

LABOR IN THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY DURING EARLY COLD WAR: THE
MARSHALL PLAN AND AMERICAN-TURKISH LABOR RELATIONS
1945-1955

A Master's Thesis

by

Sera Öner

Department of History
Bilkent University
Ankara
September 2006

To my beloved family

LABOR IN THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY DURING EARLY COLD WAR: THE
MARSHALL PLAN AND AMERICAN-TURKISH LABOR RELATIONS
1945-1955

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
Of
Bilkent University

by

SERA ÖNER

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2006

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History

.....
Asst. Prof. Edward P. Kohn
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History

.....
Prof. Stanford J. Shaw
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History

.....
Assoc. Prof. Nur Bilge Criss
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

.....
Prof. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

LABOR IN THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY DURING EARLY COLD WAR: THE MARSHALL PLAN AND AMERICAN-TURKISH LABOR RELATIONS 1945-1955

Öner, Sera

M.A., Department of History

Supervisor: Asst. Prof Edward P. Kohn

September 2006

American foreign policy, parallel to the rise of the working class as of the 1860s, has included a new policy actor: labor. Likewise, in the aftermath of World War II and emergence of bipolar world, the United States of America actively made use of labor unions and rendered it an intrinsic Cold War value.

This thesis describes America's use of labor tool in its struggle against communism after providing a general account of labor movement and its role in American foreign policy making, through descriptive history method.

Major objective of the United States was to redress Europe through military and economic aid vis-à-vis the specter of communism, to secure the periphery and contain the U.S.S.R. The road map of this new American global strategy became a monolithic one with the Marshall Plan and indoctrinated with the Truman Doctrine, which also included the labor element.

The thesis will analyze the significant role that labor in the U.S. foreign policy, shaped with American exceptionalism; its development and support for the anti-communism policies. The reason why this thesis has been written is that there is no written source elaborating Turkish-American industrial relations from the perspective of Cold War. With this end, by making use of comparative history method, Turkish industrial relations case is studied to illustrate the know-how assistance and ideology trade-off of America to Turkish labor unions, which highlights the importance ascribed by the U.S.A. to labor as a foreign policy component.

Keywords: the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, foreign policy labor, industrial relations, Cold War, Turkish-American Relations, Irving Brown,.

ÖZET

ERKEN SOĞUK SAVAŞ DÖNEMİ AMERİKAN DIŞ POLİTİKASINDA İŞÇİ SENDİKALARI: MARSHALL PLANI VE TÜRK-AMERİKAN ENDÜSTRİYEL İLİŞKİLERİ 1945-1955

Öner, Sera

M.A., Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Edward P. Kohn

Eylül 2006

Amerikan dış politikası, 1860'lardan itibaren işçi sınıfının yükselmesine paralel olarak yeni bir politika aktörü daha geliştirmiştir: endüstriyel ilişkiler. Keza, İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında iki kutuplu bir dünya düzeninin ortaya çıkması sonucu, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, aktif bir şekilde endüstriyel ilişkileri ve işçi sendikalarını kullanmış, sendikaları Soğuk Savaş'ın ayrılmaz bir değeri haline getirmiştir.

Bu tez, Amerikan işçi hareketi ve dış politikada oynadığı role genel olarak değindikten sonra, Amerika'nın komünizmle mücadelesinde işçi sendikaları ve endüstriyel ilişkileri nasıl kullandığını, betimleyici tarih metoduna göre ele almaktadır.

1945 yılında, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nin en büyük amacı, Avrupa'yı komünizm tehlikesi karşısında askeri ve ekonomik açıdan ayağa kaldırmak, kendi çevresini güvenceye almak ve S.S.C.B.'yi sınırlandırmaktı. Bu yeni Amerikan küresel stratejisinin yol haritası Marshall Planı ile tek vücut haline getirilmiş ve Truman Doktrini ile doktrinleştirilmiştir.

Bu tez, işçi sendikalarının ve emek hayatının, Amerika'nın istisnai olduğu fikriyle şekillendirilmiş olan A.B.D. dış politikasında oynadığı rolün önemini, gelişimini ve komünizm karşıtı politikalara verdiği desteği inceleyecektir. Bu amaçla, Türk endüstriyel ilişkileri bir vaka çalışması olarak ele alınarak Amerika'nın Türk sendikalarına sağladığı bilgi birikimi ve ideoloji aktarımı başarısı incelenecek, A.B.D.'nin dış politikasında endüstriyel ilişkilere verdiği önemin altı çizilecektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Marshall Planı, Truman Doktrini, dış politika, emek, işçi sendikaları, endüstriyel ilişkiler, Soğuk Savaş, Türk-Amerikan İlişkileri, Irving Brown.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

After five brilliant years between 1996 and 2001 at Translation and Interpretation Department, two years passed at Virginia Tech and another three back again at History Department, Bilkent University. I always cherished the time I had at Bilkent, thanks to the support of family and long-lasting friendships I gained. At this juncture, I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to the best mother and the best father in the world, Zeynep and Cavit Öner for the times they took on me, their invaluable support and especially mom's patience to see me still at 'graduate school'. I know mom always wanted me to be a high profile businesswoman; yet, tolerated three more years at graduate school since this experience would be priceless for my future. It was worthy of that, right?

While I was walking through the paths of history and digging through piles of papers at the archives, what I noticed was the chats with my father on history and arts, in the company of a cup of tea and beautiful view of Antalya, have been of great help to me. I would like to thank him for giving me his first gift, a book on the history of the Turks, when I was a little child. In fact, what he gave me was awareness of history and our past. It is also great pleasure for me to be his business partner. My love and attachment to them is beyond word and hope to be an exemplary parent like them. My special thanks also go to my wonderful American parents, Marie and Darrel Martin for your friendship and dear support when I was thousands of miles away from home. They are always in my heart and prayers.

Also, I am thankful to my dearest friends, who have always been with me and always treasured their presence; Ferište & Aykut Zaralı, Özlem & Ufuk

Büyükyumak, Bahar Gürsel, Tülay Keskin, Arzu & Oktay Erkaan, Barın Kayaoğlu, Levent İşyar, Nur Yörükoğlu, Narin Koray, Bahar Pepe, Ela Tanrıverdi, Raphael Arancibia, Kevin McFall, Robin Taylor, Ferman Konukman, Ebru Karpuzoğlu, Marlene Elwell, Jennifer Lynne Harris, Kemal Kahrıman, Hülya Bulut, Pelin Ayter, and my latest sweethearts that the time made me gain, Banu Ahibay, Aslı Gürbüz, Kara Eiree and Ayşe Kenger. Our chats, quality time, coffee, chocolate, snow-ball, tennis and volleyball matches, short walks on campus will always remain in my memory and more than that they proved what real friendship means in good and bad days...

I feel indebted to many precious professors who shed light on my way and contributed a great deal to shape my future; Prof Necip Aziz Berksan, Prof. Edward Weisband and Prof. Nur Bilge Criss for being my life-time mentors. In particular, Prof Weisband deserves much credit for having encouraged me to study comparative Turkish-American history and foreign policy. No one else can be as lucky as me for having them.

In fact the real architects of this thesis are Prof Zehra Arat and Prof Edward Weisband since they highly recommended me to lean on American assistance to Turkish labor movement. The book chapter project on human rights and its prospects in Turkey has been of great experience to me and I am grateful for such an international opportunity.

Prof. Halil Inalcik, Prof. Stanford Shaw, Prof İlber Ortaylı, and Assoc. Prof Oktay Özel showed me what it means to be a true historian and '*hoca gibi hoca*'. From Gülriz Büken, I learnt many things especially during the ASAT conferences. She has been an excellent liaison to promote in Turkey other face of American

history concerning Chicanos and Hispanic artists. Thanks to you, I was able to look at cultural history through a different window.

Without doubt, I cannot forget invaluable assistance of my advisor Asst. Prof Edward Kohn especially for his support for my thesis topic and archival works as well Asst. Prof Timothy Roberts' academic help. Meanwhile, our department's chair Assoc. Prof. Mehmet Kalpaklı was generous in providing financial assistance to my research at the George Meany Archives. His material and morale support gave me an impetus and endurance to finish the thesis.

During my Ankara years, I had two sacred homes: Prof Erinç and Lale Yeldan's place and my beloved aunt, Taciser Etiz's mansion- for she treated me as if I was in such a place. I will always treasure the quality time I had with them. Specifically, Prof. Yeldan's insistence for me to take economy class resulted in my enrollment into second college degree in Economic and Administrative Science Faculty and once more, you were right, hocam!

Other esteemed members of Bilkent community and faculty cannot go unmentioned. Prof. John J. Grabowski, Prof. Tanju İnal, Prof Hamit Sunel, Dr. Aylin Kesim, Dr. Lerna Yanık, Meral Karagülle, Mine Tüzüner and particularly Kutlay Bensehan İlkin, department secretaries Sevil Daniş and Nebahat Öksüz.

I am also thankful to the archivists at the Library of Congress, the George Meany Archives, the State Archives and Turkish Grand National Assembly Archives. In the mean time, I am highly indebted to Dr. Kenan Öztürk from Paris and Yıldırım Koç from Türk-İş since they gave me hints about where to find what. This thesis became possible with their guidance.

Over the course of last year, honorable members of my thesis jury, to name Dr Edward Kohn, Prof Stanford Shaw and Dr. Nur Bilge Criss have contributed to

this final work with their thoughts, suggestions and input, which I will appreciate all my life.

To conclude my remarks, Bilkent University has been an indispensable part of my life for 9 years. On this occasion, I want to express my gratitude to Prof İhsan Dođramacı and Ali Dođramacı for making this huge investment in to us. Both as a member of graduate body and a member of the Alumni Society, I see the rise of *Bilkenters* like a star, in various sectors. Without hesitance, I can say that Bilkent University, as the first private college in Turkey, is the biggest Turkish project of human capital investment. I treasured this, my friends still treasure and will the coming generations do so...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II: AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND LABOR	
1860-1945.....	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Overview of American <i>Exceptionalism</i>	11
2.3 American Labor and Foreign Policy:	
From Open Door to Cold War.....	13
2.3.1 Unionization Movement and Major Labor Unions	
in the U.S.A, the 1860s and 1945.....	15
2.3.2 Rise of Labor Radicalism, Red-baiting, 1900-1930.....	18
2.4 Conclusion	36
CHAPTER III: EARLY COLD WAR: TRUMAN DOCTRINE, THE	
MARSHALL PLAN AND LABOR.....	38
3.1 Introduction.....	38
3.2 Prelude on the Origins of Cold War	38
3.3 Post-World War II Labor Union Cooperation, International	
Labor Organizations; Anti-Communism, the AFL-CIO	
and Irving Brown.....	46
3.3.1 Internationalization of Labor: World Federation of Labor	
Unions and the International Confederation of Free	
Trade Unions.....	55
3.3.2 World Federation of Labor Unions	55

3.3.3 International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU); the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and the CIO.....	59
3.4 The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan: Repercussions in the World and in Turkey.....	66
3.5 Why Was Labor Important For The Marshall Plan?.....	70
3.6. Conclusion.....	75
CHAPTER IV: FIRST ENCOUNTER: AMERICAN LABOR AID TO TURKEY.....	76
4.1 Introduction	76
4.2. Irving Brown as an AFL Cold War Strategist.....	77
4.3. Irving Brown and His First Visit to Turkey.....	80
4.4. Conclusion	90
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION: OUTPOST OF THE DEMOCRATIC WORLD.....	91
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	95
APPENDICES:	
A.PICTURES RELATIVE TO CHAPTER 4.....	101
B. REPORT RELATIVE TO CHAPTER 4	104

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFL	American Federation of Labor
BLF	Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen
CGT	French Unions Confederation
CHP	Republican Peoples' Party
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CIGL	Confederation of Italian Labor Unions
CIO	Congress of Industrial Organizations
DP	Democrat Party
ECA	Economic Cooperation Administration
ERP	the Economic Recovery Program
FTUC	Free Trade Union Committee
FTUC	Free Trade Union Committee
HUAC	House of Un-American Activities Committee
ICCTU	International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions
ICFTU	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
IFLU	International Federation of Labor Unions
IFTU	International Federation of Trade Unions
IFTU	International Federation of Trade Unions
ILGWU	International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union
ILO	International Labor Organization
IRLU	International Red Labor Unions

ITWF	International Transport Workers Federation
IWW	Industrial Workers of the World
NATO	the North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCF	National Civic Federation
NLU	National Labor Union
OECD	the Organization for European Cooperation and Development
OEEC	the Organization for European Economic Cooperation
OSS	Organization for Security Services
TÜRK-İŞ	Turkish Labor Unions Confederation
DİSK	Turkish Revolutionary Labor Unions Confederation
UAW	United Automobile Workers
USW	United Steelworkers of America

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the aftermath of 1945, Cold War blocks were incrementally being built, and there was a growing fear of communism in Europe and Turkey. With the declaration of the Truman Doctrine of March 1947, Turkey and Greece had been secured within the anti-communist periphery. In order to redress Europe in the economic sense, the Marshall Plan was launched in 1948, briefly after the Truman Doctrine, and economic aid was provided to European countries through the European Recovery Program, the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation¹. American foreign policy also envisaged know-how assistance in the field of labor unions, which could have been an ideal means against communism. The records posit that it successfully managed to use labor as an anti-communism tool not only in Western Europe but also in Turkey, the American *exceptionalism* in mind, vis-à-vis the communist specter.

