

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

PROFESSOR JACK STIEBER

Interviewed by: Morris Weisz
Initial interview date: June 2, 1995
Copyright 2019 ADST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	
Born in Hungary 1919	
Studied Economics at the City College of New York	1940
New York School of Social Work	1940-1941
War Manpower Administration in the Social Security Administration	1941-1942
Armed Service	1942-1946
Officer Candidate School	
Harvard Business School	
Air Force Statistical Control Unit	
Statistical Control Officer	
Veteran's Employment Housing Program	1946-1947
MA at University of Minnesota	1947-1948
United Steelworkers, Pittsburgh, PA	1948-1950
Research Department	
Vietnam War	1950
National Security Resources Board, Washington, D.C.	
Assistant to CIO Members of Wage Stabilization Board	
Student at Harvard University	1952-1956
Michigan State University	1956-1962
Director of Research in the Labor and Industrial Relations Center	
Director of the Industrial Relations Center	
Milngavie, Scotland—Program for Trade Unionists	1959
Executive Secretary of the Labor Management Committee	
International Labour Organization	1962-1963

Helped Establish the International Institute for Labor Studies	
Travel through Europe to Interview People on Automation	1963-1965
Czechoslovakia—Automation Commission	1965
Poland	
Belgium	1969
Toured the World Lecturing	1971
Japan	
India	
Iran	
Israel	
Brussels	
Tokyo, Japan—President of Industrial Relations Research Association	1983

INTERVIEW

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

Q: This is Morris Weisz for the Labor Diplomacy Oral History Project. The date is June 2, 1995. I am attending the International Industrial Relations Association World Congress and seeing a whole lot of old friends, including the person I want to interview now, who has a long background in industrial relations in the United States and abroad. He is Jack Stieber of Michigan State. I will begin by asking him a couple of questions.

First, I remember you as a trade union economist well over 40 years ago. Tell us how you got into that field, a little bit about your background, as much as you're willing to admit to.

STIEBER: Like a lot of other people who are in this field, as well as in other areas, professional and otherwise, purely by accident. I graduated from the City College of New York in 1940 in the middle of the year, in January. After looking around for a job for about six months, of which there weren't any, somebody must have told me that with all the unemployment, social work was a good field. So, I applied to the New York School of Social Work. To my great surprise, because I had never even thought about it and hadn't majored in sociology or taken any courses in that area-

Q: Did you become a relief investigator?

STIEBER: No. I got admitted. In those days, the New York school was considered the fount of Freudian social work. I had probably never read anything by Freud and knew nothing about it. It

was a quarter system that had a loose affiliation with Columbia University. I was there for two quarters. That includes field work. I had a field work placement in Harlem in the Social Security Administration. I think the next field work placement they were going to give me was called the Jewish Board of Guardians, which was regarded as top-notch. I did one field work placement in Community Service Society, but the other one was a real Freudian agency. That really scared me. I didn't really have a great belief in that approach. The third term was about to start. I got a telegram from Washington probably within a few days after we entered the war in December 7, 1941 offering me a job in the Social Security Administration. I must have taken an exam before that and forgotten about it. I just was put on a list and nothing happened. So, I was a little at odds. I didn't quite know what to do. I went to talk to one of the professors, who happened to be the professor of public service. He was also the state commissioner of public service in New York State. His name was Lansdale. We talked for a while. He said, "I can see that you want me to tell you that this is the job you ought to take. I think maybe that is a good idea." So, they told me to report January 1. There was nothing like New Year's holidays or anything like that. I reported and was in the War Manpower Administration, which was then housed in the Social Security Administration. I remember a lot of things back at that time, but I can't remember anything a month or two ago. It was called the Rochambeau Building.

Q: 1815 Connecticut Avenue, which had the NLRB [National Labor Relations Board] many years later.

STIEBER: Right. I was a labor market analyst. I was there for about a little less than a year before I was-

Q: Was Garfield Fleming the head of it then?

STIEBER: He was head of the overall. Actually, in those days, it was rather unusual: my supervisor was a woman, Pauly Arcas. I remember very well, she later married another supervisor who was in charge of another area, Manny Lerner. I subsequently worked for him. I was there until I was drafted in December of 1942.

I went into the Service and eventually was assigned to Officer Candidate School and spent six weeks or two months at the Harvard Business School and became a statistical control officer. Bob McNamara had set up the first program. He was the first statistical control officer. I think I was in class number 16.

Q: THE Bob McNamara?

STIEBER: Yes. He set up the Air Force Statistical Control Unit. I went through that and eventually got out of that and was assigned to a stat control unit. I went overseas and was in a place called Dia, New Guinea. The war in the West had ended before that. The war with Japan was still going on. At any rate, I stayed there until I was discharged out, probably in about the early part of 1946. I think I had a hardship discharge because my father was terminally ill.

I came back and had enough government service to reclaim the job. By that time, Manny Lerner, who had been one of the supervisors in the Manpower Service, was now a deputy director of

what used to be called the Veteran's Employment Housing Program, run by Wilson Wyatt. You may remember, Wilson Wyatt had been a former mayor of Louisville and was really a prospect as a presidential candidate because he was such an able guy. But he got into an argument because the President, Truman, was not allocating sufficient material for housing. He was going to racetracks and so on. Eventually, he resigned in a huff. Our agency was more or less terminated. I was moved over. There was another agency which was sort of a competing agency, the Civilian Housing Program or something like that. It was run by David Siskin, who was giving some courses at GW.

Q: He had just come out of the War Production Board.

STIEBER: Yes. But that was also phased out. Sometime in 1947, I was again at loose ends and trying to figure out what to do. I think somebody then told me that there was such a thing as a university setting up industrial relations programs. So, I applied to a few of them and was admitted to the University of Minnesota. I had a GI Bill. I got a graduate assistant offer for \$300 a year, which was-

Q: I can't tell you how many times people have given credit to the GI Bill.

STIEBER: Oh, yes, if it hadn't been for that... As a matter of fact, I would have even lost the GI Bill if it hadn't been for the fact that one day I was having lunch with a former college classmate who was a professor or a dean at GW [George Washington University], Nat Bailey. He pointed out to me that if I didn't get back into an academic program within a period of six months or something, I would lose it. I then took a course at night with Dave Siskin just to keep it active, not knowing that I would ever really have to depend on it, but it turned out to be handy.

One of the people that I was working with in the Housing Agency - a number of those people were people who later on turned out to be very prominent. Robben W. Fleming, for example, was in that office. When the agency was phased out of the Lerner group and the veterans program, he went to Wisconsin as director of their Industrial Relations Institute, subsequently became director of the Illinois Institute and president of Wisconsin and president of the University of Michigan.

But the other person, who had more of an effect, was Otis Brubaker. Otis worked in the division. Otis then got the job with the Steelworkers [United Steelworkers of America] when that was done.

Q: He was a research director succeeding Harold Rootenburg?

STIEBER: Probably. But I was at Minnesota. I took a master's degree there with the idea of going on for a PhD. In December of 1948, I had just finished my master's degree, so it came at a propitious time, and Otis called me and said, "How would you like to work for the Steelworkers?" I had probably had my fill of academic life. I had been away for four years during the war and working in an agency or two. I felt that maybe it was a good time to take a break. So, I came down to Pittsburgh and I was sitting around. He said, "Well, wait a while and Phil Murray will call us when he's ready to see you."

Q: Let's step back a minute. Did you have any previous connections? You came from City College.

STIEBER: I had majored in economics. I took the usual array of economics courses, but quite frankly, while City College is a great institution and we turned out a lot of Nobel Prize winners, it had a lousy economics department. The chairman of the department was named George Edwards, who I think had a master's.

Q: This is not THE George Edwards from Michigan?

STIEBER: No, he had a divinity degree or something. There were a couple of young professors that were very able. There was Jerry Cohn, who later worked for the government and wrote some books on Japanese economy. There was another guy named Taffit. They had some good faculty members.

Q: I'm surprised. I went to City College, too, and was an engineer. I always complained that I never took any economics courses and turned out to be an economist.

STIEBER: I think you didn't miss anything. The only thing that I remember very well is I took a statistics course with Firestone. In those days, we used to work on hand machines and so on. There weren't enough to go around and I sat next to another guy. He would tell us how to do the problems and I would then finger the machine. He turned out to be Kenneth Arrow. So, that is about as close as I came to fame in the economics profession.

Q: I didn't even know he went to City College.

STIEBER: He did. He graduated the same year I did.

So, I was at Minnesota and Otis called me eventually at about four o'clock in the afternoon.

Q: You got there then at the end of 1948 or beginning of 1949?

