats. So you have to have this type of person who is good at that, and if you have had some experience in a union, that, needless to say, is often helpful, but it may not be. My own view would be that experience in a union is not an essential prerequisite. Much more important is the sort of person that you are and your general level of intelligence, of sensitivity, of personality. I can think of some trade unionists who probably shouldn't be Labor Attachés. And yet, of course, if you get the right sort, they are ideal.

Q: What about the training you would give them? We have now cut down from the one year training period we used to have for ordinary--you call it "stick" diplomats--in which we gave them a full [labor] education. We had the Harvard trade union training. Now, we are down to just a few weeks in the summer, which they can spare. Then when they go out they are disadvantaged by the fact that they get so many additional duties to labor duties. So when you have a conflict between following labor matters, and then making good contributions to policy decisions, and assignments of on-going reporting in other fields, we don't have the luxury nowadays. So if you have any suggestions as to how to train these people in the limited time we have, I would appreciate it.
LODGE: Well, you know, I am talking right now off the top of my head, because I haven't thought about this for a long time but as I think about it in some ways both the training and the assignment of someone in this field in different countries should be perhaps different. That is, I think of the Labor Attaché to Japan. The Labor Attaché to Japan has a completely different job than say the Labor Attaché to the U.K. or France.

Q: Just like the person we were talking about, Phil Heller, who had a very different position in Europe as against Guinea.

LODGE: Yes. Now if you're a Labor Attaché in Japan, you've got to spend as much time with managers as you do with union people. Indeed most of the managers have been union leaders, so it's a completely different set-up than the U.S. has or the U.K. or most Western [countries]. Take Singapore, for example; if you were Labor Attaché in Singapore, your job would be very different and the things you would need to know would be very different. In any Asian country, now that I think about it, you just don't have Western unions, and you don't have the same ideology of labor and management. You got a very different set-up.

Q: So you are saying that the training should consist of largely learning about the country you are going to rather than labor history in the United States.

LODGE: Absolutely. Labor history in the United States is almost totally useless as far as I am concerned.

Q: It's useful in terms of how different you have to approach the problems.

LODGE: Right. It is so anachronistic. I mean the U.K. and the U.S... The more I think about the world, the more peculiar the U.K. and the U.S. are. We are so different from everybody else. Somehow the training of a Labor Attaché has got to really immerse the person in these differences of culture, of politics, of ideology, of everything of the place where he or she is going. I don't know how long that takes, and it may go to the sort of people you recruit, the sort of education they have had before you recruit them. Ideally they would have some language and they would have some education before hand which would equip them.

Q: George, I have to leave and you have to leave, and what I would like to do, because it takes some time to pack up, I'd like to send you some of the material on this subject, some that I have written and some that other people have written, and then maybe develop a series of questions to continue this either when we have a person up there or you are down here on some future trip.

LODGE: Fine.

Q: Is that okay with you?

LODGE: Great.

Q: I want to thank you so much. It's a pleasure seeing you again after all these years.

LODGE: Oh, it's great to see you, Murray. It really is. I haven't thought about these things for so long.

Q: By the way, that's one of the general reactions we get in these interviews. In addition to our feeling grateful to them, people say, "You know, we haven't really thought about these things."

LODGE: It was such fun. I look back on it as being the most happy time of my life.

Q: That's great. Well, thanks so much.

End of interview