The Cold War era, which turned into a race to win a bastion in Europe and the Far East over the other in the specter of communism, envisaged the use of various

¹ The European Recovery Program is used interchangeably with the Marshall Plan. Second, the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation) was established on April 16, 1948 by Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Eire, Italy Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the UK. It was designed to oversee the economic revival in Europe and closely related with the Marshall Plan. Later, it was replaced by the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) in 1960. As to the ECA (Economic Cooperation Administration), it was established in 1948 under the direction of American businessman Paul Hoffman to carry out American responsibilities related to the European Recovery Program. ECA was essentially the Washington office in charge of the Marshall Plan programs. The operating agencies in Europe were grouped under the Special Representative of the President in Paris and the separate country missions and technical and military assistance was provided to Turkey directly by the ECA.

means -to reach its ends on the American side through such as political, military, technical, social and labor aid. What is striking about the early Cold War era is that the United States of America made serious use of labor, which could have easily been an ideal nest for communism in Europe and Turkey during the post World War II era. Given this imminent threat, the USA made the first move itself before the USSR, through the Marshall Plan and later Irving Brown, the representative of the American Federation of Labor² to Europe, in order to get to know Turkish labor system and industrial relations; and provided incredible know-how trade-off and training assistance to Turkey. Thus, the first building blocks of Turkish labor confederation were laid with the help of the American experience in early Cold War era as a safeguard against communist type of organization and consequently, mutual relations were entrenched strongly on the side of industrial relations, too.

This thesis by and large elaborates labor in American foreign policy-making as of late nineteenth century till 1955 and it is illustrating the influence of American labor leaders on the Turkish case in conjunction with the Marshall Plan, which included labor component as an extended tool of anti-communism in Europe, between 1947 and 1955.

There are several reasons to write this thesis. First of all, although use of labor as part of the Marshall Plan and the assistance provided to various European countries have been widely covered by the literature, neither a comprehensive work on Turkish industrial relations nor on Turkey and the Marshall Plan has been written regarding the USA's strategic assistance. America's contribution to Turkish labor organization has been generally given place in around one or two pages in a few Turkish literature works and there is no single source assigned to mutual labor

² After the merging of the American Federation of Labor with the CIO in 1955, Irving Brown was referred as the representative of the AFL-CIO.

relations in American literature. For example, from the perspective of Turkish labor unions history, Yıldırım Koç's book entitled *Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı ve Sendikacılık Tarihi* (*Turkish Workers' Class and History of Unionization*) covers an era from the Ottoman Empires to present time. However, only in two pages, he refers to the red-scare and closure of labor unions in 1946:

The territorial demand of the USSR regarding Kars-Ardahan provinces (neighboring the Caucuses) initiated the Cold War process in Turkey in late 1946. Consequently, on 16 December 1946, some labor unions, allegedly associated with communists-socialist organizations, were closed down and upon the enactment of Law No 5018 on Labor and Employers Unions and Union of Labor Unions, the CHP (Republican Peoples' Party) began to emphasize the freedom of association in 1947. Furthermore, the USA tried to shape and guide the unionization movement in Turkey.³

Koç, in the section on the establishment of first Turkish confederation, also rejects the idea that Irving Brown, 'a CIA agent' established the Turkish confederation through various visits and training given in the USA to some Turkish unionists.⁴ The logic he uses is the fact that the dismantlement of the CIO and the AFL. However, without any help of the CIO, the AFL European representative, Brown successfully carried out his activities in various continents.

Another important source regarding the early relations between Turkish American labor unions is the one covering interviews made by Dr Kenan Öztürk with Irving Brown in June and July 1988 shortly before his death. The book gives only the script of seven interview tapes and does not bring a discussion to the matter. Only in his two page long introduction part, does he mention that:

When the history of the unionization after World War II is analyzed, you will see that the mostly mentioned figure is Irving Brown. Brown conducted American Cold War strategy in all European countries and

³ Yıldırım Koç, *Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı ve Sendikacılık Tarihi* (*Turkish Workers' Class and History of Unionization*) (İstanbul: Analiz Basım, 2003), 80-81.

⁴ Ibid, 89.

in many African and Asian countries and in this regard, he was the first person in charge.⁵

Öztürk's book contains the interviews with Irving Brown and he has been very cooperative.⁶ In the first part of his dissertation, he mentions briefly the American labor strategy during Cold War and international labor organizations. That is why; in this thesis, various references have been made to his dissertation. Nonetheless, like other works in the literature, he fails to give comprehensive details regarding the involvement of Irving Brown and rather than American foreign policy perspective, he focuses on the Turkish experience.

The books written by Yüksel Işık (*Türk Solu ve Sendikal Hareket*)⁷ and Kemal Sülker (*Türkiye Sendikacılık Tarihi*)⁸ are mainly on freedom of association developments, rise of local labor unions and the establishment of Türk-İş confederation. However, in the related sections on the establishment of confederations, neither Işık nor Sülker mention Irving Brown, his contribution, America's aid as part of Cold War strategy.

When the non-Turkish sources are browsed written on the Marshall Plan and Labor unions, there is no reference made to Irving Brown's visit to Turkey except the sources at the George Meany Archives. However, they generally focus on freedom of association and labor unions in Britain, Italy and Greece.

To sum up so far, the literature lacks a work solely focusing on labor as part of American foreign policy and American labor unions' assistance to Turkey during early Cold War. Only a few Turkish sources do make limited references and these do

⁵ Kenan Öztürk, *Amerikan Sendikacılığı ve Türkiye: İlk İlişkiler, AFL-CIO'nun Avrupa Temsilcisiyle Söyleşi. (American Unionization and Turkey: Early Relations, Interview with the European Representative of the AFL-CIO)* (İstanbul: Tüstav, 2004).

⁶ I am very grateful to Kenan Öztürk for he transferred his typewritten Ph.D. dissertation into a CD and sent it to me.

⁷ Yüksel Işık, *Türk Solu ve Sendikal Hareket*(Turkish Left and Unionist Movement) (Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi, 1995).

⁸ Kemal Sülker, *Türkiye Sendikacılık Tarihi* (History of Turkish Labor Unions) (İstanbul: Tüstav, 2004).

not discuss the issue, as part of Turkish American foreign policies within the framework of anti-communism. Nevertheless, none of these works comprehensively elaborate the role labor played in American foreign policy. Hence, this thesis will fill an important gap in the literature and shed light on the barely discovered arm of the Marshall Plan's social assistance to Turkey regarding the labor unions.

The code of underpinnings for the Cold War became a monolithic and a conceptual one under the name of Marshall Plan, initially covering military, economic and technical aid, yet coming to include social aid in the field of labor relations. The Marshall Plan became the *modus operandi* or road map document for American foreign policy. As of early summer 1947, while the world was becoming a chessboard to be ruled over and the countries were turning into bastions to be secured between America and the USSR, the former had to make its move earlier than the latter to get another bastion, which was fragile and threatened by the USSR. To put it another way, America had to protect the geographically furthest outpost of the democratic West: Turkey. Hence, the Truman Doctrine of March 1947 and the Marshall Plan of July 1947 was devised to protect the allies and provide military and economic aid.

Since the Marshall Plan and its four sub-components relating Turkey namely economic, military, technical and social aid, have been poorly discovered and insufficiently written in the literature, the purpose of this thesis here is to elaborate the American aid to Turkish industrial relations and labor unions during Cold War, after providing a comprehensive perspective regarding the role of labor in foreign policy making of the USA from late 19th century till 1955.

Hence, this thesis is not about the history of Turkish American labor unions but rather how America rendered industrial relations an intrinsic Cold War value as

part of its foreign policy making, in the specter of communism, by putting the emphasis on Turkish case. The thesis shall use both descriptive and comparative history methods together. The descriptive method will be implemented in explaining the chronology of events and background of significant unionist leaders between the 1870s and 1940s while the comparative method will be used to compare Turkish labor system to the American labor system, as of the second half of the thesis. Thus, this thesis shall be structured as such: First, in Chapter II, after providing historic account of labor in American foreign policy and American *exceptionalism*, the internationalization of labor in the world and its place in US foreign policy, the need for the creation of the Marshall Plan, its inclusion of labor and American anti-communist plan of action in the field of labor, in various European countries shall be discussed.

While touching upon these issues, it will be seen that one figure, Irving Brown, became important, who was the representative of the American Federation of Labor to Europe as of 1945 and given the charge of pursuing American labor foreign policy in Germany, France, Britain and Italy between 1944 and 1947 by making use of the CIA funds and in Eastern Europe (Greece and Turkey), the Middle East and Africa after 1947 by using the Marshall funds. So, this chapter shall illustrate how labor became a foreign policy-making tool over the course of the history of the USA.

Chapter III shall base upon the Turkish case, first encounter of both countries in the field of industrial relations, visits of American trade unionists to Turkish labor unions, the training program offered by the US government for two-month period and the impression of Turkish unionists, expected to structure country's first confederation.

Irving Brown and his mission paid several visits to İstanbul and İzmir⁹ on various occasions in 1951, to have meetings with Turkish employers and workers in order to design Turkish industrial relations¹⁰ in line with the European ones recently redesigned with the help of the USA. Hence, a training program was agreed with the Democrat Party government and the USA. Within this framework, almost 600 Turkish workers were sent to 2 month-training programs in the USA. Some of them stayed three months. The training covered visits to many industrialized American cities such as Pittsburg, Chicago, New Jersey, and Los Angeles. The trained Turkish unionists returned to Turkey to establish first labor confederation of the country. In order to illustrate all details and aspects of Turkish American cooperation in the field of industrial relations, documents obtained from the U.S. Embassy to Ankara, the George Meany Archives in Maryland/U.S.A¹¹, Turkish dailies archives at the Turkish Grand National Assembly; interviews with Irving Brown in Paris in 1989¹² and Yıldırım Koç in Ankara in 2005 and 2006 shall be used.¹³

Finally, the thesis will have achieved to show that the United States of America, bearing American *exceptionalism*, based on liberalism, individualism and capitalism, and uniqueness of its own industrial relations with long past in mind managed to contribute to the foundation of a Turkish confederation upon the anti-

⁹ See Pictures of his visits to Turkey in Annex I.

¹⁰ Turkish industrial relations were not organized under the umbrella of a confederation before. Thus, this was a great opportunity foreseen by American unionists earlier than the Russians to be well evaluated.

¹¹ Now that Irving Brown contributed to the establishment of Türk-İş, I expected that there would be many primary sources regarding that era at the Türk-İş Archives. However, a person who wanted to kept anonymous said that some of the documents got moldy and thrown away or during the military coup d'états of 27 May 1960, 12 March 1970 and 12 September 1980, the documents belonging to the establishment of Türk-İş were burnt. For this reason, as a researcher, I was lucky to have found related documents around 60 pages at the George Meany Archives regarding that era. Yet, it is also sad not to have original copies, which would be shedding light to a transformative time of Turkey.

¹² Seven interviews were carried out with Irving Brown in Paris in June and July 1988 by Dr Kenan Öztürk. The book is the manuscript of the seven interview tapes.

¹³ My continuous efforts to find the unionists who had been to training programs in the USA for two month-periods were useless. The Retired Unionists Association in Ankara did not have a list of them or the ones I was able to reach were too young to remember

communist ideals of the democratic world and that America efficiently made systematic use of labor during early Cold War era as it had never done before.

CHAPTER II

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND LABOR: 1860-1945

2.1 Introduction

American foreign policy was early based on mercantilism and commercialism. Before establishing formal diplomatic relations with the Far-Eastern countries and Europe, commercial ties were strengthened in first place. Over time, as of the 1860s, America began to produce more than the domestic demands. As a corollary, the crisis of 1893-1897 occurred on account of fundamental structural problems such as overbuilt economy and an inadequate market for goods. Thus, the country would either cut down on production or had to find new markets to sell and boost profit in order to keep or increase the number of jobs. In other words, this connoted increase of welfare and in a way more job availability for workers, the numbers of whom were nurtured with new flux of migrations from Europe. As Republican Senator Albert J. Bridge of Indiana put it, “we are raising more than we can consume....making more than we can use. Therefore, we must find new markets for our produce, new occupation for our capital, new work for our labor.”¹⁴

Hence, the country had to revise its foreign policy and determine a global strategy, including new targets. In May 1893, historian Frederick Jackson Turner, who read his famous essay at Chicago Fair, entitled “The Significance of the Frontier in American History” reminded Americans that the continent had now been settled.

¹⁴ John Mack Faragher et al., *Out of Many*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003), 616.

Having passed “from the task of filling up the vacant spaces of the continent”, the nation is now “thrown back upon itself.”¹⁵ This meant that America needed to determine a new “frontier” to circulate its input and output and in so doing to sustain its economic system and welfare.

Especially, during late 19th century, U.S. foreign policy became more and more an interest seeking one.¹⁶ With this end, the geographic periphery had to be secured through interventions into Cuba, Haiti, Hawaii, the Philippines, Dominican Republic, Panama, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala and Chile. Thus, America’s economic interests were ensured by recognition of ‘no visible frontiers’ outside the U.S.A., which constituted a new geostrategy for it. As it was proved at the Chicago Technology Fair of May 1893, America was turning into a hi-tech giant of the world and new empire of the world following the Spanish-American War of 1898.

In this course, the contribution of labor unions and workers is undeniable. Influence of labor in American foreign policy can be separated into four major periods, which is the subject matter of this chapter: late 19th century marked by awakening and organization of working class; early 20th century U.S. foreign policy marked by labor radicalism in domestic policy; wartime consensus during 1939-1945 and agreement between government, unions and business sector, turning into tripartite solidarity, to be carried over to the post-war era; and last, anticommunism during post-1945.

First of all, during late 19th century, it will be seen that parallel to the industrialization, a working class came into being and forged to be unionized. Various craftsmen guilds, unions were incrementally put under federations; this or that way, they supported foreign policy or opposed. Yet, one thing was obvious that

¹⁵ Ibid., 616.

¹⁶ Michael Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1987).

labor started to play an important role in American foreign policy. Secondly, between 1890s and 1920s, the U.S. also witnessed the rise of labor radicalism, resulting in red-baiting especially during the term of President Woodrow Wilson. Some labor unions, sympathizing with socialism and Stalin had to make a decision. This period can be defined as the adolescence period, during which the unions were trying to establish their real identity. With this end, specific emphasis shall be put on President Woodrow Wilson era and Socialist Party.