STIEBER: I got there in December of 1948. I was interviewed about then. I went down and Phil Murray was in his office. Phil Murray was a very modest, diffident sort of person. He said in his typical Scottish brogue, "Well, young man, Otis tells me that you're a fine young man and have the trade union movement at heart and understand what a union is about and all of that. If Otis says that, I believe him." I was listening. Then a voice behind me—somebody had come into the room and said, "Are you a member of the Communist Party?" I turned around and it was David McDonald, who was then secretary-treasurer of the union. I didn't know whether he was kidding or not. It's not a question that anybody had asked me.

Q: Well, they were going through their problem.

STIEBER: They were going through their problem, but still, it was so far removed from me that I-

Q: Not if you went to City College.

STIEBER: I think there was also possibly whether he knew that I had gone to City College or whether he also knew that Otis had recommended me and because Otis was on the far left wing of the union.

Q: But far from being communist.

STIEBER: No, never a communist, but very... He was a very progressive, strong, trade unionist. In later years, people like Arthur Goldberg, Dave Philler, and others regarded—and Ben Fisher, for example—I think people regarded Otis as being so hard-nosed, that really he could not negotiate because he was never prepared to compromise. The union position was the right position. But Dave McDonald maybe had suspicions about Otis. At any rate, I sort of sloughed that off, and I smiled and laughed and said, "No, of course not." I had no affiliation and had no strong disposition to the Communist Party or the ideology.

I went to work for the Steelworkers. Meyer Bernstein was working for the union at that time. Shortly before I left, Marvin Miller came to work. He was a good friend of Otis'. He had worked for the FMCS [Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services] and also he was probably in a union or two. During the War Labor Board days, he had been with Otis in Philadelphia.

Q: He really revolutionized the bargaining.

STIEBER: He certainly did. At any rate, I worked in the Research Department. There were the three of us. I think Marvin replaced Meyer. Meyer took an overseas assignment about that time. Then the Korean War started in 1950. President Truman called labor leaders down to Washington. He had gone through the experience of the war itself as a Vice President. He knew that you could not prosecute a war without the collaboration and cooperation of the labor movement. He had brought down Phil Murray and Bill Greene, who was then the A.F. of L [American Federation of Labor] president. They had a meeting in Washington. Symington was then head of the National Security Resources Board. He is the one that probably called them down and said he wanted to have labor's promise that there would be no strikes and things like that.

Q: Is Symington getting credit for that because it was Morris Tolbert, who had very little influence on Truman, but on that thing, he did from his political background. He felt it was necessary to get labor...

STIEBER: Murray talked to the _____ and told them, "We will give you our full cooperation because we believe this is a war that we have to be in, but unlike the World War experience, we have learned from that, that while you gave us a lot of top jobs, Hillman and others running the War Production Agency and so on, a lot more influence and work is done at the middle and lower levels. So, we want some of our younger people to go down to Washington and we want them to be put in positions where they will be able to be influential in making day to day decisions." That was readily agreed to. At that time, as I recall, Hyman Bookbinder from

the Amalgamated, Everett Kassalow, and I were sent down to Washington. That was December. I went down. At first, we were on the National Security Resources Board, but that—pretty soon Symington had resigned, I believe—turned out not to be a very influential agency.

Q: You, Everett, and who else?

STIEBER: Bookie.

Q: All CIO [Congress of Industrial Organizations] people.

STIEBER: Wayne Erckling was down. Pete Henle. I saw him yesterday at the meeting here. There were others.

Q: What we had then was, for the first time, staff people assigned at the relatively influential spots, even though they were lower down.

STIEBER: Right.

Q: There was somebody from the Machinist Guild. Was it Epstein?

STIEBER: Yes. He was the research director for the Machinist.

Q: Albert Epstein was a very conservative economist.

STIEBER: I think in those days the Machinist was considered a conservative union. But the Wage Stabilization Board was starting up. Actually, the labor members had resigned from the board over a tiff at that time. I can't remember the details, but there was something... George Taylor was the head of the board. Labor walked out. You'll have to go back and retrace history.

Q: Yes, the trade union members walked out, but they left their staff.

STIEBER: No, not yet. They walked out. I think it was because Charlie Wilson of General Electric was then running the whole war effort and it was some decision he made with regard to the role of labor. You'll just have to get it from others or read it. It is a historical event of some significance because it lasted several months. Then, negotiations were undoubtedly carried on. Eventually, the A.F. of L and CIO went back under terms that they considered to be acceptable.

Q: I think the Miners Union also had somebody in there. They were independent at the time?

STIEBER: I can't remember anybody from the Miners, but when they went back, I then went to be the assistant to the CIO members of the Wage Stabilization Board. I was not the number one person. A lawyer named Wile, who was Angel Reedes' lawyer... Ben was a lawyer from Angel Reedes' lawyer, who was the president of the Textile Workers. The three labor members were Angel Reedes, Joe Childs of the Robo Workers, and Bern from _____ of the Communication Workers of America. They were the three labor members. They had alternates. John Brophy was one of the former alternates from the former miners union, but he—

Q: So they must have been still in the CIO.

STIEBER: Oh, yes. The merger had not taken place. The A.F. of L had their own officers. Of their principals, the one I remember the best was Arnold Walker of the machinists union. Lane Kirkland used to come down once in a while because he would sort of help out a little in the A.F. of L side. But I was there full-time, of course. Because the principals were political—they were presidents of unions that had to be run—they wouldn't come down except when business was going to be transacted. In other words, voting would take place. People like myself and Ben Wilde had—there was one fellow working for me. I can't even remember his name, but he had been a government employee. We had a small office. I would be doing things on a day-to-day basis.

Q: I must interrupt you to try to fit this into my recollection. You used to come to the meetings where I was the secretary of the BLS [Bureau of Labor Statistics] Advisory Committee.

STIEBER: I was with the Steelworkers.

Q: Yes, but you said you had a job.

STIEBER: No, I wouldn't have come to them when I was working for the Wage Stabilization Board. It would have been in those two years that I spent with the Steelworkers, 1948-1950. I wouldn't have—

Q: Marvin Miller was the original one that I remember. Then you came and represented Otis.

STIEBER: That is entirely probable. So, I was handling the day-to-day work in the office, getting the cases ready and then, when there was going to be a meeting, briefing the labor members so that they would go in and decide how they were going to vote and vote on the various cases that came up. By that time, the members, as I recall—Nate Feinsilver was the chairman. John Dunlop was-

Q: Of the Wage Stabilization.

STIEBER: Yes. He was a professor of law at the University of Chicago. John Dunlop was of Harvard University. Clark Kirm might have been there for a while. Robin Fleming, by then he was an academic and he was the executive director.

Q: The thing, I think, that comes out of all this in the international terms, is how many of these names later became so important in international labor and stresses one thing that has so far not come out and will come out in other connections in our project, namely the War Production Board being the source of so many of the people like Joe Keenan, Irving Brown, Alan Strong, myself, who later went into it, and the War Labor Board in the Second World War as well as the Wage Stabilization Board. Somebody has to do some looking into why these people went into international work. Dunlop and Kirm, of course, were two of the four horsemen that-

STIEBER: That was long before. At that time-

Q: But Dunlop had already begun it. His work on industrial nation systems

_____.

STIEBER: _____ after that.

Q: Really?

STIEBER: Yes, I think so. After all, in those days, except for the fact that there was a war going on, limited, true, but international economics was not very important in the United States. It might have been two or three percent of the gross national product, so it wasn't considered to be the kind of thing that you took courses in in school or paid much attention to.

Q: Why did the Steelworkers send Meyer abroad? He certainly was there.

STIEBER: I think Myre went abroad in the post-war effort.

Q: This is Meyer Bernstein.

STIEBER: I believe he went to Paris with the Marshall Plan. I think Everett Caselow also was on that-

Q: Everett went in November 1954.

STIEBER: _____ might have been there earlier, but he was with the _____ Workers probably of the UAW [United Automobile Workers] for a short time. At any rate, this is really all peripheral, but as a staff member and with our principals being gone, I would be dealing with the public members. John Dunlop, one day, we were talking and he said, "What are you doing here? What is your background?" I told him I had a master's degree and worked for the Steelworkers. He said, "Do you know anything about the Wage Inequity Program of the Steelworkers Union?" I said, "That was held in a different department, but I naturally know about it." He said, "Why don't you go on for a Ph.D.?" I said, "Well, I'm married. I have one child. I have another one on the way. In later terms, Azalta the Greek once said it was the whole catastrophe or something like that. I can't afford to go back to school." He said, "I'll make a deal with you. You will agree to write your thesis and if it's any good, it will be published as a book on the Steelworkers Wage Inequity Program," which really had grown out of the War Labor Board and became called the Cooperative Wage Program, where they set up a national classification scheme for the entire steel industry. He was interested in that as a wage economist. He said, "I think if you do that, I could get you enough funds to go back to school." I had the GI Bill. We talked it over, so in 1952, I went there.

Q: We should mention the fact that Dunlop has a wonderful reputation and is also criticized sometimes. One of his great successes has been identifying people and helping them. There are so many people - Galenson, Val Lowen, who did the job on France, Lloyd Olmen, who did another steel history - he is really remarkable. Jack Barbash had a little of that quality, too.

Everett also encouraged people like that. To identify people and put them in places where they would not lose financially as they progressed.

STIEBER: Yes, well, that is why I have a sort of different view towards John Dunlop than a lot of others. John is not the most popular person. He is very outspoken. Whatever he believes in, he believes in very strongly. But I always found him to be a very sympathetic and understanding kind of guy.

Q: He is appreciated more by the younger people. We will be seeing him today. I saw him before. By the way, he too has agreed to be interviewed. He is willing to set a date. We just don't have anybody to interview him. That is the problem.

STIEBER: So, I got to Harvard. By then, I was 32 or 33 years old. Again, I had a hiatus of four or five years from school. So, going to a university like Harvard, which I had heard of but never in my wildest dreams would have ever thought that I would be a graduate student there... I then started to do my research, well-funded, through two fellowships, the Littauer Fellowship and the Wartime Fellowship, plus my GI bill.

Q: Were you book published?

STIEBER: Yes, eventually, on the Wartime Foundation Fellowship. I traveled to various parts of the country, Pittsburgh, Detroit, New Jersey-

Q: You also had _____ from your work in the union.

STIEBER: I had met some of those people, that's right. Although, that was, to some extent, a little bit of a drawback, because I had worked for the union and here I was, coming to interview people, and they wouldn't ignore me because I wasn't that important in the union, but they would always be interested enough to know where you come from and so on. I met some wonderful people, Sylvester Garrett, who was then the permanent arbitrator for the-

Q: He made his name as Molly Yard's husband.

STIEBER: You can say that, but in arbitration circles, Garrett was the preeminent arbitrator.

Q: Absolutely. He came out of the NLRB.

STIEBER: Right. He was the arbitrator for the United States Steel Corporation and the United Steelworkers of America. Another wonderful person named Joseph Molnar, who was the classification expert for the United States Steel Corporation. He spent a lot of time with me and really was very, very helpful.

Q: Let's get the title of your book.

STIEBER: Eventually I wrote the thesis. It got my degree in 1956. It probably came out about 1959, Harvard University Press, *The Steel Industry Wage Structure*. I believe that is the title. At

any rate, from that, when I got the degree, I went to the meetings of the Allied Social Sciences and in the job market was hired by Charles Killingsworth, who had just set up a new center of labor and industrial relations at Michigan State University. I was hired as the director of research in that program. I went there in 1956. In 1959, I was still research director of that program. It wasn't an academic program. It was totally in the years when automation was, on the one hand, the great promise of the future, and the bugaboo of the future. We got out money from the Legislature largely on the promise that we would do research on automation. That is one of our first projects that we started to do.

But my first exposure to the international field came in 1959. I don't remember his name, but he is a very nice man. He came through East Lansing. I can't even remember his name. He was with some foundation. Whether at that point or a few months later, he wrote me a letter and said, "How would you like to go over and teach in Scotland in a trade union management program?" Well, I had never been abroad. I was born in Hungary. I came to the United States at the age of three and a half. I had never been abroad otherwise, except in my war days, and there I had been in the Pacific, not in the European Theater. It sounded like a wonderful opportunity. We had two kids. We went to Scotland. I remember being on the plane and sitting next to a man who was a Scot. He asked me where I was going. The best I could do was spelling the name of the place and pronouncing it the way it was spelled. I said, "It's Milgavie." He said, "You mean Milngavie." Milgavie would have been the spelling of what I pronounced. At any rate, I taught for about two months. It was a program of trade unionists who had come in for a week at a time, various unions. Also, separately, a management group would come in. It was housed in a mansion, a group of places.

Q: Which city?

STIEBER: Mayor of Glasgow, not far from Glasgow.

Q: Jack, if you ever can think in the future and we'll put it in at this point of the name of the person involved or the program under which it was operated... Was it a U.S. government program?

STIEBER: I think it was a private foundation of some kind.

Q: Was it connected with a trade union? It sounds for a trade union education, it might have been...

STIEBER: It's all very vague in my mind. I may have some papers back home. At any rate, I worked with those people and taught in.. I remember going on a weekend to a center where foremen and shop stewards were gathered. I remember the place because at that time, I didn't play any golf, but there is a very famous golf course that is in Troon. We stayed in a hotel there. I remember lecturing to the unionists and learning for the first time that the idea of seniority was something that they didn't care for and didn't know about. Really, the union people were no more interested in seniority than the management people. They felt that this was not part of the British approach.

Q: Did you stress the advantages of a seniority system in the United States? Were there questions about that?

STIEBER: Oh, yes, I explained to them how American unions regarded seniority, what our contracts looked like. I had some contracts with me. That was my first exposure to the international...

Q: How long were you there?

STIEBER: About two months. I did a little traveling. I remember going to Berlin and just spending about three or four weeks on the continent. I came back. While I was overseas, Killingsworth resigned as director of the program. He had been offered a university professorship at the University of Wisconsin, where he came from, by Ed Witte, who was the father of the Social Security Act, and where Killingsworth had done his graduate work. He was offered a university professorship. When he told our own president at Michigan State that he would like to accept that, President John Hannah said, "Well, if that's what you want, I'll give it to you here." So, Killingsworth stayed as a university professor. While I was overseas, I remember getting a phone call at 6:00 am from the provost saying, "The faculty here has decided that when Charles takes this other job, they want you to be the director." I had some misgivings. I had already gotten into my research work and didn't know that I wanted to become an administrator, but I eventually decided in favor of that and became the director of the Industrial Relations Center. So, we got back in 1959. From now on, I'll try to sort of stay on the international work because that is your main focus.

My next exposure to international work... I suppose I should mention briefly, shortly after I got back, the Center was in a very bad state. It had both a labor education program, a management education program, and a research program. The guy that had been hired for the management program was a very anti-labor guy. Charles obviously didn't know it when he hired him. He took the view that the only people that could teach anything about collective bargaining and labor management relations were people who were in management and, therefore, academics had nothing to contribute. I tried to explain to him that there was no rationale for our being if we could not use university people to at least participate in these programs. Eventually, we got into a very bad scrape. The Michigan Legislature, which was then heavily controlled by Republicans, _____ an investigation of the school on the grounds that we were pro-labor. The University of Michigan had gone through something like that in 1948.

Q: Haber?

STIEBER: Bill was there, but this was a labor program. General Motors had smuggled a student into the labor education program to sort of sit in on... Took notes and then _____ them. At any rate, we got into that kind of a rhubarb about it. They investigated us in the legislature. The committee that investigated us was two Republicans and one Democrat. Predictably, the vote was two to one that they should abolish this unit of the University, shouldn't give them any money. Well, fortunately for us, unlike most other industrial relations programs, or many of them, while we were set up the first year with a direct grant from the legislature, after that, we departed from our line item status and became a part of the University budget. This meant that

the president could allocate funds and had a constitutional right to use those funds as he saw fit. President Hannah, who really had been persuaded to set up the center in the first place by the UAW—

Q: Was he involved in the aid program?

STIEBER: Yes, he became, later on, the director of USAID [United States Agency for International Development]. He had been persuaded by the UAW that it would be a good idea in Michigan to have a labor education program. Charles Killingsworth said, "Well, if we're going to have a labor education program knowing the experience of what happened at the University of Michigan, we want it to be a balanced program so that there should be a management program, a labor program, and a research program." We then became a part of the University budget. Hannah then said, "Well, the legislature doesn't have the authority to tell us how to use our funds. I'm going to continue the program." Eventually, the only change he made, he said, "I think, instead of it being a freewheeling program reporting to the president, we're going to put you in a college." Eventually, we had an academic program with a degree.

Q: Was he a Republican?

STIEBER: He was a Republican, yes.

Q: That's the thing I remember about him. He was a decent type.

STIEBER: He was just a very intelligent guy. He understood how important labor was in a state like Michigan. But again, before that, I also had an interesting experience. When this took place, this was a very shaky business and I wasn't sure at the time whether we would continue or not. I was down in the Labor Department pursuing a research grant. Howard Rosen was director of manpower in the Labor Department.

Q: With a whole lot of money.