Thirdly, another purpose of this part is also to illustrate that red-bait and anti-communism did not start solely after 1945 yet way before during early 20th century. The third phase of the labor and foreign policy is the World War II era, marked by solidarity between government, unions and business sector, urged by wartime mobilization. The fourth phase is initiated with the emergence of Cold War, which is the main setting and period for this thesis and Turkish case study. All these four phases were marked by one concept; American exceptionalism. According to the unions, as this was the case with the identity of Americans, they also held that American labor organization system was unique and had to be transposed to other countries in order to secure welfare of their own citizens.

2.2 Overview of American Exceptionalism

American exceptionalism or character stems from the American Revolution, based on antistatism, populism, egalitarianism, self-realization, liberal laissez-faire and individualism. Parallel to the building economic prosperity and the Open Door policy in late 19th century, America was forged to be the empire of the world; it did not emerge as an Empire in early 21st century, contrary to the common conviction today. Being an empire meant to have power, more and more mills turning, thereby

leading to the construction of an unchallenged huge political and economic system, the hands of which were almost everywhere. Undeniably, America followed a foreign policy based on commercialism and national interests. It intervened in Latin America and Far East as of late 19th century and got more and more involved in Europe during the World War I and II, to secure their economic interests, as a priority in foreign policy.

All these achievements were made possible thanks to American character. Between the 1860s and 1945, the journey of American unionization illustrates the reflection of this character. This observation is also the answer to why socialism could not survive in the U.S.A; because socialism was contradicting tenets of capitalism such as individualism, liberalism, self-realization, populism and antistatism. Post-World War II period is also marked by American exceptionalism. Basing on this feature, America felt an urge to redress Europe by providing economic assistance and by trading off its values to make the Democratic world more viable and to create a strong interlocutor in its commercial and political relations.

With these in mind, the USA created an aid plan, based on both political and economic interests. The edifice of a new Europe meant a viable economic counterpart for the USA while these countries would also remain in the sphere of American influence. In economic sense, the countries, which were able to smartly make use of it, benefited a lot to redress their economies; for those which could not do efficiently like Turkey, became more and more dependent on the USA. In either way, America had the best out of it. Before implementing the plan, the U.S. made efficient use of labor unions to win the working segments of these societies.

In the aftermath of the war, the fact that the Cold War emerged between the USA and the USSR made it necessary for America to redesign the labor movements in Europe and the Middle East in American way before the communist type of unionism became influential. With this aim, major activist of the American Federation of Labor, Irving Brown was charged with the duty of disseminating American way of union organization and the know-how through trainings and meetings with the unions and national authorities in Germany, France, Britain, Italy, Greece, Bulgaria, Turkey, Egypt, Korea and Iran. With vivid examples, the reader will be amazed by this lucid plan of action, which is inspired by the American exceptionalism regarding the American way superior to the communist one. Before moving onto the onset of the Cold War, it will be beneficial at first to have a closer look to the psychology, hard-work, history and the development of freedom of association of labor, turning into an important foreign policy actor.

2.3 American Labor and Foreign Policy: From Open Door to Cold War

Through industrialization, American search for order was completed in the continent; the domestic markets were entrenched and created a working class by 1900. The technological advancements, a wide web of railroads and innovations in the country made it superior to European countries in terms of economy. In that, as of the 1860s, when America started to produce more than the demand for goods in the market, it had to seek markets abroad. Industrial production based on consumption would either stop or would expand to other countries. As Senator of Alabama John T. Morgan warned in 1882:

Our home market is not equal to the demands of our producing and manufacturing classes and to the capital which is seeking

employment... We must either enlarge the field or our traffic or stop the business of manufacturing just where it is.¹⁷

Later, during the depression of the 1890s, Secretary of State Walter Gresham worried that the U.S. enterprises could not afford constant employment.¹⁸ He proposed that the government act immediately “to enable Americans to compete in foreign markets with Great Britain.”¹⁹

Organized labor, business and the governing elite in the United States have traditionally seen the third world as a source of raw materials useful in U.S. enterprises and as a market for goods produced by U.S. workers. Overseas investments were also regarded necessary to absorb the excess capital produced by businesses in the United States.²⁰

Without doubt, the Open Door policy enabled American expansion of corporate and political influence and U.S. unionists highly benefited from this policy because expansionism meant more mills running and new jobs were created. Foreign investments created profits that returned to the country, were invested in new domestic enterprises and helped maintain salaries and other benefits for workers. Raw materials obtained from foreign and overseas markets were the ingredients of a thriving U.S. manufacturing sector.²¹ Higher wages, benefits, salaries ensured job security, and laborers were able to enjoy national welfare. These were the payoffs for American workers, obtained through investments made in foreign markets and flow of natural resources.

¹⁷ Llyod C. Gardner, *Imperial America: American Foreign Policy Since 1898* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1976), 17.

¹⁸ Beth Sims, *Workers of the World Undermined: American Labor's Role in US Foreign Policy*, (Boston: South End Press, 1992), 7.

¹⁹ Walter LaFeber, *The New Empire*, (Ithaca: NY, Cornell University Press 1963), 200.

²⁰ Sims, 6.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

2.3.1. Unionization Movement and Major Labor Unions in the U.S.A Between the 1860s and 1945.

To begin with early labor unions' organization movement, it first started in the Gilded Age, which witnessed territorial, economic, industrial and demographic expansion between 1865 and 1901. First worker groups to get organized were railroad workers, locomotive firemen, and steel workers. The grouping of labor unions was based on wage-earning and the type of craft. General aim of early unions was to provide decent working conditions and hours in first place and in time, such organizations began to voice the demands of the workers.

At this stage, it is a must to briefly touch upon the significant labor union organizations, which were major actors in the field of labor. The first national labor federation of America was the National Labor Union, founded in 1866 and dissolved in 1872 and it is the core of the movement which paved the way for other organizations, such as the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor. In December 1869, the Knights of Labor union was founded by a group of Philadelphia tailors led by Uriah S. Stephens. The Knights grouped workers by industry, regardless of trade or skill or gender. Until the establishment of the American Federation of Labor in 1886, the Knights of Labor was the most active labor union. For the first time, a labor union organized nationwide campaigns for the following purposes-sometimes reaching an anarchist extent such as Hay Market Riot-²² and achieved these objectives to a large extent: shortening the hours of labor

²² On 1 May 1886, labor unions organized a strike for an eight-hour work day in Chicago, under the leadership of the Knights of Labor leading 80,000 people down Michigan Avenue, as the first May Day Parade. In the next few days, 350,000 workers nationwide joined the parade and went on strike at 1,200 factories. Though the causes of the incident are still unknown, the police killed two workers and wounded several during a skirmish and a couple of days later, on account of rage growing in Chicago, a bomb attack took place against the police by the workers, resulting in death of 8 police officers. On November 11, 1887, August Spies, Albert Parsons, Adolph Fischer, and George Engel, convicted by court, were hanged together in front of a public audience. This event cause the rejection of May Day

to an eight-hour day, ending the use of child labor, equal pay for equal work among the genders; the use of arbitration rather than strikes; the promotion of cooperative businesses. Knights had a reputation for being all-inclusive since it accepted women, blacks (after 1883), and employers as members.

In 1886, the American Federation of Labor was established in Columbus, Ohio by Samuel Gompers-president until his death in 1924- as an umbrella federation for craft unions in the U.S and the Knights of Labor lost its members to the AFL, from 1886 onwards. ²³ On December 1, 1873, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen was founded at Port Jervis, New York and the members were the skilled railroad workers. Initially, insurance benefits were the main incentive for membership, but by the late nineteenth century, the Brotherhood merged with the American Railway Union, established on June 20, 1893 and became more specialized in unionization.

International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, another significant labor union, was established in 1900 in New York City. In June 1905, the International Workers of the World was founded in Chicago at a convention where two hundred socialists, anarchists, and radical trade unionists from all over the United States (mainly the Western Federation of Miners) joined and objected to the policies of the American Federation of Labor.

Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) was a federation of unions that organized industrial workers in the United States and Canada, especially between 1935 and 1955. On account of presence of leftist unionists within itself, to some extent it lacked the support of the governments until 1955, which will be elaborated

as the Labor Day since it reminded of this radical movement and instead, every first Monday of September became the Labor Day, which is a federal holiday.

²³ Craft unionism means organization of workers in a specific industry according to particular craft or trade that they work in. It contrasts with industrial unionism, in which all workers in the same industry are organized into the same union, regardless of differences in skill.

in the Cold War relations part of this chapter. In 1955, the CIO merged with the AFL to constitute the AFL-CIO. In May 1935, the United Automobile Workers was founded in Detroit, Michigan as a reaction to the AFL policies and became an integral part of the CIO. Out of this many labor unions, only the AFL and the CIO were the most influential spokesmen of the workers during late 19th century and early 20th century.

Table 1. Major American labor unions and confederations

Name of the labor union/Federation	Date & Place	Characteristics
National Labor Union (NLU)	in 1866 and dissolving in 1872	first national labor federation in the U.S.A. Set example to the Knight of Labor and the American Federation of Labor
Knights of Labor	December 1869-1901; Chicago	founded in secrecy in December 1869, by a group of Philadelphia tailors led by Uriah S. Stephens. The Knights grouped workers by industry, regardless of trade or craft; totally dissolved in 1900 since members left it for the AFL as of 1886.
Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen (BLF)	December 1, 1873; Port Jervis,	
American Railway Union	New York June 20, 1893	Dissolved in 1897
American Federation of Labor (AFL)	Columbus, Ohio in 1886 by Samuel Gompers	Founded mainly by craft unions
International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union (ILGWU)	1900; New York City	Merged with Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union in 1995 to form the Union of Needle-trades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE)
International Workers of the World (IWW)	June 1905; Chicago, headquarters in Cincinnati, Ohio, USA	Had two hundred socialists, anarchists, and radical trade unionists from all over the United States (mainly the Western Federation of Miners) opposing to the policies of the American Federation of Labor
United Automobile Workers (UAW)	May 1935; Detroit, Michigan	Governed under the CIO till 1946 by John L. Lewis; Walter Reuther elected president in 1947 till 1970
Congress of Industrial	1935-1955; Chicago	A federation of unions that

Organizations (CIO)		organized industrial workers in the United States and Canada; merged with the AFL in 1955.
United Steelworkers of America (USW)	May 22, 1942; Pittsburg, Pennsylvania; founder Philip Murray	represents workers from the U.S. and Canada and workers from sectors such as metals, chemicals, glass, rubber, tires, transportation, utilities, container industries, pharmaceuticals and health care.

2.3.2. Rise of Labor Radicalism, Red-Scare and Red-Baiting, 1900-1930

The United States is regarded as an exceptional country, uniquely different from the traditional societies of the Old World. The term “*American exceptionalism*”, which underscores this difference, was widely discussed after World War I to search for the weakness of working-class radicalism in the United States. Furthermore, the *exceptionalism* issue gave rise to debates at the Comintern bodies in the 1920s, especially between Joseph Stalin and Jay Lovestone, the secretaries of the Soviet communist party and American socialist parties.²⁴ Although there was not a communist movement as strong as in the case of Russia, the emergence of the left movement at the heart of capitalist United States was unusual and the movement, which had its ups and downs, was doomed to fail. Nonetheless, it was on the rise on the eve of World War I and in the aftermath of World War II. What is significant about the left movement against Wilson’s decision of American involvement into World War I is that it led to the “*Red Scare*” and anti-communist psychology for the first time, in the country before the inception of the Cold War in 1945. Thus, the aim of this section is to analyze the influence of American Left movement on America and emergence of Red Scare during the 1910s and 1920s.

²⁴ Seymour Martin Lipset and Gary Marks, *It Did Not Happen Here: Why Socialism Failed in the United States* (New York: W.W.Norton and Co., 2000), 15

This section will illustrate why socialism could not survive in the USA and how the rise of the Left Movement, its inspiration by the Bolsheviks and its efforts to prevent conscription for World War I caused majority of public opinion to react against the Bolsheviks harshly in that American political will did not recognize the new government in Russia, coming to power in 1917. ²⁵

Rise of radical labor movement in the USA coincides with President Woodrow Wilson's term of office and his foreign policy especially concerning entry into World War I was highly challenged by the rising American Left while communism was gradually settling in power in Russia around late 1917. Though at the beginning, Wilson was inclined to remain neutral, upon the Zimmerman telegram and the increasing attacks towards American commercial ships, he decided to join the war in 1917. However, the American Leftists and leftist citizens, mostly from the working class of German, Scandinavian, Jewish and Eastern European immigrants robustly opposed American involvement since this would negatively affect the workers and it would not be appropriate to fight against their worker brothers in Germany. The Left movement, which illustrates how foreign and domestic policies are mutually inclusive, was not a phenomenon emerging all of a sudden on the eve of World War I, neither did the Red Scare psychology begin in 1945. As a corollary, the events of radical socialist movement developing among the labor unions in early 20th century created a communist scare and a protective psychology on the government's side.

As of late 19th century through the 1930s, working class and class consciousness was forged and highly influenced by Marx and socialism in Russia though it did not form into large scale socialism in America. Engels, Sombart, Marx,

²⁵ The USSR was recognized by F. D. Roosevelt in 1933.

Wells and many other sociologists or political theorists anticipated the establishment of a strong socialist movement or a viable left-wing working class party now that America was a leading industrial country. However, socialism could not grow deep roots and failed because socialism or fraternity of the proletariat was against the unique *American character* stemming from the Revolution, based on antistatism, populism, egalitarianism, self-realization, liberal laissez-faire and individualism.

Furthermore, America did not have a long established caste or class system, or peasantry as in Russia or in Europe. For instance, after Marx's death, Engels recognized that socialist movements were not emerging on a mass scale in the United States and attributed political backwardness of American workers to the absence of a feudal past.²⁶ As Alexis de Tocqueville pointed out, "the aristocratic element had been feeble from America's birth" and the traditional patterns of family and corporate authority of the Old World never managed to achieve any vigor in the New World.²⁷ America developed on a totally bourgeois basis. Social classes took course according to income level or to level of participation into national economy. Workers always had a chance to climb the ladders of the middle class. Nonetheless, socialism tried its chance twice: first, before America's entry into World War I under the leadership of Eugene Debs leading to the Red Scare, which shall be the subject matter of this section, and second, after World War II, which will be elaborated at the end of this chapter.