STIEBER: A lot of money. We got the first largest grant of any university to pursue automation studies. At any rate, I was there talking to Howard and others and I got a call from Hyman Bookbinder, whom I mentioned earlier, who was now working for the Department of Commerce. Kennedy had been elected President in 1960. He was special assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce. He said, "I tried to call you at Michigan, but they told me you were down here. Come on across the street. I have something I want to talk to you about." So, I went across the street. He told me- (end of tape)

I met with Bookie (We used to call him "Bookie.") He said, "Set up this new committee, labor management. I was handling it, but I have too much to do. I have a lot of other things for the Secretary." He worked directly for the Under Secretary, a man named Edward Gudeman, a banker, I believe. He said, "How would you like to come down here and become the secretary to this committee?" Well, it sounded very intriguing. On the other hand, I was at the University, had tenure and everything. I couldn't make up my mind, but he then took me... He said, "Let's go and talk to the Secretary." We went and talked with Mr. Hodges, a very nice southern gentleman,

sort of like the Phil Murray type. He said, "Mr. Bookbinder says that you are an able young man. I have no reason to doubt that. We would like to have you." Of course, I also knew by that time that Arthur Goldberg was going to be the Secretary because there was a joint venture. I think I may have gone and talked to Arthur at the time because I knew him from the Steelworkers. I said, "Why don't I try it and see how it works out, but I don't want to resign from the University at this point. I can't decide if I want to do this permanently." So, that is when I came down for the summertime, rented a house and joined car pool, as you reminded me. It was very exciting. I came into contact with the President's Council like Walter Heller, Gardner Ackley, Jim Tobin, and people like that. Of course, our committee was, I think, 18 members. Walter Reuther was on there. George Meany was on the labor side. David Dubinsky was there on the labor side. Machinist's president Harrison and two others-

Q: Very active in international affairs.

STIEBER: Right. Management people... Henry Ford was one of the management representatives, a very fine man, the editor of "Business- (tape cut off for a moment)

Public members included Clark Kerr and Arthur Burns, a well-known economist. There was a joint chairmanship. One year or month, one meeting the Secretary of Commerce would chair and the other meeting the Secretary of Labor. But shortly after the committee was set up, Arthur Goldberg was nominated to be on the Supreme Court. Willard Wirtz took over.

Q: By then, it's about 1962 or 1963.

STIEBER: 1962. Willard Wirtz took over. I was the executive secretary of the committee. At first, I did it full-time and then, starting in September, I started coming in three days a week. President Hannah of the University, who had a lot of experience in Washington, had been the manpower administrator for the Department of Defense, took the attitude of, "If you want to go down there in Washington where people talk all the time, that's up to you, but you still have to do your job here." So, I would go home on Friday and do my job at the University on the weekends. I can always say that I shook President Kennedy's hand because I was once introduced to him. We met with the President. One of the things I remember... President Kennedy was a very astute person. He recognized the various personalities and the characteristics, idiosyncrasies, of this committee. He especially deferred very much to Arthur Burns. Arthur Burns being a conservative economist, the President realized that his views would be influential with the management community. He would always say, "Dr. Burns, what do you think of this" even after everybody else had had their say. We did some very interesting work. I stayed there for six or seven months. My assistant was a young man named David Burke, who subsequently became Senator Ted Kennedy's top assistant and later on, as I read in the newspapers, became the president of one of the networks.

Q: How did you get back into _____?

STIEBER: At any rate, I decided after going back and forth for six months that I couldn't continue to do it and I wasn't going to give up the university job. I had a sabbatical coming up. At that time, I then had applied for a Fulbright, was offered a Fulbright to Aix-en-Provence, but

at the same time, Walter Galenson, who was at the ILO [International Labour Organization]...
...They were setting up a new institute, the International Institute for Labor Studies. The director was a former MP [Member of Parliament] named Marquand.

Q: The author of Organized Labor in Four Continents.

STIEBER: Correct. Walter said, "This institute is going to be set up. They're going to have a research program. They're looking for somebody to set up the research program." That sounded much more interesting to me than taking the Fulbright. I went down there. I met Mr. Marquand. David Morse was the Director General. Then I took a sabbatical there for a year, starting in 1962. My first job was to establish an international automation conference. From all over the world, the conference was heavily subsidized by an American industrialist. I can't remember his name for the life of me, but I know that Ted Kheel was instrumental in getting the funds and working with them.

Q: Ted Kheel, a very famous arbitrator, he came out of the NLRB.

STIEBER: Right. And Ben Roberts was there. At any rate, we set up this conference on automation. Eventually, I edited a book on that conference. We had people from the Soviet Union, Poland, Eastern European communist countries...

Q: What was Ben Roberts?

STIEBER: Ben was just sort of a consultant to the ILO. I think he had already had a longstanding relationship with them.

Q: This was B. C. Roberts, the first head of the International Industrial Relations Association. I'll be interviewing him next week.

STIEBER: Again, I met some very prominent labor leaders from Great Britain at that time. I remember particularly Jack Cooper, who became a lord later, was the president, I believe, of a municipal workers union. I'm not sure. I stayed there for a year, set up the research program of the Institute. At the end of that, I was back in the States and there was an automation commission in the United States. It had a committee of people from Management and Labor, but the staff director was a man named Garth Mangum, whom I had met at Harvard. We were both graduate students. He was another Dunlop protégé. Garth called me and gave me a wonderful assignment. He said, "How would you like to go to Europe and interview people and write a section for us on automation?" Well, the idea of going on an expense account with pay and everything to-

Q: With your family?

STIEBER: They didn't pay for the family, but eventually I made my headquarters at the ILO... I had just left there after a year. I had left and now I came back and they gave me a place to work and an office. I traveled all over France, Great Britain, the Netherlands... I was in Czechoslovakia during the Dubcek period, the spring period. I remember meeting with some economists from that group.

Q: Did you by any chance meet George Wheeler?

STIEBER: Oh, yes. My entre there was Lavcik. I had met him through my ILO connection. He invited me to Prague and met with these people. George Wheeler was an American who had more or less defected, although at that time... He was sitting in on the meeting. This was the period of the spring thaw. It was so popular to be critical. These people were very critical of communism.

Q: I won't ask you a whole lot of details about Wheeler because his career is very important to the international labor field, but I won't ask you about anything you don't know. I'll ask you his status within the thing. You see, he did defect from the War, from the occupation, and is an important cog in this wheel. He wrote two books (One of them is Who Split Germany? or something like that.) when he was still very active in the-

We're resuming this interview on the following morning - that is, June 3rd. Jack is back here now. We stopped yesterday as you were getting into one thing that I want to develop a little bit later. Let's continue with the places to which you went and were able to observe the operations in general of the international labor field and then we'll go into specific comments you have about the work of the U.S. government in embassy works with the labor attaches, in AID, Information, or anything else you want to say.

Continue on your voyages. I was very surprised and pleased to find out that one of the things that happened was that you found yourself in Czechoslovakia at the time of the Dubcek-

STIEBER: As I said, I was there on a study of automation in European countries. This would be 1965. The United States had set up an Automation Commission. They had asked me to visit various countries and see what they were doing in this field and anything else that I could pick up in terms of their technological development and things of that type.

Q: You said "they." This was not a government-financed study?

STIEBER: It was a government-financed study. The Automation Commission was set up in 1965. Johnson would have been President. It was probably a tripartite body. I had no contact at all with the Commission itself. My contact was with the director of the study, who was Garth Mangum, who was a professor at the University of Utah and another one of John Dunlop's students. He and I had met at Harvard when we were both there as graduate students.

Q: The interesting thing from the point of view of our project is anything you would have to say about the reactions, if any, on the part of the government, whether they knew about it. Generally at that time, we were not favoring going behind the Iron Curtain and you actually did that.

STIEBER: Yes. I had complete reign and freedom. I had made these contacts when I was in the ILO in 1962-1963 in the International Institute for Labor Studies and organized this large

conference on automation. The man whose name I couldn't think of, who really underwrote a good part of the program was a man named Snyder. He was the president of something like U.S. Industries. His contact was Ted Kheel. There was a lot of controversy at the meeting. In fact, it almost broke up.

Q: Now you're talking about the ILO.

STIEBER: Yes. We had representatives from Eastern Europe, Russia, and others, but they were always government handpicked people and controversy was over the attitude of the United States and the Western countries towards the representation from these groups, whether they were really participating in what was supposed to be an academic type conference or really mouthing the views of their government. It got to a very acrimonious state because it almost broke up. I remember, Bob Fleming, who was a close friend of David Morse, asked Morse to intervene and to get the thing sort of quieted down so that we could proceed and get the thing done. At any rate, the contacts that I made there... For example, one of the persons from Czechoslovakia was a young man named Jan Auerhan, who was the son of a well-known communist official who I didn't know, but Auerhan was a very intelligent and well-trained academic person. In Poland, there were at least two representatives. Both of them were really government representatives. In Czechoslovakia, a man that I named earlier, Lavcik, who had had some very bad experiences under the communist regime, his wife, I think, had committed suicide. Because of his difficulty with the government, he himself probably was committed to the communist ideology, but when Dubcek became Prime Minister and the spring thaw was in, he, among others, joined this group. He was sort of in charge of the research effort. That is where I mention that I participated in the meeting of perhaps half a dozen economists, among whom was this man that you knew earlier named George Wheeler. They were interesting characters not directly related to your study, but I remember distinctly one young man who was sort of deputized to take care of us. He took us to a show that later on played in an international exhibit in the United States. It was called the *Laterna Magica*. He was sort of well-known because as a child, a teenager, he had sort of fingered his father as a suspect person and his father had been executed. Now he was probably in his early 20s. I think eventually he came to the United States and got an academic position.

Q: I am going to ask you a little bit more about that because Wheeler himself was involved in many of the things I mentioned last night. What struck us is the fact that he defected when his contract wasn't resumed in the American occupation in 1946 and that he went off to Czechoslovakia and became, so far as we knew, totally committed to the regime there and yet what we found out later (and I never imaged that you actually had met him) - what you tell me know is that he was one of a small group of people at your dinner indicating that he was in favor of the Dubcek type of revolution. He later wrote this book in which he was very distressed at the fact that the Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968 to defeat the Dubcek Revolution when he had no such feeling in 1948 when they took over. So, something happened. He did write a book after that. But what was your reaction to him? He was essentially an economist, right?

STIEBER: Right. At that time, I had no knowledge of his history, so I wasn't really paying any particular attention to him. The main thing that I recall from this meeting was that all of the people—whether they took identical positions, I can't recall—were very critical of government policy. In other words, it was no longer that they were afraid to speak up because they felt that

this would leak and in some way get them into difficulty.

Q: When you say they were critical of government, you mean the old government, but not Dubcek?

STIEBER: Well, they thought they ought to be moving more rapidly, making overtures, learning from the West, more or less divorcing themselves from the dictated policies of the Soviet Union. They sort of seemed to be vying with each other to be more critical.

Q: Any reaction on the subject of adopting free enterprise as against capitalism, that type of discussion?

STIEBER: I can't really remember that. I think most of our time I would try to elicit information which was directly related to the study of automation, how much they should be taking advantage of new developments in this field.

From there, we went on to Poland. That was an entirely different story. There, the official, a Dr. Frank, was a very typical communist representative.

Q: Of the two groups, the pure economists and the pure politicians, he was sort of a politico?

STIEBER: He was not an economist. In fact, I suppose, as is traditional in many Eastern European countries and even in the West, these people would have been lawyers developed in terms of their training. I felt that we never really felt comfortable with him. As a matter of fact, I do remember once incident which epitomized this. When I was with the ILO in 1962-1963, one of my duties in the International Institute for Labor Studies was to teach in an educational program for labor people from underdeveloped countries. These would be African nations, Asians... There were a couple of Eastern European people. Two of them that I remember specifically were a woman from Poland (I can't remember her name. We had a lot of contact with her) and another one from Russia (His name was Klutchnikov.). They were entirely different. The woman had been allowed to go to this only on condition that she leave her teenage son at home. He, on the other hand, was very strictly following the government communist line. We were discussing wage differentials and really academic subjects. They did have at least two people from the West, although it was for the underdeveloped countries, to get a little bit of mixture. They had at least two that I remember distinctly. One of them was Lynn Williams, who was then an international representative of the Steelworkers from Canada and later became president.

Q: And president of the IRRA [Industrial Relations Research Association].

STIEBER: Yes. The other one was a management official from Qantas Airlines. They were my two brightest students.

Q: Let me ask you about that Poland thing. I get into these things because of other interviews. The name Oscar Longi, of whom you may have heard-

STIEBER: Yes, of course.

Q: The famous economist who went back to Poland after he was in the University of Chicago. Did you get to meet him?

STIEBER: No, I never met him. Madame Borowska, (that was her name), came to our house. She was very outspoken - in fact, too outspoken in our academic sessions. She would speak up on the problems of workers in a country like Poland and the matter of wage differentials and things that were part of our discussion. I even feared for her because I knew that there were people there that would report back.

Q: Did any of the Polish people that you met mention what happened to [Oskar] Lange?

STIEBER: Not that I can recall, no. Of course, at that time, Lange would have been in Poland.

Q: Oh, yes, definitely, but beginning to have some difficulty.

STIEBER: No, I can't recall that. When we came to Poland, we stayed in a hotel and I tried to reach Madame Borowska and just couldn't get a straight answer. She used to work for Dr. Frank. We even brought a record because her son was interested in American music. We brought up a present and said, "We'd like to give it to her. Where can we meet her?" He just would slough over and say, "Well, she doesn't work here anymore." But we never could get it straightened out. I don't remember whether in the end we said, "Well, here is this record. We would appreciate it if you would find her." Later on, we were in Sweden. I think it was the same trip.

Q: This was on the automation trip?

STIEBER: Yes. I think it was on the same trip and it was later. We went to the movies one day and at the intermission—they have intermissions in movies. It could have been a play—the lights went up and there was Madame Borowska sitting in the audience. We went over and greeted her. By now, her son was grown, in his early 20s. We were staying in an LO hotel. You may have stayed there. It's not a little hotel, but it was one that was owned by the LO. People were advised that the rates there were reasonable.

Q: It was a tourist hotel that was very good. We did stay there.

STIEBER: Yes, I'm sure you did. She had left, gotten out of Poland with her son. In fact, I think one of her problems had been that she had been married to a Jewish man. Whether or not he died, I can't remember. At any rate, she was by herself. She had immigrated to Denmark originally, but she said learning the language in Denmark was very difficult. It seemed to me that the languages in the Scandinavian countries always sounded the same.

Q: Danish is gargle.

STIEBER: She was working for the Swedish Institute with Midner, Yosterayn, and so on. She was a trained economist.

Q: Did she ever get the record that you left for her?

STIEBER: We asked her about it. I don't think she did. That hotel has a subway entrance. She told us where she lived. It was on the outskirts in one of these very large housing projects that the Swedes went in for in the outskirts of town. She sent her son to meet us and to bring us out there. We had dinner at her place. She sort of told us a little more about her saga and how she had gotten out and went to Denmark for a while. I think this might have been subsequent because it couldn't have been the same visit. This might have been on another trip that we took later on.

At any rate, Professor Frank would only take us... We had a chauffeured car and we visited steel plants. One of the interesting things about that was that when we stopped for lunch, I noticed that the chauffeur wasn't there. I said, "Where is he? Is he going to have lunch?" He said, "No, he doesn't eat with us." In other words, they had this very strict dichotomy between-

Q: This was a classless society.

STIEBER: That's right. He ate differently, although we did eventually—by insisting that we wanted to see a worker's living quarters, the chauffeur did take us to his apartment. It was a small apartment where he lived with his wife and one or two children and a grandmother. The Franks lived in... Have you been to Poland?

Q: No.

STIEBER: There is a beautiful old quarter with very nice housing in a square in Warsaw. Government officials had their... We were at their house. Obviously, they had beautiful furniture, a very nice house, a nice dining room, and nice things.

Q: Servants?

STIEBER: I don't remember any servants, but we couldn't really get to go to any things... If you asked them something about the Jewish quarter or something like that, we would always be told, "Well, it's not on our itinerary," or "There isn't time to get there," and so on.

Q: Did he know you were Jewish? You are Jewish?

STIEBER: I am Jewish. He must have known. I can't remember whether we had any discussion, but sure, he must have known that. Just the very idea of asking about it would have given him that information.

Q: I want to get in all the places you were before I start on your reactions to government programs. You then took this long trip on the automation, including these two countries behind the Iron Curtain. I assume you went to most of the Western countries, too.

STIEBER: Yes. We were in Germany and talked to trade union officials and management people. In fact, I saw one of the people that we met, Annie Benohu. I had met with her and

through her with the principals of the French management-

Q: Walin Boussier?

STIEBER: Yes, there was somebody by that name. Took us to a very swanky lunch and restaurant. The Labor attaché at that time actually was Dan Goot. Do you know Dan?

Q: I know Dan very well, yes.

STIEBER: Well, Dan and I had been college classmates together at City College.

Q: He's down in Florida. I tried to _____ him, but I couldn't.

STIEBER: He lives in Florida. I spent some time with him, but not really very much because I had gotten the names of the government officials that were responsible for manpower policies. I was very impressed with the... The offices sort of were in buildings that looked like private houses. They were very elaborate. It was like being in a very large room. While our offices are very nice for top level officials, they didn't compare with the kind of things that I saw with these people.