First of all, the reasons lying behind Wilson's decision regarding American involvement in the war, which caused the rise of the dormant Left movement, should be elaborated. It was Woodrow Wilson's fate to be the first U.S president to face the full blast of twentieth century revolutions. His responses made his policies the most

²⁶ Lipset, 21.

²⁷ Jack Greene, "The American Revolution and Modern Revolutions." in *Understanding the American Revolution* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), 383.

influential in twentieth century American foreign policy. “*Wilsonian*” became a term to describe later policies highlighting internationalism and moralism, aiming to extend democracy.²⁸

At the beginning, Wilson was against entering into war. However, a prewar suspicion of German militarism and autocratic government and the accounts of “uncivilized” German warfare influenced Wilson and many Americans to believe that the United States faced an evil world force and that in going to war with Germany, the nation would be striking a blow for liberty and democracy.²⁹ Furthermore, there was an increasing anti-war psychology from the ranks of immigrants and the socialists. Although in an economic sense America was not neutral, politically, Wilson took up active opposition to war to win reelection in 1916. In his presidential campaign, Democrats adopted the winning slogan “He Kept Us Out of War” in order to draw hundreds of thousands of votes away from the anti-war Socialist Party.³⁰ Yet, pretty soon, Wilson was to change his foreign policy and be challenged severely.

Cultural, political and economic factors had already made the impartiality of Wilson impossible. War time trade between the USA, France and Britain boomed and America was making \$3.2 billion in 1916 as opposed to \$824 million in 1914, while loans to the Allies exceeded \$2.5 billion and to the Central Powers only \$27 million, by 1917.³¹ Thus, America was already indirectly partial in an economic sense. The interception of the Zimmerman telegram in 1917 and German U-boat attacks to American commercial ships and Ally ships carrying American passengers

²⁸ Walter LaFeber, *The American Age: U.S Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad 1750 to the Present* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1994), 269-270).

²⁹ Ross Gregory, “Rights, Honor and Interests.” in *Major Problems in American Foreign Policy. Volume II: Since 1914* (Massachusetts: D.C Heath and Co., 1989), 58.

³⁰ August Heckscher, *Woodrow Wilson: Biography* (New York: MacMillan Co., 1991), 263 and Faragher et al., 675.

³¹ Faragher et al, 673-4.

between 1915 and 1916 just eased the process of American involvement into the war. The telegram was suggesting Mexico to take up arms against the US and receive in return the lost territory in New Mexico, Arizona and Texas:

It is our purpose on the 1st of February to commence the unrestricted U-boat war. The attempt will be made to keep America neutral in spite of all. In case, we should not be successful in this, we propose Mexico alliance upon following terms: Joint conduct of the war, joint conclusion of peace. Ample financial support and an agreement on our part that Mexico shall gain back by conquest the territory lost by her at a prior period in Texas, New Mexico and Arizona. Arrangement as to details is entrusted to you Excellency.³²

As it can be seen, in 1917, America was regarded by Germany as supporter of the Allies. In response, America broke diplomatic relations with Germany on February 1917 and President Wilson addressed the Congress immediately for permission to wage war against Germany:

It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful nation into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance... We shall fight for things which we have always carried nearest our hearts, -for democracy... for the rights and liberties of small nations... to make the world itself last free. To such a task, we can dedicate our lives and fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.³³

In his address, Wilson was expressing America's willingness to restore peace and balance of power in the world. The disclosure of the Zimmerman Telegram and President's address simultaneously caused both widespread pro-war and anti-war sensations in the society. On the one hand, anti-German feelings emerged and thousands of people, who had cultural ties with Britain and France joined pro-war

³² The Zimmerman Telegram in *Major Problems in American Foreign Policy, Volume II since 1914* (Massachusetts: D.C Heath and Co., 1989), 50.

³³ An Address to a Joint Session of Congress. 2 April 1917, 8.30 p.m. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 41, January 24-April 6, 1917 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 526-27.

demonstrations in New York, Boston and many other cities. Most newspapers, religious leaders, state legislatures, and prominent public figures supported the call to arms. However, Wilson was concerned about the reactions of ordinary people to fight in Europe. He engaged into war mobilization to unify the country and with this end, he established the Committee on Public Information to organize public opinion for universal military draft, as America was delayed entering the war due to lack of a concerted draft policy. For instance, Senator Paul Oscar Husting's letter to the President, dated April 27, 1917, was expressing this concern:

I had the honor of discussing with you the question of the advisability of raising troops by conscription or volunteering...It is plain from the statements of Senator Chamberlain and other that no soldiers can be put under conscription until about August 1. This means we shall lose the months of May, June and July when time seems to me to be of the very essence.³⁴

On the one hand, the anti-war senators and the Leftists were trying to delay conscription by organizing anti-draft demonstrations and distributing flyers. On the other hand, Wilson was enforcing the National War Labor Board to regulate labor force not to disrupt production and to arbitrate labor disputes or strikes. Samuel Gompers, pro-war head of the American Federation of Labors (AFL), provided a patriotic support while the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW or Wobblies) denounced capitalism as a system based on exploitation, and opposed US entry into the war. IWW leaders advised their members to refuse induction for the "capitalists' war".³⁵ So, Wilson held that the IWW was a subversive organization and a threat to national security.³⁶ Moreover, in farm communities and in urban working class neighborhoods, opposition to war was so widespread that in 1917 the White House

³⁴ From Paul Oscar Husting to President Woodrow Wilson. Washington D.C April 27, 1917). *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 42, April 7-June 23, 1917 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 146.

³⁵ Faragher et al, 682.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 666-667.

provided the initial funding for Samuel Gompers' pro-war Alliance for Labor and Democracy.³⁷ Wilson charged Samuel Gompers, head of the AFL, to chair the Nation War Labor Board in April 1918. By the same token, the IWW grew in the West in 1916 and 1917 and gained strength among workers in domains vital to war such as copper mining, lumbering and wheat harvesting. Upon strike organization efforts of the IWW in Bisbee and many other places, the Justice Department agents organized raids against them and arrested hundreds of activists, ultimately leading to the beginning of a powerful wave of political repression.³⁸

With some exceptions and defections, the American Left strongly opposed World War I and Wilson's foreign policy, "as a capitalistic, imperialistic power that was fighting in the name of superannuated nationalism."³⁹ Nonetheless, America's entry into war led to dissidence in the American Left between the ones who believed after all that England was preferable to "feudal" Germany and those who could see no difference to the working class between one oppressor or another. Finally, some socialists like William Walling, Upton Sinclair and A.M Simons left the Socialist position to support Woodrow Wilson.⁴⁰ Yet, the majority of the Left held that it would be murder to fight against their proletariat brothers and all workers in the world were comrades. Debs voiced this concern in a militant way in his Canton, Ohio speech on June 16, 1918, and stated that "the master class has always declared wars; the subject class had always fought the battles"⁴¹ while American socialists' "hearts were with the Bolsheviki of Russia for their incomparable valor and sacrifice

³⁷ Nick Salvatore, *Eugene V. Debs: Citizen and Socialist, Biography* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1982), 281.

³⁸ Faragher et al, 682.

³⁹ Loren Baritz, *The American Left: Radical Political Thought in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Basic Books, 1971), 107.

⁴⁰ Baritz, 107.

⁴¹ Robert D. Schulzinger, *U.S Diplomacy Since 1900* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 93.

added luster to the fame of the international movement.”⁴² The international working class had everything to lose and nothing to gain from this war exercised in greed and violence. This conviction was clearly stated at War Proclamation and Program Adopted at National Convention by the Socialist Party at St. Louis during the Convention on April 1917.

Modern wars as a rule have been caused by the commercial and financial rivalry and intrigues of capitalist interests in the different countries. Whether they have been frankly waged as wars of aggression or have been hypocritically represented as wars of defense, they have always been made by the classes and fought by the masses...Our entrance into the European War was instigated by the predatory capitalists in the United States who boast of the enormous profit of \$7,000,000,000 from the manufacture and sale of munitions and war supplies and from the exportation of American food stuffs and other necessaries...The war of the United States against Germany cannot be justified even on the plea that it is a war in defense of American rights or American “honor.” ...The danger of recurrence of war will exist as long as the capitalist system of industry remains in existence.⁴³

According to the American socialists’ rhetoric, millions of workers would die, millions would be hurt and the outcome would retard the social and political liberation of oppressed classes all over the world.⁴⁴ With this end, the Socialist Party engaged anti-draft campaigns. Flyers and pamphlets were distributed and demonstrations were organized. To illustrate, the below cited flyer circulated by anonymous anarchists appealed to the individual’s conscience to refuse induction into the military:

You are against murder and bloodshed; you have no special grievances against the working class of Germany. All you ask for is to get along peacefully, express yourself, make a living and take care of your family. You do not want war and you did not ask the president or any one else to declare war. But you will ask: What can I do if I am

⁴² Salvatore, 292.

⁴³ “War Proclamation and Program Adopted at National Convention, Socialist Party, St Louis, Mo., April 1917.” In New York Senate, Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities. *Revolutionary Radicalism*, part 1, “Revolutionary and Subversive Movements Abroad and at Home” 1 (Albany, 1920), 613-618.

⁴⁴ Baritz, 107.

drafted and ordered to fight?...You would probably be killed and your family would suffer...You have a mind and a conscience and you believe in brotherhood and real democracy. If you think murder is wrong, REFUSE TO JOIN THE ARMY or any military body...No matter what the government of other fellows does, let us you and I be faithful to mankind and REFUSE TO GO TO WAR.⁴⁵

Such seditious flyers and pamphlets frustrated Wilson; however, he had to wait for the aftermath of the war to punish such seditious activities. His primary objective was first to unite the Americans around a single cause: entry into war. On the other hand, the anti-war Leftist movement had so much appeal among the working class and towns, cities inhabited by especially immigrants that Eugene Debs ranked in third place at the presidential elections of 1904 (402,283 votes), 1908 (420,793 votes), 1912 (900,672 votes) and 1920 (919,799 votes). As it can be seen, his votes increased in 1912 and 1920 in a dramatic way parallel to the rise of labor radicalism circa World War I. Debs was regarded among three men in America, who had a special persona beside Wilson and Roosevelt.⁴⁶ There was a growing anti-war opinion among immigrants, who constituted one-third out of 92 million population and endorsed the Left Movement. Strong support for the Central Powers was found among the eight million German Americans in the Mid-West and South as well as the four million Irish Americans, who shared their ancestral homeland's historical hatred of English rule.⁴⁷

The socialist party made its biggest gains during the war in its strongest urban center, Milwaukee. The party won some electoral offices in the city as of 1904,

⁴⁵ "Refuse to Kill or Be Killed." New York Senate, Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities. *Revolutionary Radicalism*, part 1, "Revolutionary and Subversive Movements Abroad and at Home" 1 (Albany, 1920), 854-855.

⁴⁶ From Allen W. Ricker to Colonel Edward Mandell House. New York April 30, 1918. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 47, March 13-May 12, 1918 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983) 471

⁴⁷ Faragher et al, 673.

including state legislature and municipalities.⁴⁸ Germans in Milwaukee, Scandinavians in Minneapolis; Jews, Germans and Irish in New York were antagonistic to American involvement on the side of the Allies.⁴⁹ Henry Morgenthau, who was a former U.S. ambassador to the Ottoman Empire between 1913 and 1916 and called back to the U.S. because of war, expressed his deep concerns about the past antiwar stance in New York as it follows in his letter to the President on November 26, 1917:

The growing anti-war sentiment in New York should be fought as vigorously as possible. I addressed great many large and small meetings and mixed with Democrats, Independents and Socialists. I was greatly discouraged at the amount of outright opposition and the tremendous indifference to the war as well as the lack of enthusiasm among the mass of those who are supporting the war.⁵⁰

Thus, it was hard for the government to convince public opinion. In all these communities, the Socialist Party had close relationships with many ethnic-linked unions whereas support to the Party fell in smaller and rural communities where social pressure could be more coercive.⁵¹ Moreover, the American “participation into the World War I had a beneficial effect on trade unions, In the course of the war, the membership of the American Federation of Labor doubled and the government recognized the impossibility of winning the war without an effective mobilization of the labor forces.”⁵² As far as general dissidence was concerned, the Socialist Party became an anti-war platform of the pacifists and socialist working class.

⁴⁸ Lipset, 245.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 250-1.

⁵⁰ “From Henry Morgenthau to President Woodrow Wilson.” November 26, 1917. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 45, November 11-January 15, 1918. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 123.

⁵¹ Lipset, 215.

⁵² Jay Lovestone, “The Grand Offensive Against the Workers. In *The Government-Strikebreaker: The Study of the Role of the Government in the Recent Industrial Crisis*. (New York: Workers Party of American, 1923), 9-16. in Loren Baritz.

Meanwhile, the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917 became influential in American involvement in the war and Red-baiting at home. After the Bolshevik Revolution took place in Russia, radicals around the world drew inspiration from the first successful revolution against a capitalist state.⁵³ Likewise, American socialist rhetoric was abundant in expression of such an inspiration, too:

The kind of a revolution we need first is a revolution in the minds of men and women. Economic development always makes physical conditions ripe for a change long before the brains of human being catch up with the process. From what we know, we could sweep away capitalism tomorrow if the working people were mentally prepared to do it. We all hope for the best in Russia. The unit of the new society will be not the municipal council, not the political cabinet, not even the Socialist party branch, but the labor union.⁵⁴

The statement illustrates that revolution would be possible in America through an economic revolution followed a political one basing on labor unions.