Q: I should put in that Annie Benohu is here now. One of the great advantages we find in our programs is the opportunity to meet people who have been educated in the United States who have gotten their PhDs, as she did, and writing on the steel union. They welcome Americans and really facilitate studies that we're interested in. That is just one of the side advantages.

STIEBER: Very helpful. Some of the kind of things that I recall were not really directly involved in labor union representation matters. For example, after this conference, I remember going to London in another year and the Labor attaché there—I don't remember his name—and I went out to Jack Cooper's training headquarters. He was the general secretary, I believe, of the General Municipal Workers Union.

Q: This was about when?

STIEBER: It probably was 1965.

Q: Joe Godson? No, not Godson. Way after him.

STIEBER: I've seen his name subsequently. He became an ambassador. He had a large family. His name was Byrne.

Q: Six daughters. We interviewed him.

STIEBER: He had a large family.

Q: He came out of the Teamsters Union.

STIEBER: Yes. I wasn't terribly impressed with him at the time. I can't say why. Either he didn't feel that it was really worthwhile to really give me any inside information that he might have had.

Q: Later, we'll get into the general-

STIEBER: I was very much impressed. Jack Cooper, I'm sure he had not had any education, was a typical leader of a British trade union. He wasn't the principle man at the conference. The other one was from the Electrical Workers Union. His name slips me. He would be a name that you would recognize. He invited us out. He was very proud of his training center. It would be a lot like Black Lake for the UAW. He had a meal for us and took us through the various classrooms and things like that at this center outside of London.

Q: Your international travels took you (besides the automation thing), later on, lecturing?

STIEBER: Yes. Well, the international thing, that automation study resulted in my writing a monograph which was submitted to the Commission. Eventually, the Commission reports came out in, I think, two or three volumes. It was part of that.

The next overseas venture that I had was in 1971, which again was part of a sabbatical. I was invited to the University of Leuven in Belgium through the offices of Roger Montpan, whom I had met just by accident. In 1969, I attended as one of the few non-lawyers that was invited to a group of academic labor lawyers who used to meet regularly and would put out casebooks. Benair and Clyde Summers-

Q: Dave Zispin?

STIEBER: No, Dave was not in that group. Roger was on the program. I guess maybe Clyde Summers or somebody had invited him. I was impressed. The main thing I was impressed with was that his English was so good. Therefore, I talked to him and asked him if he would be able and willing to come out as a visitor to Michigan State. He was delighted and came out in 1969. One of the episodes he ran into was, this was at the height of the Vietnam War, and there was a student strike. He was in a quandary. What is he supposed to do? Here he is, a visitor from another country, and other professors were canceling their classes and things like that. He said, "No, my class goes on. I don't want to get mixed up in this business."

Q: Do you know why his English was so good?

STIEBER: Why?

Q: The Dutch Oriental people in Belgium insist on speaking English rather than French.

STIEBER: I can tell you that. I have enough French to get around, order in a restaurant, and things like that. We lived in Brussels in a what looked like a large apartment house called the AG Building, which we later learned was sort of the place where government officials kept their mistresses, their "cinq à sept" (five to seven) trysts.

Q: You don't expect anybody in our group to know what a "cinq à sept" is. It's the prior to going home to dinner with your family when you have a mistress.

STIEBER: Right. But it was very convenient in terms of the location. We were close to the train station on the main drag there and so on. But when we started on our way, we decided we were going to go to Belgium via the Far East and make this a world tour. At that time, I contacted the USIS [United States Information Agency] and they were very forthcoming and set up meetings, lectures, and so on. The first place we went to was Tokyo.

Q: Let's get this straight. Before you left on your around-the-world trip, this is what we're supposed to be getting into. You've contacted the USIA [United States Information Agency, same organization as USIS, different era] and said you were going to these places.

STIEBER: That's right. I think they may even have paid me something for these lectures and so on.

Q: They didn't pay part of your international travel, but they paid you per diem and expenses for the days you spent.

STIEBER: Yes. This made it feasible. I don't know if he was a Labor attaché or not. His name was Sandy Rosenbaum or something like that. He was in Tokyo.

Q: He was not a Labor attaché.

STIEBER: I don't think he was a Labor-

Q: He was probably a USIA-

STIEBER: Probably. The interesting part about that was that I had sort of boned up to be talking about labor management relations, technological development, automation, and that sort of thing. But the day I arrived—this was 1971—Nixon was President; George Shultz was probably Secretary of the Treasury. But the United States went off the gold standard at that time. So, here I get off the plane and there were all of these meetings set up with industry and labor groups, and they weren't interested at all in labor. They wanted to know about the monetary matters, which I didn't know anything about. I was always seeing the people at the USIS. I had an interpreter. I got all of the newspapers and other documents that were coming through and sort of was able to bluff through enough discussion to be able to answer questions, which then appeared in the newspapers the next day as "American expert says thus and so about the effects of the United States going off the gold standard and how it's going to affect the Japanese economy" and all of that.

Q: This is a common development. They were very fortunate in having a qualified economist on a labor tour, rather than some trade unionist who could not have spoken on the subject.

STIEBER: We know that the Japanese even today, let alone at that time, women were not

accepted as being able to make any difficult or important decisions. We had a woman who was a translator. She was a very feisty person. I think she had translated previously for Paul Samuelson and others. We would get into these meetings in which I would give my spiel of maybe a half hour and then we would open up the questions and somebody would get up- (end of tape)

Q: This is tape 2 of the interview with Jack Stieber. He was just saying that an around-the-world trip when the USIA arranged for some speech engagements in Tokyo alone or in other places?

STIEBER: _____

Q: We'll get on to that. Jack was describing the benefit of having a qualified translator. You were saying that after a five minute question, she would translate it...

STIEBER: She would translate it in one or two sentences. I would say, "He talked for all this time and is this all he said?" She said, "The rest wasn't important." But she was very interesting.

Q: The thing I want to ask you here about this here is, you came there under the auspices of the USIA. A gentleman whose name you didn't quite remember was obviously a USIA officer and was arranging your trip. Did you get in touch with our Labor attaché at that time, who might have been Lew Silverberg?

STIEBER: No, I don't think I got in touch with the Labor attaché.

Q: And they didn't put you in touch.

STIEBER: They didn't put me in touch. I can't recall that. My-

Q: Under our system, he should have been involved in selecting the places where you were to speak.

STIEBER: No, Sandy did that, the USIS officer. We went to Hokkaido. This would have been in the summertime.

Q: It's a snowy place in the winter.

STIEBER: I met there. I addressed labor union meetings in Hokkaido. I stayed overnight in a Japanese inn, which was run by an employer federation for employees. Then, I went on to a major city there and spent maybe a couple of days. I don't remember the city that we were in, but these were labor union people. I met the president of the Automobile Association. I later on invited him to a meeting in East Lansing, which he eventually didn't attend. He sent a telegram and said he couldn't make it; he was tied up. We also went to other places, certainly Osaka. I met with both industry and union officials.

Q: Does the name Immerman strike you as being somebody you met?

STIEBER: No, I can't remember that name.

Q: This is quite important for us because our system was supposed to operate in a way where anybody with a labor experience, academic, employer, or trade union, would be scheduled by the USIA, which would take care of the technical arrangements, but the determination of where you would go or contacting the union should have been under the supervision of the Labor attaché. It's an internal bureaucratic matter.

STIEBER: I can't recall meeting any Labor attaches in Japan. I'm quite sure that... The person I had dealings with was a very young man. I met his wife, went out to dinner together.

Q: I'm not implying that he wasn't competent.

STIEBER: No, no. I think they may have even been located in different offices.

Q: They were located in different offices, but the contact wasn't there. Tokyo was your first stop?

STIEBER: Tokyo was the first stop. We probably were there about a week. We went on to Singapore. Again, I had a former student who had recently gotten a degree at our school. He was an official of a shipbuilding company. He took us around. This man might have been a Labor attaché, but, again, I'm not sure. In fact, I am reasonably certain that he was an Asian. In other words, whether he was an American who had a government position... The main thing I remember, unfortunately, is the restaurants that they took us to.

Q: Which were very good.

STIEBER: Yes, that's right.

Q: I don't know whether we had a Labor attaché in Singapore.

STIEBER: Spent a couple of days.

Q: You had other labor programs there?

STIEBER: No, there were no professional... We stayed in the Raffles Hotel. The main thing I remember about the Raffles Hotel is that they must have had the same beds that the British military used when they were there. They were hard as hell!

Q: We normally suggest staying at one of the more modern Hiltons or something. The Raffles has a wonderful reputation.

STIEBER: We just thought we would stay there.