Although sympathetic to the March Revolution overthrowing czar, President Wilson refused to recognize the authority of the Bolshevik regime when he received reports of the ferocity of the civil war in Russia.⁵⁵ For instance, Samuel Reading Bertorn's letter to the President dated December 14, 1917 mentioned the gravity of the situation in Russia:

The Situation in Russia with its all chaos, conflicting aims and movements, threat of civil war and irreparable action is of greatest complexity and pregnant of the greatest dangers...Despite the fact that the doings of the Bolsheviki cannot be recognized as binding and representative of Russia's aims.⁵⁶

⁵³ Faragher et al, 688.

⁵⁴ Philips Russel, "Thoughts about Russia." *International Socialist Review*, 18, no. 1 (July 7, 1917), 21.

⁵⁵ Melvyn Leffler. *Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1994), 11.

⁵⁶ "From Joseph Patrick Tumult with Enclosure to the President." December 14, 1917. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 45, November 11-January 15, 1918 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 288.

This excerpt illustrates hints for the inclination of Wilson not to recognize the Bolshevik government. Furthermore, Robert Lansing, Secretary of State during World War I, was also reporting about atrocities engaged in Russia by the Bolsheviks in his telegram dated September 18, 1918:

In view of telegrams received yesterday revealing that a state of terrorism exists in Moscow and Petrograd through which thousands of innocent Russian citizens are being killed, it occurs to me that it might be desirable for this government to do what it can to prevent a continuance of this terrible state of affairs.⁵⁷

Beside such reports and the spread of revolutionary fervor abroad, Wilson's ideological animus toward Bolshevism grew. According to Wilson, Bolshevism represented a threat to the liberal-capitalist values, constituting the basis of America's moral, material power and the Fourteen Points.⁵⁸ In the mean time, there was a common conviction that the new government in Russia was precarious. In the two years following the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, the *New York Times* predicted, in ninety one editorials, the collapse or near-collapse of the Soviet communism.⁵⁹

The violent events and strikes before and during the war in the U.S.A. confirmed Wilson's concerns. For instance, the Communist Party Manifesto and Program, which had aspirations to the Russian Communism lucidly summarizes the views of the Leftists in America:

The world is on the verge of a new era. Europe is in revolt. The masses of Asia are stirring uneasily. Capitalism is in collapse. The workers of the world are seeing a new life and securing new courage. Out of night of war is coming a new day. The specter of Communism haunts the world of capitalism. Communism, hope of the workers to end misery and oppression. The workers of Russia smashed the front of Capitalism and Imperialism. They broke the chains of the terrible

⁵⁷ "From Robert Lansing with Enclosure to President Woodrow Wilson." Washington September 18, 1918. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 51, September 14-November 8, 1918 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 61-62)

⁵⁸ Faragher et al, 691.

⁵⁹ John Patrick Diggins, *The Rise and Fall of the American Left*, (New York: W.W.Norton and Company, 1992), 149.

war; and in the midst of agony, starvation and the attacks of the capitalists of the world, they are creating a new social order. ..Everywhere the workers are in a desperate struggle against their capitalists masters. The call to action had come. The workers must answer!!!...The Communist Party proposes to end capitalism and organize a workers' industrial republic.⁶⁰

The call for insurgence worried many conservatives for fear that similar revolutions might be imminent. While the peacemakers were arguing over the treaty with Germany and pondering over how to stop the spread of Bolshevism, the Red Scare erupted in the United States. The Bolshevik Revolution of November 1917 gave impetus to the wartime fear of radicalism and enabled conservatives to carry it over to the postwar Red Scare of 1919-20. Fear of Bolshevism was made more acute by a series of strikes and race riots in 1919 and gave focus by bombings in the U.S by extreme radicals.⁶¹

The war bred an aroused nationalism and ordinary Americans began to think about sabotage and subversion. Patriotic groups, veteran organizations, business associations, and the Catholic Church wanted to root out domestic Communism and all other forms of radicalism.⁶² Within this context, between 1918 and 1920, the Wilson administration organized an oppressive antiradical campaign, to eliminate Red Scare. This is an important period in Progressive era because although the social history of American workers and their families is an important focus for labor historians, scholars have rediscovered the role of the state in the 1990s as agent of repression and change and as regulator and administrator of the work environment.⁶³

During the period before and after World War I, attacks upon radical, pacifist and at times even liberal groups began directly. With the passage of the Espionage

⁶⁰ "The Communist Party Manifesto and Program". *The Communist* 1, no.1 (27 September 1919): 6-9.

⁶¹ Kendrick A. Clements. *Woodrow Wilson: World Statesman*. (Chicago: G.K. Hall, 1999), p. 175.

⁶² Leffler, 14.

⁶³ Eileen Boris and Nelson Lichtenstein "Labor and the State." *Major Problems in the History of American Workers*. (Massachusetts: D.C Heath and Co., 1991).

Act of June 15, 1917, the repression of dissident movements became an explicit policy of the Wilson Administration.⁶⁴ Furthermore, thirty five states passed sedition laws, banned display of red flags, and investigated radicals.⁶⁵ In 1918, the Espionage and Sedition Acts, outlawing any disloyal, profane, scurrilous or abusive language intended to cause contempt; scorn or disrepute to the government, the Constitution or the flag intensified repression of the Socialist Party.⁶⁶ The government, endorsed by business leaders, attacked the Socialists' antiwar stance as un-American. Hundreds of socialist leaders and other radicals were convicted for sedition and antiwar activities. Party newspapers across the country were suppressed and barred from mails, on account of Red Scare and a possible uprising against the Wilson Administration. Strikes, antiwar agitation, racial disturbances were increasingly blamed on foreign radicals and alien ideologies, betraying American values and institutions.⁶⁷ Pro-German sentiment, socialism, the IWW and trade unionism in general were regarded as a threat and the accusation of Bolshevism was used as a strong weapon for turning public opinion against strikers and political dissenters.⁶⁸

As a corollary, Wilson kept pursuing Red-baiting at a larger scale specifically after World War I.⁶⁹ The Open-Shop strike of 1920 and 1922⁷⁰, the Steel and Mine Strikes of 1919 and the vicious "Red Raids" of 1920 allowed the Government to prepare the ground for the country wide attack on the working class.⁷¹ Labeling opponents as Red or Bolshevik for the first time started with Woodrow Wilson. For example, in his campaign for Senate ratification of the Treaty of Versailles and the

⁶⁴ Lipset, 244.

⁶⁵ Leffler, 14.

⁶⁶ Espionage Act. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 47, March 13-May 12, 1918 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983) 365.

⁶⁷ Leffler, 15.

⁶⁸ Faragher et al, 692.

⁶⁹ Joseph G. Rayback, *A History of American Labor*, (New York: The Free Press, 1966), 249.

⁷⁰ Colin J. Davis, *Power at Odds: The 1922 National Railroad Shopmen's Strike*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997).

⁷¹ Lovestone in Baritz.

League of Nations, he called his opponents Bolsheviks, whose ideology was based on conflict, poverty and inequality.⁷² Furthermore, he linked ongoing strikes to the events in Russia and equated American radicals with Russian Bolsheviks.⁷³ For this reason, Wilson did not recognize the government in Russia.

In conjunction with the Espionage and Sedition Acts, more than 2100 cases were brought to trial in the United States. Socialists, pacifists, radical laborers and anyone resisting the patriotism were tried.⁷⁴ During the Red Scare of 1919 and the early 1920s, the membership of both communist parties declined dramatically since wartime espionage and sedition acts were now used against communists and anarchists as Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer directed unannounced raids against their homes and headquarters.⁷⁵ The most prominent prosecution was that of Eugene Debs on June 1918 on account of his antiwar speech in Canton, Ohio. Even when he was sentenced to ten years, he stated that he was accused of having obstructed the war and he admitted it because he abhorred war and would oppose the war if he stood alone. Debs served thirty two months until he was pardoned by President Warren G. Harding in 1921. In the spring and summer of 1919, several bombings took place. In return, federal officials organized raids to root out subversives of the IWW and their alleged Russian connections at the Union of Russian Workers.⁷⁶ Thousands of people were arrested for being Communist. Many of the arrested people were flagrantly labeled as illegal and 840 people were deported.⁷⁷

⁷² Leffler, 18.

⁷³ Ibid., 15.

⁷⁴ Faragher et al, 687.

⁷⁵ Diggins, 111.

⁷⁶ Faragher et al, 692.

⁷⁷ Clements, 175.

Consequently, the Great War created economic, social and political dislocations that reshaped American life. On the one hand, the rise of American left challenged U.S. foreign policy and influenced America's attitude towards Bolshevism and involvement into World War I through anti-war and anti-conscription campaigns. On the other hand, the right wing of labor, the American Federation of Labor, supported the national foreign policy. Without doubt, foreign policy had repercussions in domestic policy. Patriotic fervor and the exaggerated specter of Bolshevism were used to repress radicalism, organized labor, feminism, and the entire legacy of progressive reform.⁷⁸ What was significant about the Wilsonian foreign policy was that it was antagonized by the Reds under the umbrella of the Socialist Party in the United States, for the first time. It tried to delay conscription by anti-war demonstrations and speeches. The Leftist movement, at the heart of capitalism, made its biggest strike to come to power through elections and found great appeal among the pacifists. In addition, it dexterously made use of anti-war stance of the immigrants. However, to make an overall assessment, as Herman Kayserling and Len Samson, argued the movement was short-lived between two world wars because the social content of socialism, with the big exception of property relations, is similar to what Americans think that they already have such as a democratic, socially classless, anti-elitist society.⁷⁹ Furthermore, Wilson and many ordinary Americans made associations between Bolshevism and the rhetoric of the Socialist Party and concluded that what they suggest was totally against the very nature of American *character* and institutions. Left Movement and immigrants, supporting it, were perceived as un-American and disloyal. For this reason, nationwide Red-baiting was initiated and thousands were arrested for un-American

⁷⁸ Faragher et al, 693.

⁷⁹ Lipset, 30.

deeds. Consequently, the Left movement was curbed down until the emergence of the Cold War after World War II.

Woodrow Wilson's universalism, though it remained utopian managed to emphasize that the world was in need of an international institution. According to Wilson's doctrine expressed in the Fourteen Points, freedom of markets was wedded to political democracy and the self-determination of peoples, merging the ambitions of American ideals and interests with a concept of global peace and stability.⁸⁰ That's why, his global strategy was transposed into his domestic policy to curb down the radical labor movements and to enhance rapprochement with the right wing of labor, represented by the AFL. Wilson's ideology concerning the protection of freedom of markets and welfare of American society at the global level was also pursued by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

As to Franklin D. Roosevelt's⁸¹ vision, these were the fundamental ideals interests to protect American economy and for that reason, any recession or disturbance caused by wars should have been avoided. For this reason, Roosevelt's efforts were directed to construct a mechanism for security policy based on the United Nations and his basic assumption was that if there was an unimpeded increase in international trade, then the peace would be long-lasting.⁸²

On the other hand, Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized the USSR in 1933 and opened the diplomatic relations since Russia became the largest buyer of American industrial equipments as well as agricultural products and Roosevelt wanted to surround Russia in America's policy about Cuba. However, the AFL leaders opposed to American recognition of Russia, which had an ideology in breach of American

⁸⁰ Federico Romero, *The United States and the European Trade Union Movement, 1944-1951*. (Chapel Hill: University of Carolina Press, 1992), 4.

⁸¹ Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President between 1933 and 1945.

⁸² Romero, 4.

liberalism and capitalism. They refused to have any relations with Soviet trade unions or to send a delegation to the USSR to inspect their conditions. During the 1920s and the 1930s, some labor unions lost members on account of dual unionism, manipulation of workers by employers leading to yellow unionization. During this two decades, the attacks on labor accompanied by the anti-red hysteria inaugurated by 'the American Plan', aiming to replace the legitimate unions with company unions. Without doubt, this system put the unionist under the restriction of the employers and the 'Yellow Dog' system (individual contract) system turned into a substitute for collective bargaining.⁸³ Until the market crash of 1929, the unions lost half of their 5,000,000 members. The initiation of the Great Depression turned the labor unions into skeletons. Workers wanting to go on strike for threatening to be expelled from their workplace or to be replaced by African-American workers; some were beaten, or they were controlled by selling jobs, kickbacks and extortion from employers for strike insurance and sweetheart contracts.⁸⁴

In the ranks of the AFL, it became common to label their opponents as Communist. As of the 1920s, basing on the Wilsonian experience, some union constitutions began to include provisions barring Communists or persons associating with Communists from membership or denying their rights to run for office.⁸⁵ However, the tactic of labeling all opponents as Communists became a practical weapon to combat advocates of progressive reforms and challenges to leadership that were not related with Communism at all.⁸⁶

To conclude so far, the red-scare emerged in early 20th century and paved way to radicalism during President Woodrow Wilson's term. After 1920, nation-

⁸³ George Morris, *The CIA and American Labor: the Subversion of the AFL-CIO's Foreign Policy* (New York: International Publishers, 1967), 38-39.

⁸⁴ Morris, 41.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 45

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 46.

wide red-bait was initiated in that even the labor unions were labeling each other as being red. Hence, the unity of labor unions was challenged ideologically for the first time. On the other hand, the economic depression of the 1930s caused distress among the workers and the unions. The New Deal was a testing period for the unions and it was a matter of life or death. Some of the unions got closed on account of financial crisis while some survived. For this reason, the mobility spirit of the country united all different fronts of thoughts during World War II as well as the workers and the Great Depression memories faded away.

2.4. Conclusion

As it can be seen above, as of late 19th century, the labor unions had been interested in foreign policy of their country. The doctrines such as Manifest Destiny, the Monroe Doctrine and Open Door laid the foundation for American expansionism both in terms of territory and sphere of influence. American foreign affairs in general had been governed by essentially expansionist assumptions as America competed with the colonial powers toward the turn of the 20th century. The idea of expansion as the ‘destiny’ of American democracy was linked to the country’s financial and industrial establishment, advocating free trade and the opening of international markets as the nation’s primary historical interest.⁸⁷ Democrats, Republicans, big labor and businesses that could profit by U.S. internationalism tended to support such expansion. Except the opposition to outright annexation of Hawaii, the AFL, in general, supported American adventures abroad while the CIO’s left wing stood

⁸⁷ Romero, 4.

against American foreign policy and the right wing of the CIO was supportive of U.S. governments.⁸⁸

Bipartisan agreement between labor unions and government emerged in late 19th century. Both the AFL and the CIO assumed a uniquely important role in U.S. expansionism, fueled by this consensus, which has characterized most of the U.S. foreign policy since the late 1890s.⁸⁹ Both federations had a sober sense of mission about American responsibilities regarding the struggling democracies elsewhere.⁹⁰ Top AFL leaders including Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell of the United Mine Workers and Daniel J. Keefe of the International Longshoremen, Marine and Transport Workers' Union- had established a labor-business coalition. These industrialists served on the National Civic Federation (NCF), with key members of American industrialists and financial elite. The NCF was established as a tripartite body in 1900 aiming to reduce conflict between employers and workers in the capitalist economy. In exchange for giving up radical demands for supporting the capitalists system, the unions represented in the NCF won recognition of their organizations. Hence, they obtained material and political gains. Among the employers represented at the NFC, there were notorious union-busters such as Mark Hanna, J. Ogden Armour (whose workers were defined as white slaves by the AFL investigation committee) and Cyrus H. McCormick.⁹¹ Thus, involvement of labor in American foreign policy illustrates how wide the scope of the U.S. globalism was.

⁸⁸ Phillip Foner. *U.S. Labor Movement and Latin America: A History of Workers' Response to Intervention; Vol. I 1846-1919*, (South Hadley, Mass: Bergin & Garvey, 1988), 3-10.

⁸⁹ Sims, 12.

⁹⁰ The Commitment to Democracy (Washington: American Political Foundation, undated), 46 in Beth Sims.

⁹¹ Labor, business and government cooperation became a subject highly elaborated in the literature. Following works also confirm the fact that such a tripartite cooperation aimed at curbing down American radicalism and curbing it down to remain within the confines of American character. Gordon M. Jensen. "The National Civic Federation: American Business in an Age of Social Change and Social Reform, 1900-1910" (Ph.D. dissertation, 1956); Philip S. Foner. *U.S. Labor Movement and Latin America*. (South Hadley, Mass. : Bergin & Garvey, 1988), 49-50.; Philip S. Foner. *History of Labor*

CHAPTER III

EARLY COLD WAR: TRUMAN DOCTRINE, THE MARSHALL PLAN AND LABOR

3.1. Introduction

The period of 1945 and 1949 has been a turning point in the history of the world since it marks the end of World War II and establishment of a new world order, which began to be shaped by bipolarized superpowers, the US and the USSR. This also illustrates how the world turned into a chess-board altered by these two foes' strategies until the 1990s. Thus, the aim of this chapter; after providing a general perspective on the emergence of Cold War, including its origins and past grievances, post-World War II labor union cooperation, international labor organizations, anti-Communism, the AFL-CIO' leading unionists and Irving Brown's international strategy will be explained. The indoctrination of American policy through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan covering not only military, economic but also social assistance components, including labor, will be explained. The chapter aims to conclude and illustrate that labor was an intrinsic Cold War value.

3.2. Prelude on the Origins of Cold War

Concerns about the communism appeared in the US in early 20th century; however, the ideological concerns took shape when the USSR put much of Eastern

Movements in the United States. Vol.3. (New York: International Publishers, 1975); Philip S. Foner. *The Policies and Practices of the American Federation of Labor, 1900-1909*. (New York: International Publishers, 1964), pp. 65-110; James Weinstein. *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State, 1900-1918*. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968).

Europe under its sphere of influence after defeating Germany from 1945 onwards.⁹² Between 1945 and 1949, the US incrementally began to assume the role of a hegemon, in the aftermath of the Second World War because Russia, devastated by war, was casting ideological threat to the world. To understand the origins of the Cold War era, what caused two parties to suspect each other before 1945 should be mentioned.

During World War I, a large part of Russia was under German occupation and national minorities were fighting each other for autonomy in today's Ukraine, Moldova and Eastern Europe. In the meantime, Russia was suffering from drastic famine and poverty. Thus, the Bolshevik government needed humanitarian aid and saw that they should get on well with the West and the US.

In 1919, while peacemakers were arguing over a peace treaty with Germany and thinking on how to stop the spread of Bolshevism, Red Scare erupted in the US because the Russian Revolution and the Communist risings in central and Eastern Europe scared the American radicals and conservatives.⁹³

In 1921, The US Congress responded to Russia's call for aid and provided assistance in the amount of \$20 million. However, President Wilson had antipathy towards the Bolshevik government because Lenin disbanded the Constituent Assembly, the most democratically elected body in Russia, because of loss of seats in the Assembly.⁹⁴ Furthermore, Lenin refused to pay off the debts of the former Russian governments to the US. For these two reasons, Wilson did not want to recognize the Bolshevik government. He knew that Bolshevik domestic policy would fail and it did leading to famine; but, Wilson was scared that their rhetoric would

⁹² Leffler, preface.

⁹³ Ibid., 9-10.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 7.

capture the Europeans and erode the Allied support for the war.⁹⁵ So, as of the 1920s, anti-bolshevism was instilled in the US since it was believed that Bolshevism's roots were conflict, poverty and inequality.⁹⁶ In 1933, the Bolshevik government was finally officially recognized.

During World War II, Stalin waged war against Germany, occupying its territories and defeated Hitler's army, with the support of the US, France and Britain. Meanwhile, Harry Truman succeeded Franklin D. Roosevelt as president before the end of the war.

Towards the end of World War II, the allies convened to discuss the shape and future of Europe. The Yalta Conference was the wartime meeting over February 4 to 11, 1945 between the heads of government of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The delegations were headed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin respectively. At the end of the War, the Potsdam Conference was held in Potsdam, Germany from July 17 to August 2, 1945. The participants were the victorious allies, who were to decide how to administer Germany, which had unconditionally surrendered nine weeks earlier. Participants were the United States (President Harry S. Truman), the Soviet Union (Joseph Stalin), and United Kingdom (Winston Churchill and later Clement Attlee). The Potsdam Agreement envisaged the division of Germany and Austria into four occupation zones (agreed on earlier at the Yalta Conference), and the similar division of Berlin and Vienna into four zones.

The Soviet Union's aggressive, antidemocratic policy toward Eastern Europe had created tensions even before the war ended. Therefore, the western allies were suspicious of the motives of Stalin, who had already encouraged satellite communist

⁹⁵ Ibid., 8.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 18.

governments in the eastern European countries under his influence; the Potsdam conference turned out to be the last conference among the allies. During the conference, Truman told Stalin about his powerful new weapon. Stalin, of course, knew already about the atomic bomb through his spies in the Manhattan project. Toward the end of the conference, Japan was given an ultimatum. Though Japan was inclined to give up the war, the US dropped the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which can be interpreted as a warning message to the communist Russia. As a corollary, Stalin sensed that the US was hardening its position.⁹⁷ At the end of World War II, Stalin realized that achievements of his goals –territorial gains, national reconstructionism and control over the Eastern Europe and Japan-, depended on a cooperation with the Allies. Thus, Stalin would be able to get reparations from Germany and protect his interest in the Ruhr region, rich in coal, steel, metallurgy and chemical industries. On the other hand, Stalin would not compromise his basic territorial rights and he wanted to create a sphere of political influence in the Eastern Europe and control Germany and Japan.

Stalin had to be friendly toward the West but in the mean time, wanted to implement his policy of influence shrewdly. For instance, Stalin promised Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference of February 1945 that he would declare war on Japan to eliminate its threat to Asia. However, the fears of the US were verified because on August 1945, Russian armies attacked and took over Manchuria and occupied Northern Korea; and immediately, Russia began to support communist movements, in these countries. Furthermore, seeing that his country was vulnerable in the South, Stalin had to safeguard his periphery. He wanted to control traffic through the Turkish Straits into the Black Sea and sought naval bases, air-transit rights and

⁹⁷ Ibid., 40.

petroleum concessions from Iran.⁹⁸ For instance, Russia had already sent its first note in 1939 to Turkey expressing Russia's territorial and security claims.

The first conflict between the US and the USSR occurred over Poland and free elections were supposed to be held in Poland in accordance with the Yalta Conference. Yet, Russia manipulated the elections and took Poland under its preponderance. However, Poland was highly important for the allies since it constituted a buffer zone against Russia and Poland's security was a matter of life and death. Yet, it was too late and Poland became Russia's domain. Furthermore, Stalin started to take over Eastern Europe as of 1945 and denied national autonomy to Romania, Poland and Bulgaria. Stalin supported the communist parties in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, which later refused to act in accordance with Stalin's demands. In so doing, Stalin's true aim was to get foreign communist parties' support to serve the interests of the communist Russia. This also illustrated the fragility of democratic institutions and the weakness of democratic parties in Europe.⁹⁹ In addition, Stalin furthered his assertions with his demands on Turkey.¹⁰⁰ Thus, the wartime alliance ended, and the Cold War began. The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the initiatives in Germany were decisive moves in the development of the Cold War.

Stalin for the first time expressed in his famous speech of February 1946 that the war had arisen as the inevitable result of the development of world economic and political forces on the basis of monopoly capitalism. Although later on Stalin expressed that he was for ideological co-existence of capitalism and communism in the world, he always kept his suspicions and concerns against the US and believed that a conflict with the West was imminent. Meanwhile, George Kennan, a top

⁹⁸ Ibid., 38-9.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 76.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 75.

official at the U.S. embassy in Moscow, stated in a long telegram he sent to the State Department in 1946 that the US should pursue a containment policy against Russia since it was becoming more and more expansionist.

From the standpoint of Stalin, he was frustrated at the policies of the West and reasons for expansionism. For instance, he was indignant at Western intervention on behalf of the White Russians during the Russian Civil War of 1918-21. He also believed that capitalism encouraged Hitler to attack Russia on 22 June 1941. Furthermore, he protested the delay of the Western forces to the second front during war. Stalin was exasperated by the West's attempts to limit German reparations to be made to Russia in return for the damages the Germans caused during World War II.¹⁰¹ Ultimately, the development of atomic bombs and American atomic monopoly, which was demonstrated in Hiroshima and Nagasaki endangered Soviet security.

By mid-1947, communism was viewed as an ideological threat by the Americans and the actions of America came into being as a result of concerns about the USSR's chance of manipulating the power vacuum, worldwide financial hardships, exchange controls, emergence of popular Communist parties especially in China, Vietnam and Eastern Europe. As a reaction to the increasing tension created by dissemination of Russia's communism in Poland, Germany and Asia, the US aimed to contain the Soviet influence and communism.

With this end, the officials in Washington sought not only to generate a cold war consensus at home but also to organize most of the world into an American-led orbit. Incrementally, the US had an unprecedented leadership role in the international arena.¹⁰² At home, anti-communist campaigns were supported. For instance, the House of Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) was established to search pro-

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 41-2.

¹⁰² Ibid., viii.

communist activities and activists. The HUAC especially investigated the Hollywood industry in late 1947, which attracted the public attention to a great extent. On the other hand, the businessmen associations and politicians were attacking the workers' unions and the civil rights advocates. Ultimately, The Truman administration managed to incorporate the support of the Americans from different regions, social strata and economic backgrounds against communism and Russia. Furthermore, the US assumed a role of hegemon and responsibility for rebuilding Europe, ensuring the security of its friends and overseeing the functioning of the world economy.¹⁰³ After cultivating the domestic constituencies, Truman worked hard to gain international acceptance of anti-communist American foreign policy and did this through persuasion, inducements and financial leverage.¹⁰⁴

For this purpose the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan were introduced in 1947. The concerns both the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan were based on was the fact that the communists were on the verge of seizing power in France, Italy and Greece. If the communists came to power, then, the USSR's influence in Europe would create totalitarian regimes and bind their economy.

Harry Truman stated at Congress on March 12, 1947 that with *Truman Doctrine*, the United States would support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. The doctrine was specifically aimed at assisting governments resisting communism such as Greece and Turkey, who did not receive the aid that they needed, they would inevitably fall to communism with the result being a domino effect of acceptance of communism. Truman signed the act into law on May 22, 1947 which granted \$400 millions in

¹⁰³ Ibid., 80-3.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 81.

military and economic aid to Turkey and Greece. So, it can be said that the Truman Doctrine was what American policy to be pursued would be.

On June 1947, the Marshall Plan followed aiming the reconstruction of Europe in the aftermath of World War II. Marshall asked troubled European nations to draw up a program to prevent hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos. The Soviets participated in the first planning meeting, then departed rather than share economic data on their resources and problems, and submit to Western controls on the expenditure of the aid. The remaining 16 nations requested reaching \$17 millions for a four-year period and in early 1948 Congress voted to assist European economic recovery.

The key geographic area that brought America and Russia *face-à-face* was Germany and the blockade with which Russia separated Germany into west and east. America felt obliged to take diplomatic and economic risks because the communist threat was right at the doorstep of Western Europe and western economies would suffer if German coal production would falter.¹⁰⁵ For this purpose, American forces were deployed in West Germany and provided food to the Germans. France, Britain and America combined zones in Germany because Russia had broken the Yalta deal by occupying the Eastern Germany. In return for the unification of the trizonia, on June 23, 1948, Russia blockaded Berlin and cut all access to the West. As a retaliation, the US implemented airlift to prove their determination by distributing food supplies from the air to the Germans.

Meanwhile, under the American leadership, the North Atlantic Treaty was established in 1949. On April 4, 1949, The *North Atlantic Treaty Organization* (*NATO*) was established as an international organization for defense collaboration, in

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 84.

support of the North Atlantic Treaty signed in Washington, D.C. The core provision of the treaty was Article V, which was intended so that if the Soviet Union launched an attack against the European allies of the United States, it would be treated as if it was an attack on the United States itself. Thus, the Kremlin retreated before Truman's strength demonstrations. Stalin, fearful of war and recognizing the weakness of his country, retreated rather challenging the American airlift. Therefore, Russia abandoned the blockade.