Q: Where did you go from there?

STIEBER: From Singapore, the only thing we did, I think, in Thailand was change planes. Then we went on to India, where we met with you and we stayed at the Oberoi Hotels.

Q: You can see we had a better idea.

STIEBER: That's right, you knew where people would be more comfortable. There, of course, my recollection is that you had arranged for me to meet important government officials. I gave some speeches in New Delhi. You may or may not recall that we took a trip up to Chandigarh by car.

Q: I remember that. You know, we had so many visitors. I did not recall taking you to Chandigarh. Carolyn went with us?

STIEBER: Oh, yes, and we had a lunch when we got to a certain point about half-way. We stopped the car and...

Q: You weren't taking any chances.

STIEBER: That's right. I gave a talk there at the university. The main thing I remember there, as well as in other places in India, the students would always come up and the main question was, "How do we get to the United States? How can we get to an American university in the United States?"

Q: Let me ask you a couple of questions. This is so prevalent in India. They see nothing in the future for them. We are torn between recommending the better students to the United States even where they promise to come back, make a family promise, make a professional promise. Let me inject here something that I don't know whether I'll put in my tapes _____. The Labor Minister during some of my earlier years there was a man named Haphi, meaning "elephant." He looked like an elephant. When we came back one time, by that time, he was Governor of the state _____. So, I was lecturing at the university and he had a reception for us _____. He had when he was Minister put the pressure on me to get his son into an American university _____. His son did not need my help, but they always like to do it through somebody. He got into the University of Texas and I said to him, "I want you to know, our experience is, no matter what they tell you, these kids are going to find an American girl, get married, and stay even in Texas." "No, no, no, no, we want him to go. He has committed himself, etc., etc." When we came back on this lecture tour, he was the Governor of the state and he had this affair for us. He said, "You were right. He has settled down there. He is a prominent engineer. He is doing wonderfully. He married an American girl. We have American grandchildren. We don't see them often enough." He really practically told me that, as fortunate as it was for the boy, how bad it was for the family. They always come up and say to you, "How can they get to the States," offer to give you references of how good they are, etc. I don't remember this particular case-

STIEBER: I'm sure it was true (and others as well). This was 1971. In fact, one of the people here, an Indian named Jacob Mankidi, quite frankly, not one of our best students in the United States, but he is an important official now. He went back to India. He did go back. He introduced me to his wife here, took a picture of us, and told his wife, "The first American meal we ever had in the United States was at the Stiebers' house." The truth of the matter is, I'm sure he didn't have

a meal at our house. I don't remember inviting any individual student. But at that time, our program was so small that we could have an open house with 35 students and put out a lot of food and so on.

Q: For Indians, that is a meal because they don't have sit down meals. They have a variety of craziness, this kind of a vegetarian-

STIEBER: One of the things that I do remember, we were at loose ends to some extent. While your hospitality extended to inviting us over and having us for dinner and so on, I was always looking in the paper for what was going on.

Q: How long were you in Delhi?

STIEBER: It might have been five or six days, maybe even longer. We went to the university just because we had seen there was going to be a lecture by Herbert Aptheker, the communist.

Q: The famous communist theoretician.

STIEBER: Right. On our own, we took a taxi or whatever transportation and we went. We just sat in the audience. His lecture was strictly anti-American. Carolyn was sort of holding me down. I think I eventually did make a comment or raise a question, but the students ate it up. In other words, they accepted everything he said at face value.

Q: Yes, this is a problem we had in India, mainly that the government's relationship with the Soviet Union was such that they had a whole lot of visitors, not only from Russia, but from the United States who were very unfriendly to us. It distresses me to report to you that if you had told me you wanted to go there, I would have wanted to go, too. We liked to know what was happening.

STIEBER: That was one thing I remember distinctly. Another thing that I remember, we looked in the... You must have had some kind of an American newspaper or something.

Q: Oh, yes.

STIEBER: There was something going on either at the Kiwanis or maybe the Lions, one of these international organizations. We saw that that was at a hotel, so we went there. There was a speaker. I believe he spoke about industrial relations. Generally, it was mostly... The first thing, I had never been in the United States to a Kiwanis meeting. Whether it's Kiwanis or Lions, the first thing they do is, they get up and sing the song. This is the same kind of thing that would happen in any country.

Q: It was probably the Lions Club.

STIEBER: I think it might have been the Lions. It was one of those kinds of organizations that I had never visited before.

Q: But mostly Indian members?

STIEBER: Yes. In fact, I might have been the only American. The speaker was an industry speaker on industrial relations, generally pretty much anti-union. These would have been mostly better-off businessmen and so on. Those are the two things that have some relationship to labor or political matters. You also arranged for us to go to the Taj Mahal. We had a driver there. I was supposed to go to give a talk or give a couple in Lucknow, but there was flooding. I remember, up to the very morning that we were supposed to depart, through the embassy officials, you had designated somebody to go with us, whether we were going to go or whether we weren't going to go. I got a phone call at 8:00 am saying "The trip is off because the-

Q: That was too bad because that would have given you a different look at India.

STIEBER: Yes, but I never got to that place.

From there, we went to Iran. That was also very interesting. We came there probably at two or three o'clock in the morning. One of the things we ran into in India was, you had designated somebody to meet us at the airport. The plane, probably quite typically, was several hours late. When we got there, we went through customs. The main thing they seemed to be interested in was whether we were carrying any jewelry or things like that. I don't know whether as a government official you may not have had that experience, but when you walk out of that airport, you're inundated by-

Q: People who want to help you.

STIEBER: Well, they want you to take their taxi.

Q: You mean, the embassy driver...

STIEBER: We missed him. We didn't make the connection. Apparently, it turned out when we saw you the next day, he was there. But one way or another, we missed each other. So, before you know it-

Q: The planes arrived in the middle of the night and he gave up trying to meet them.

STIEBER: Something like that. Before you know what's going on, somebody has grabbed your luggage and said, "Come, come, come. We take you directly to where you want to go" and so on and so forth. They had no designated official-looking taxis like you do in Washington, DC, in Tokyo, or anyplace else. Everybody has their own car. There were two brothers who had this. They had our stuff in the car. Frankly, I was reluctant to tell them we were going to the Oberoi Hotel because that immediately tips them off that we were well-off Americans. We were pretty scared. They started in this rickety car. Then he pulls into a gasoline station, which means that-

Q: He doesn't have enough money.

STIEBER: Absolutely. There was a guy sleeping by the pump on a little cot or on the floor. He

said, "Do you have some money? I need some gasoline." Well, again, I felt that this was the beginning. Once he tells us how much it is, he'll realize how much money we may have or something like that, but we were in their hands. We had no alternative.

Q: It's a matter of curiosity. What was the total cost of the gasoline?

STIEBER: I can't remember, but it wasn't a lot. It was what I could have felt was reasonably within the realm.

Q: I take it you know that this experience of yours is going to remain in our files with warnings to people about how to arrive in the middle of the night in New Delhi.

STIEBER: Hopefully it's better, but probably it isn't. Lo and behold, he got back and he took us to the Oberoi. The main thing he wanted was, "When can we see you tomorrow? We take you to all of the best places."

Q: Including Agra, which is-

STIEBER: "Every place you want to go. We will be here tomorrow morning. What time?" Of course, we wanted him to realize that we were important people, so he'd better not fool around with us, so we said, "We're here under the auspices of the American embassy and they will make full arrangements for us." The main thing that impressed us, and Carolyn particularly, in this hotel, which is an opulent place, here there are two Indians. On the one hand, there are these people who are sleeping in the streets, cows wandering around. On the other, there are these women dressed in saris with gold and silver braids and diamonds in their nose, which could be worth a couple of thousand dollars for every one. In the restaurant, they would be playing American music and things. In fact, on another occasion in Yugoslavia, we encountered that sort of thing. At any rate-

Q: The Oberoi was a place where we would put up the Beatles. My daughter met them there.

STIEBER: It is a beautiful hotel.

We went to Iran, got there in the middle of the night.

Q: Part of it is the weather and part of it is that the Indian government, which operates the only airline that can land in daytime, because they want to get the business, every other airline goes through New Delhi at two o'clock or something like that.

STIEBER: Well, we got there. There, the benefits of being under the auspices of the American State Department and USIA were very evident. There was a man there waiting for us to whisk us through customs, no fooling around with luggage or anything. He took us directly to the hotel. They had a program set up.

Q: Again, there was no Labor attaché there, right?

STIEBER: I think he was a USIA person.

Q: We didn't have one there. _____.