3.3. Post-World War II Labor Union Cooperation, International Labor organizations; Anti-Communism, the AFL-CIO and Irving Brown

Throughout the 20th century, the United States played a significant role in the world and the collapse of the European powers, in the aftermath of World War II, opened the arena to an expanded U.S. presence. Both in political and economic terms, the U.S. began to dominate the world. In 1950, the U.S. produced 40% of world's goods and services while it was building up strong military forces and the military spending jumped from \$13 billion in 1950 to \$50 billion in 1953.¹⁰⁶ With the leverage provided by its economic and military resources, the US ruled the world politics and economy. Major actors of the economy were coming from the working class.

During the post-war, the tripartite collaboration between labor unions, government and business sector was formalized by Nelson Rockefeller, head of the State Department's Office of Inter-American Affairs during World War II.¹⁰⁷ Between 1939 and 1945, entire American labor unions cooperated with business sector and government. This wartime cooperation enabled mass-production to

¹⁰⁶ W.M. Scammell. *The International Economy Since 1945*. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980), 56.

¹⁰⁷ Sims, 10.

support military equipments for the U.S. forces dispatched to Europe. On the other hand, labor radicalism sympathizing with socialism was curbed down. The wartime coalition has manifested in various forms.¹⁰⁸The American Federation of Labor's anticommunist activities in postwar Europe were financed by private sector and the Central Intelligence Agency. To give a lucid example; the American Institute for Free Labor Development board included trustees both from big business and labor leaders as well as American companies operating in Latin America- such as Kennecott and Anaconda copper companies, ITT, Pan American World Airways, the Rockefellers and W.R. Grace, Exxon, Shell, IBM, Koppers and Gillette.¹⁰⁹ Beside these companies another 90 corporations with their holdings in Latin America supported the AIFLD financially though never in sums approaching the U.S. government's contributions.¹¹⁰ According to Roosevelt, an uninterrupted international trade would be the insurance of a long-lasting peace. As a corollary, these concerns were concentrated in an all-embracing concept of national security which led the Truman Administration to use international economic policy as a tool for establishing stability and guaranteeing security.¹¹¹

The tradition of the Open Door policy, American commercial interests, the increased interdependence of the world economy, and the ambition to convert the country's increased influence into supremacy pushed American leaders to find in an increasing volume of international trade as the driving force for expansion. With credits provided to the Allies during World War II, the Breton Woods Accords¹¹² and then the negotiation of a loan for Great Britain, the U.S. imposed its own

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 10.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 11.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 11.

¹¹¹ Romero, 5.

¹¹² The United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference was held in Breton Woods in 1944 and led to the establishment of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in 1946, internationalizing the monetary flow.

understanding of a multilateral trade system for furthering growth.¹¹³ As Truman stated:

A large volume of soundly based international trade is essential if we are to achieve prosperity in the United States, build a durable structure of world economy and attain our goal of world peace and prosperity.¹¹⁴

Hence the goal of prosperity was the basic aspect of the postwar order and a vital element in securing the peace.

Wartime psychology cast positive impacts on the American society. Women and men, businessmen and workers unified their powers under the aegis of mobilization. This solidarity between the government, citizens, labor unions and businessmen faded the memory of the Great Depression and the concerns caused by the New Deal policies of Roosevelt. The wartime situation strengthened the significance of the labor unions and at the end of the war, union membership jumped from 10 million to 14.5 million. The large industrial unions of the Congress of Industrial Organization had already taken root in major industries of the country.¹¹⁵ The steel tonnage and the kilowatt hours produced became source of pride for the Americans and public opinion's agreement on production and efficiency helped bridge the divisions in domestic policy. The emphasis on output and growth emerged as a logical result of New Deal and wartime controversies.¹¹⁶

The fear of postwar period was dominant at the labor unions. At the wartime, solidarity was achieved and more and more workers were employed. What would happen after 1945? A recession in economy was expected both by the CIO and the

¹¹³ Romero, 6.

¹¹⁴ Thomas G. Paterson, "The Quest for Peace and Prosperity: International Trade, Communism and the Marshall Plan", in *Politics and Policies of the Truman Administration*. Ed. Barton J. Bernstein (Chicago, 1970), 78-112.

¹¹⁵ Romero, 7.

¹¹⁶ Charles S. Maier, "The Politics of Productivity: Foundations of American International Economic Policy after World War II", *International Organization* 31, no 4 (1977), 609.

AFL. The postwar stance of the CIO, which included the unions by industry fields rather than crafts, was immediately identified by its leader unionists. So, in order to cope with any economic recession, the CIO proposed foreign aid, the breakup of monopolies, economic cooperation in order to expand international trade, and the presence of unions at the peace table and in international organizations.¹¹⁷ According to the CIO, the guiding principle was to continue the international anti-Fascist coalition and the alliance with the USSR. This was its future framework for international cooperation, economic growth and social advancement.¹¹⁸

The CIO originated in the New Deal period with no political or ideological biases but it had a Communist inspired left-wing, which made the CIO discredited in the eye of the government. As a corollary, the CIO's call for furthering cooperation in the field of labor with the USSR received little response from Roosevelt. Furthermore, the internal unity of the CIO was at the stake of dissolution. Its unity broke for the first time between 1939 and 1941 following Stalin's pact with Nazi Germany and it was restored in the atmosphere of the anti-Fascist alliance when its left wing firmly advocated productivity as a patriotic cause.¹¹⁹ The second turmoil period began in the CIO between the leftist coalition and the anti-Communist group led by Walter Reuther, who was once indignant at the AFL's policies. Now, Reuther was ready to break away from the CIO in 1947.

While on the one hand the CIO regarded inclusion of the USSR as a complementary element, on the other hand, it was supporting establishment of international mechanisms discussed at Breton Woods since such efficient mechanism

¹¹⁷ Romero, 9.

¹¹⁸ Minutes of the CIO Executive Board, 16 June 1944, Documents of the CIO Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs (ALHUA), Wayne State University, Detroit, pp. 24-27; CIO News 7, no. 48 (25 November 1944) and no 51. (18 December 1944) from Federico Romero, 9.

¹¹⁹ Romero, 10.

would guarantee more jobs and that is why its motto was ‘five million jobs for U.S. on postwar world trade’.

Both the AFL and the CIO held that development of trade on a multilateral basis, American foreign aid and the development of new markets were vital goals for foreign policy of American unions during the postwar reconstruction. By the same token, there was a traditional adherence to the idea of expanding American capitalism, dating back to early 20th century in the AFL; yet, it was still in a formative stage for the CIO.¹²⁰

As to the AFL, established under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, it assembled all craft unions. It strongly supported America’s investments made in Latin America in late 19th century and it was characterized as nationalist and anti-Socialist. In fact much of labor press reflected anti-war sentiment during America’s first imperialist venture with the war against Spain in 1898 and the majority of the unionists opposed to American intervention. Yet, when some unionists like Samuel Gompers, out of fear of having their Americanism questioned, he and other major leaders climbed aboard the war-makers’ ship and supported the gunboat diplomacy of the USA in Latin America.¹²¹ Furthermore, Matthew Woll, the AFL’s international affairs chairman played major role in devising ‘labor pan-Americanism’, a fraternity with suitable labor leaders below the Rio Grande to complement the US attempts at making South America its exclusive domain.¹²²

On the other hand, it was supporting the growth of trade unions in international arena according to a nonpolitical model of the International Labor Organization, established by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. This type of unions positioned on such an axis would form new outlets for American exports and reduce

¹²⁰ Ibid., 11.

¹²¹ Morris, 34-36.

¹²² Ibid., 49.

competition based on low labor costs. Thus, strengthening of the AFL's influence abroad would be in the economic interest of American wage earners and American industry in general and in the mean time, liberal democratic values and consumption based American way of life would be disseminated.¹²³ The nationalistic and civilizing mission of this model was less important for the CIO leader while the economic logic was not substantially different as expressed by Philip Murray and Walter Reuther, who accentuated the social and public benefits of international prosperity model rather than its advantages for American industry.¹²⁴ Yet, differences in political orientations resulted in conflicting programs after World War II.

According to the AFL, leaders the USSR was threatening totalitarian regime and no cooperation should have been sustained contrary to the CIO programs. The AFL always put emphasis of American values such as liberalism, freedom of expression and individualism as it was expressed by George Meany, secretary treasurer of the AFL on 5 April 1945:

Freedom of thought and expression must be safeguarded throughout the world. This is the ultimate moral purpose...for which we are fighting the Second World War. Tyrannical governments which would crush out freedom of thought in their own lands endanger spiritual freedom everywhere.¹²⁵

Hence, anti-communism became the motto of the AFL. In the jargon of the AFL, 'free trade unions' were regarded as free from domination by political parties or governments, in other words the unions had to be anti-communist, pro-West and anti-Soviet.

Anti-communism was not limited to the AFL per se. In the 1930s and during the war, the ILGWU built up a network of contacts with militant anti-Fascist in

¹²³ Romero, 11.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 12.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 12.

various European countries through Social Democratic refugees and the International Transport Workers Federation (ITWF), including many European railroad workers.¹²⁶ Once the USA entered into war, these contacts became information channel for the Office of Strategic Services, newly established American intelligence service aiming to collect information about war. Its labor section was governed by Arthur J. Goldberg, a top level representative of the CIO. This situation led to a comprehensive network of communication, support and financial aid to European trade union leaders, most of whom were Social Democrats and anti Stalinist and some of them were in exile seeking refuge in the USA. David Dubinsky and Matthew Woll, vice-president of the AFL worked on contacts between the OSS and the European resistance, aiming to restore their contact to leadership positions in European unions and to prevent them against the Communist influence.¹²⁷

The AFL also channeled a million dollar fund to the establishment of Free Trade Union Committee (FTUC) after World War II and its aim was to continue collecting information for the AFL and assist the reconstruction of ‘free’ trade unions in Europe and the rest of the world, in opposition to Communist influence.

Jay Lovestone and Irving Brown, who both were anti-Communist and anti-Stalinist, were brought to the committee to synchronize information flow from Europe. Both Lovestone and Brown were interesting characters. Lovestone, émigré of Lithuania, was a former member of the Communist Party in America and since he supported Bukharin, he became the scapegoat of the Communist Party and got expelled. In the 1930s, he changed side and began to support anti-communist political stance at the labor unions. He cooperated with David Dubinsky, the ILGWU as well as the UAW. As of 1940, he became Dubinsky’s advisor in his clandestine

¹²⁶ Ibid., 14.

¹²⁷ “The Labor Section of the OSS” memorandum from Arthur J. Goldberg to General William J. Donovan. OSS Archives of the Central Intelligence Agency, in Romero, 14.

contacts with Europe. He was characterized by conspirational and semi-clandestine methods of the FTUC. Irving Brown worked with Jay Lovestone in Germany in 1945 to organize labor resistance against the Nazis and Brown advised the American occupation forces during the last phase of the bloody war in Germany.

Lovestone and Brown, drawing on their experiences in the field, foresaw a rupture was imminent between the West and the USSR. Specifically Lovestone believed that the USSR would follow a destabilization policy in economy and social areas as this was outcome the USSR learned on account of its isolation during World War I. According to these two protagonists, the labor unions would have a strategic role and the USSR would do its best to control them through the rhetoric of comradeship. Hence, Lovestone concluded that the FTUC should start its own crusade for the reconstruction of 'free' trade unions as the pillars of anti-Soviet stabilization in Europe.¹²⁸

Therefore, a memorandum was prepared by the Vice-President of the AFL, Matthew Woll as it read:

The labor movement of the European countries will be divided geographically and ideologically into two groups in accordance with the division of Europe itself into two 'spheres of influence. The socialist and democratic labor movement will have to endure a very hard struggle for survival...The Communists will enjoy full freedom of propaganda and activity. They will even be presented in the governments and the administration of individual countries. With the help of the mighty Russian state and a powerful internationally coordinated and streamlined propaganda machine they will strive for the domination of the labor movement in every country.¹²⁹

Basing on this strategy, where the Communists were weak in the Netherlands, Norway, Luxemburg, the unions would remain in the hands of democratic elements and the FTUC would intervene with a direct contribution to the treasuries of the

¹²⁸ Interview with Irving Brown by Federico Romero. Washington D.C., 14 August 1984. in Federico Romero 15

¹²⁹ Romero, 16.

labor unions.¹³⁰ As to Austria and Germany, the AFL would support the part in Western occupation as generously as possible. The FTUC concluded to publish a bulletin in French and German to inform the unionists about the American way of unionization.¹³¹

Throughout the postwar period, a group of leaders such as Matthew Woll, David Dubinsky, Jay Lovestone and Irving Brown were the ones drafting and applying international labor policy under the supervision of George Meany and the OSS. In the operations of the FTUC, priority was given to Germany and organization of resistance movement, composed of workers against the Nazis in the spring of 1945. Later, France and Italy appeared in their agenda of unionization value trade-off.

The AFL was always in full coordination with the Department of State and the OSS. During early 1945, the AFL proposed the Secretary of State to open labor attaché positions in order to better harmonize the activities of American labor unions in Europe. The AFL's aspiration was to stimulate the government in using labor unions and social issues in American foreign policy making, which was a logical strategy to fight against communism.¹³²

However, passionate struggles of the AFL caused its isolation from the international trade union movement. Before moving onto the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine, it will be appropriate to focus briefly on two major international movements between leftist World Federation of Labor Unions and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 16.

¹³¹ Ibid., 16.

¹³² Ibid., 17.

3.3.1. Internationalization of Labor: World Federation of Labor Unions and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions

Parallel to the emergence of industrialism in the 19th century, a working class came into being. In order to fight the improper working conditions at factories, steel mills and sweat-shops in the industrial Northern part of America and in Europe, the workers started to get organized and unionized. Hence, following the establishment of guilds and unions, there came the international confederations around the 1940s. Until then, majority of the unions were trying to identify their identity and parallel to World War II, the political stance of international labor confederations became clear. Early Cold War developments also caused bipolarization of labor unions in the world. The aim of this title is, first of all, to provide a general picture of international labor organizations; how and why they were established and how they got influenced by Cold War. Use of such a descriptive method of history shall facilitate to understand where and how labor fits in American foreign policy. Hence, the second part of this title is to elaborate the rise of labor in American foreign policy, including the Cold War era.