STIEBER: The main lecture I remember giving, in addition to having some interviews, was at the university. The Shah, of course, was still the reigning official. I gave a talk there. In typical American fashion at the end of 45 minutes or an hour, I said, "I am sure there are a lot of things here that I may have said that are not correct as regards your own country and your own experience. Please feel free to ask any questions." Total silence. No questions at all. Then one person does get up and ask a question. I responded, but it was obviously an American. At the end when we were sort of milling around, I said, "What are you doing here?" It turned out he was from an American university, so he was the only one who felt free enough to stand up and ask a question. Everybody else, I told him, "I'm surprised. A lot of the things we were talking about I would have thought would have been of interest to these people and they would have raised questions about relating American experience to their own." He said, "They wouldn't ask any questions. Once you come in here with a government official, they would know that everything they said was going to get back to the university officials and the government, so you don't get any kind of a back and forth discussion."

From there, we went to Shiraz. Whatever the year was, 2,000 or something like that, they had a great celebration in this place in Shiraz where they had air conditioned tents all over the grounds. Vice President Agnew was going to be there. Again, we had a guide, a student, who would be sitting in the back with us. We asked him to take us through the sections where the masses lived. He said, "That is not on our schedule." He would sometimes also not respond. Later, when we were walking around in the rooms of the places and taking pictures and so on, he said, "The driver understands English. I can't answer questions that would not reflect on things that the government does not want me to discuss."

Q: Jack, we're getting into the things that I really want to ask some questions about and develop. It's 12:15. We'll have to find another place. I'm sorry. I didn't realize how late it is.

STIEBER: Maybe we can finish by 12:30. I don't know that I've got that much more.

I went to Israel from there. There I did meet the Labor attaché.

Q: George Lichtblau?

STIEBER: No. First of all, the first Labor attaché was this woman who I knew from the United States, Margaret Plunk. I had met her in the Netherlands and had dinner at her house. She was the Labor attaché. But then she was being replaced by another person. I think his name starts with an 's.'

Q: Leonard Sandman.

STIEBER: Yes. He was a Labor attaché.

Q: In fact, he was in the Labor Department.

STIEBER: Yes. There, I really had the interaction with Labor attaches. We went around to various government officials and talked with-

Q: And trade unions and management.

STIEBER: Yes.

Q: How long were you there?

STIEBER: It could have been a week or so. We had some relatives there that we looked up. This would have been in Tel Aviv. We went to Jerusalem and also I had some friends from the University of Tel Aviv. We could have been there a whole week, maybe close to-

Q: Did you have many trips to European countries on that trip?

STIEBER: I think from there we flew directly to Brussels.

Q: That is where you had that _____.

STIEBER: Yes, and spent the next three months there.

Q: I didn't realize it was so long there, lecturing in English.

STIEBER: Yes, lecturing in English, and the regular scheduled classroom, their own system. Of course, Roger was there.

Q: Blanpain.

STIEBER: Not to be confused, even though his name is a French name, with any French. It was in the midst of the schism between the Flemish... They had just decided to split the university. The French opened up a new campus outside of Brussels and the Flemish kept the Luvin campus. I remember asking Roger, "You know, I know enough French so that I can get around. If we go, I can order things and so on." He said, "Better you should speak English."

Q: Absolutely. Blanpain, of course, is the former head of the IRRA and was our expert at the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] on multinationals

_____.

STIEBER: A lot of things happened there that were interesting. He had designated a former student of his to take us around. I was in the American embassy there and I was sort of walking in the hall and saw a name on the door: Klingerman. I remembered that at the university, Charles Killingsworth's secretary, whose office was right next to mine, was Polly Klingerman. Her husband had graduated from MSU [Michigan State University]. He had just been assigned there as one of the officers, not a Labor attaché.

Q: A political or economic officer.

STIEBER: Yes. Actually, the ambassador later was in San Salvador. He retired recently. He was a former boyfriend, more or less, of Carolyn's from the University of Chicago. He had some important positions. He was in Salvador. It starts with a 'D.'

Q: What about the Labor attaché? We have an embassy there and then we have an EC-

STIEBER: I'm sure I met the Labor attaché. We were over at the Klingerman's house for dinner once. Actually, one of the interesting parts there was... And this man may have been a Labor attaché. He had come directly from Vietnam. He was very strongly committed to the American involvement in Vietnam. By that time—this would be 1971—it was already clear that things were going very badly. Klingerman himself, who had come from Africa—Zaire or someplace, I can't remember which country—disagreed with them on quite a few things on their experience. The interesting thing about that is that, just a week before we left, I saw in the local newspaper that Mrs. Klingerman has written a cookbook based on her wide travels and experiences-

Q: You mean, just recently on your trip.

STIEBER: Yes. She was going to have a book signing ceremony at one of the bookstores. So, while we weren't going to buy the book, we went out there to Schuler's Books in Okemos, which is only a couple of miles, and got in line while everybody else was waiting to have the book signed. I came up there. For a second, she couldn't remember us. I remembered her.

Q: Her husband is retired by now?

STIEBER: He was, but he was there also. He is retired and teaches at an American school in a place called Troy, Alabama, I believe. There must be such a place. He is retired. This is under the auspices of maybe the University of Maryland or something. They have an overseas programs and he lectures.

Q: Jack, we're reaching the time. There are a couple of things I really want to get into. One of them is, what is your general feeling... I mention both questions because, even if we have to stop, I want to get to the second one, about the work? Any suggestions about what we should be doing in this field that we're not or what we are doing that is wrong? How do you feel about the whole labor involvement of the U.S. government? You have mentioned that it's been very helpful to you in your travels.

STIEBER: I do think from just the kind of questions that you have asked, it seems like there was not (at that time anyway) close interaction between the USIA and the Labor attaches in some places. There really should have been more because the Labor person should have been taking me around. In 1983, I was again in Tokyo because the international meeting was there and I was president of the IRRA. Again, I had arranged for a series of lectures and went down to Fukuoka, visited steel plants. The woman (and I'm sure she was again of the USIA rather than a Labor attaché) took me around.

Q: Our Labor attaché there might have been a man named Warner Slayzack?

STIEBER: Possibly Slayzack, I'm not sure.

Q: He was a student in Wisconsin. That is interesting. It is such a large post that maybe you can separate those functions in that place, whereas... In a place like Delhi, it was a large post, but I sure wouldn't let anybody come in and plan the labor program.

STIEBER: I did really more interaction with labor groups and meetings that would just be announced and people would just show up because there was a big steel plant down there. Therefore, they had some interest.

Q: Let me get to the last question, especially before people might be interrupting us. That is, what observations, if any, you have on the advantages, disadvantages, of the sort of covert activities that became publicized? Do you have any feeling about that?

STIEBER: By that time, I was already a university academic _____ in the newspapers. I was surprised. I never did think that it was such a terrible thing as long as the Labor representatives were doing what they were supposed to be doing in terms of cementing relationships and working with labor unions.

Q: What about what the trade union covert activity might be, both the A.F. of L and the CIO? Although the CIO got much lesser funds as _____ mentioned, the fact is that both of them accepted funds for carrying on activities in the trade union in the name of trade unions and some academics, including our friend Jack Barbash felt as though, even though you might think there was a positive need for that type of thing under certain emergency situations, ultimately _____ negatively for our interests.

STIEBER: I guess the question is what they were being subsidized in getting funds on a covert basis from the CIA, but were they taking their orders from the CIA or were they taking them from the International Office of the AFL-CIO and using the government funds to carry on their activities. Certainly, I think that the negative part of it is that it immediately gave Labor a black eye. Other countries see the idea of the CIA in itself -- any involvement, whether it's only through funding or more directly, was suspect. To that extent, you might say, in hindsight, it was a mistake.

Q: What about the institutes that were set up after this publicity and covert thing? They set up institutes with U.S. government finances openly. The activities of the AFL-CIO in Asia, Latin America _____.

STIEBER: Again, what were the institutes doing? If they were doing trade union activities, I think it probably would have been better if the funding had been all above board. In other words, not under covert.

Q: Now it's above board and yet it's criticized also.

STIEBER: Yes. I'm not anti-government. Nowadays, being anti-government is popular with the Republican Party. I don't have a strong, negative view on that. The main thing is whether we were co-opted by these organizations. Again, one could question and say, "After all, the AFL-CIO is not an impecunious organization. Did they need the money? Couldn't they have done it without this?" I don't know.

Q: We're talking about \$20 million.

STIEBER: I don't know the amount of the funding.

Q: That is approximately the amount. I guess the question is, supposing they hadn't gotten this, would they have been able to conduct these kinds of activities? If the answer is no, then perhaps it was justified. But I think to the extent that any involvement with the CIA immediately gave labor a black eye and made them suspicious of unions in the United States, then it's a bad thing. But it's not an open and shut business.

I want to free you and thank you very, very much.

End of interview