3.3.2. World Federation of Labor Unions

The post- World War II developments in the international labor movements were highly influenced by the initiation of Cold War and labor became an important tool to reshape the working classes and to insemminate democratic world's ideals. For this reason, it is necessary to have a general look at the labor unionism developments in the world.

It is the World War II era when the most intensive contacts started to take place among the labor unions of different countries. The early contacts turned into

concrete steps at the London Conference of 6-17 February 1945. This conference united 53 international and national labor unions and 204 delegates represented 60 million unionized workers.¹³³ As a fruit of this conference, the World Federation of Labor Unions (WFLU) was established in Paris in 1945.

The first congress of the World Federation of Labor Unions convened between September 25 and October 8, 1945, with the participation of 64 national organizations and 20 international organizations representing 67 millions of workers.¹³⁴ The aim was to establish a board to harmonize the works of labor unions at the international level. The newly established board was reflecting strong international support for creation of an international institution. The board consisted of the followings:; Walter Citrine as president, from the British Trades Union Congress (TUC); Louis Saillant as secretary general from the General Confederation of French Workers; V. V. Kouznetsov (the USSR), S. Hilman (USA), L. Jouhaux (France), V. Lombardo Toledano (Mexico), H. F. Chu (China), G. Di Vittorio (Italy) and E. Kupers (the Netherlands) were elected as vice-presidents and members of executives, while J. Brophy (the USA), M. Faline (the USSR) and W. Schevenes (Belgium) were elected as deputy-secretaries.¹³⁵ The AFL was excluded from the WFLU on account of its cutting-edge anti-Communist policies.

This new international labor union action had three major objectives: "Assistance to under-developed countries, fight against fascism and against workers' liberties and economic rights".¹³⁶ The WFTU's manifesto also called for the total destruction of fascism, support for democratic reconstruction of Germany and Japan,

¹³³ Kenan Öztürk. Thesis, 13. Öztürk's PhD dissertation has excellent details about internationalization of labor union movements. That's why, this chapter is mostly based on this summary of labor movements in the world.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 13.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 13.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 14.

cooperation of Allies at the United Nations, the representation of all unions at international meetings on peace treaties and reconstruction as well as the end of racial and colonial repression, the adoption of full employment and social security policies.¹³⁷

Without doubt, this movement did not take place out of blue. International Association of Workers' was established in 1864 by Marx and Engels though it did not bear labor union characteristics. Yet, it had all the political workers' movement components. Nonetheless, ideological dissidences paved way to its dissolution in 1876. Although it was a short-lived umbrella association, it played an important role in the evolution of workers' political consciousness. Inspired by the International Association of Workers, many countries established their own national labor unions such as the TUC in 1868 in Britain, the AFL in 1881 in the USA, the CGT in 1895 in France, the DGB in 1892 in Germany, the UGT in 1884 in Spain and the CGT in 1906 in Italy.¹³⁸

In these countries, labor unions developed according to the realities and characteristics of their geographies and political administrations. In order to synchronize international movements, International Professional Secretariats were created in 1903 and transformed into International Federation of Labor Unions (IFLU), in 1913, which can be considered as the first attempt to create an international center.¹³⁹ The IFLU had three major political tendencies: American unionism, German unionism which led to the Second International and anarchist-unionism. The records illustrate that the IFLU had 22 millions of worker members. After World War II broke out, all labor unions supported their countries and contributed a great to the production of weapons, ammunition and food-stuff for their

¹³⁷ Romero., 21.

¹³⁸ Öztürk., 14.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 14

armies. On account of a world-wide war, IFLU could not convene or carry out any joint activities during the war.

Communist tendency among the labor unions was supported by the USSR. Upon its initiative, International Red Labor Unions (IRLU) was established in 1921 in order to protest American capitalism. In 1926, it had 13 million members.

The International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions (ICCTU) was established in 1920 in the Hague. It was suppressed during World War II and reestablished in 1945 in Brussels. Its aim was to unite the Christian labor unions in the world and enhance cooperation among them. Later in 1968, it decided to abandon the religious reference and transformed its name into International Confederation of Labor Unions.¹⁴⁰

During the antebellum between 1918 and 1939, political disagreements emerged between the IRLU, the ICCTU and the IFLU, particularly, on account of clash between communism and capitalism. As of the post-war era, it can be seen that international workers movement's unity and independence was fragmented into two major groups according to new political evolutions: communism vs. capitalism. Hence, in 1949, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) was established.

The Cold War climate was also felt in France and as a result, France decided to throw World Federation of Labor Unions out of its territory in 1949. Thus, Vienna replaced its former headquarters in Paris. In 1956, Austria banned the WFLU and the headquarters was moved into Prague, in former Czechoslovakia. In 1985, the FWLU had 84 national labor unions from 74 countries and 11 International Labor Unions

¹⁴⁰ Öztürk. Thesis, 15.

and represented 206 million workers in the entire world. The WFLU still has leftist tendency, today.

3.3.3. International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU); the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and the CIO

In the aftermath of World War II, international political arena turned into bipolar world order. Although the war exhausted Europe and the USSR, the latter still remained as a super-power while the former needed a financial leverage to redress itself. The other polar of the world order, the USA, emerged as the super-power to challenge the USSR. Without doubt, the bi-polarism turned into a policy of securing the periphery meaning that the USA provided financial and ideological assistance to protect the democratic political systems. As of 1945, the bi-polarism was also reflected into industrial relations, modes of production as well as unionization of workers.

Parallel to massive political and economic involvement of America into Europe, at the industrial relations level, it also started to play an important role through internationalization of the American Federation of Labor. Through such move, the purpose was to challenge the International Federation of Labor Unions, which gradually began to support socialism.

The AFL was the only American member of the IFTU since only one organization per country was able to be a member. Particularly, the CIO resented at this and insisted on being part of American delegation to the International Labor Organization and the IFTU in order to break the monopoly of the AFL at the international level.¹⁴¹ Although the AFL defended its own status as the sole

¹⁴¹ Romero, 18.

international representative of American labor, the IFTU accepted the CIO to the British Trade Union Conference, in order to increase the number of its members through incorporation of the CIO and the Russians.

Yet, the AFL rejected to join the London Conference of February 1945 which was overshadowed by the meetings at Yalta. At this conference, the AFL was expelled from the IFTU. The AFL, not affiliated with the IFTU, was the first agency to fulfill the objectives of the anti-communism plan in Europe. Irving Brown and Jay Lovestone, representatives of the AFL to Europe, were leaders of this plan and had already started to support America's war in the labor fronts and they successfully organized German and French workers against the Nazi regime through the CIA funds in 1945.

As of May 1945, their new assignment was to fight against communism. Hence, In September 1946, the AFL adopted a resolution envisaging that it would engage into the resurrection of liberal unionism, which is an indispensable safeguard for the world peace.¹⁴² The perception of Soviet labor unions by the AFL leaders was the same as the statements of William Greene, president of the AFL:

The Soviet trade unions are both formally and actually an organic part of the state machinery, a branch of the Soviet government and the ruling dictatorial Communist Party...The world body of organized labor would lose its freedom to criticize the Soviet Union and the Communist dictatorship...Thus, the world labor federation would practically be transformed, in the political field, into a 'yes organization' of the Soviet government and consequently of world communism.'¹⁴³

As expressed by William Green, the labor unions in the USSR did not have freedom to maneuver without the supervision of the Communist leaders. According to Irving Brown, the Bolsheviks, once in power showed little gratitude for the

¹⁴² Öztürk, 12.

¹⁴³ William Green. *The AFL and World Labor Unity*. (Washington D.C., August 1945), 2-4, in Federico Romero, 20.

decisive performance of the Russian workers and their elected leaders. After brutally crushing the Kronstadt uprising of March 1921, organized at factories in Kronstadt by Russian workers as a reaction to unfavorable economic conditions, Soviet leaders began a systematic elimination of trade unions as independent representative bodies.¹⁴⁴

Soviet strategy to be tailored for labor unions went through various stages.

Until 1927, there were constant factional struggles in the Bolshevik leadership regarding the nature and role of trade unions. At the beginning, there were acute differences between those who favored truly independent trade union (e.g. Rykov and Tomsy) and those who advocated the ‘militarization of labor’ such as Trotsky. Within these extreme poles, Lenin, Stalin and part theorist Bukharin assumed varying positions. Eventually, all nuances faded under Stalin’s subjugation of labor organizations. ‘Trade unions’ became mere transmission belts to fulfill political directives of the Party and the State. Labor leaders were handpicked by Party bureaucrats as well as their duties, orders and policies.

The opinion of Irving Brown became confirmed when Stalin furthered oppression of Russian labor unions and banned strikes. A party coming to power defend the rights of proletariat was now in contradiction with itself.

Although the AFL was outside the IFLU, the CIO’s president Murray met President Harry Truman and his secretary general, James Carey and later, asked the IFLU to take a position to support the Marshall Plan. Yet, extreme leftist unions from Italy, France and the USSR opposed to it. For instance, secretary general of French CGT, Benoît Frachon held that ‘under the pretext of providing assistance to European countries, American monopolies wanted to take advantage of the destroyed situation of Europe, in order to establish an American domination.’¹⁴⁵

The AFL again proposed to international labor unions, regardless of their membership to IFTU, organize a conference to support the Marshall Plan. Yet, the

¹⁴⁴ Roy Godson. *Labor in Soviet Global Strategy*. Preface by Irving Brown. (New York: Crane, Russack & Co., 1984), preface x.

¹⁴⁵ Öztürk, 16.

proposal was rejected. Then, the British TUC and the CIO offered in October 1948, to suspend the activities of the IFTU for a year. When the relations were at a stalemate, then both the TUC and the CIO pulled out of the IFTU, on 19 January 1949 and the labor unions of Belgium, Norway, New-Zealand, Australia, Sweden and Switzerland ended their membership, vis-à-vis the increasing pressure of the USSR on the IFTU.

On 5 February 1949, the AFL took the lead to organize the non-communist unions under an international organization. Hence, a conference took place in Geneva, upon the initiative of the AFL, the TUC and the CIO. It was decided to convene in London between 28 November and 7 December 1949 to establish the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). So, the ICFTU managed to group 59 national organizations of 52 countries, representing 48.458.000 workers and its headquarters was established in Brussels.

To summarize so far, AFL-CIO's prescription for trade unionism was not class-based because if it had been so, it would not have been accepted. In other words, class struggle was inconsistent with the cooperative labor-business relations advocated by the AFL-CIO. For this reason, it based itself on apolitical unionism and aimed at increasing the size of the pie through enhanced productivity and collective bargaining. In so doing, the AFL-CIO has intentionally or not supported the global economic and political status quo.¹⁴⁶

Irving Brown, one of founders of the ICFTU, was saying in an interview carried out by Kenan Öztürk in 1988 that:

Communism was a threat in Europe. Not only in France and Italy but also In Greece as well as small countries such as Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, almost everywhere in Europe yet particularly in France and Italy. There was a widespread economic crisis. Without

¹⁴⁶ Beth Sims. *Workers of the World Undermined: American Labor's Role in US Foreign Policy*. (Boston: South End Press, 1992) 6.

the assistance of the USA in 1947, we would not have the democracy today. In 1945, 1946, 1947, the communists held the majority at the unions. There so many large-scale powerful strikes to prevent the evolution of economy. The countries were very poor. In order to reconstruct themselves, they needed assistance. The assistance came from America and the Marshall Plan.¹⁴⁷

As it can be seen in the statement of Brown, the AFL and the CIO never missed an opportunity to strengthen the unions against the specter of communism. In order to realize this strategy under the ‘social component’ of the Marshall Plan, Truman administration and labor unions worked hand in hand and American unionists have been proud of their efforts and experiences in Europe. For example, George Meany in his speech in 1964, president of the AFL-CIO and former secretary of treasury of the AFL, explained his working methods and his objective for France:

We supported the split among the communists in France. When we identified that the dissidence and split was obvious, we provided money to the party, close to us. We sent money to the unionists of the FO; we established bureaus for them; we sent materials and other things, absolutely necessary to weaken the communist front.¹⁴⁸

The activity report of French labor federation CGT dated from the 27th congress containing Benoît Frachon’s statement with this regard:

Three years ago, the agent of American imperialism, the delegate of the AFL, Irving Brown came to France with a remarkable amount of dollars to create dissidence. No serious person may think that Irving Brown is just a unionist, working on behalf of American working class. He is the very agent of the State Department of the USA.¹⁴⁹

In the French journal *Le Monde* of 9 May 1967, former head of international division of the CIA, Thomas Braden said the following regarding the cooperation between American government and labor unions, in conjunction with the Marshall Plan: ‘we created our own proper fronts, by asking assistance of the AFL.’

¹⁴⁷ Öztürk, 17.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 18.

The affiliation of the AFL-CIO with the CIA began to be revealed to public as of late 1965. The *Washington Post* ran a four-part series (30 December 1965- 2 January 1966) that was in effect an exposure of Jay Lovestone's connections with the CIA. For the first time, the public was getting a glimpse at the CIA. The exposure of its 1961 invasion of Cuba, having turned into a fiasco in the Bay of Pigs and the wide circulation of the book *the Invisible Government* by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross (New York 1964) opened the floodgates of publicity on the CIA.¹⁵⁰ A similar negative trend was evident in the protests at a number of university campuses against the CIA recruiting among students.¹⁵¹ As a consequence, the Senate set up a committee to hear the CIA director. On 28 July 1966, J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, asked the CIA director Richard Helms at a public hearing to explain reports that his agency is involved in union affairs and takes part in union elections (*New York Times*, July 29). Yet, the reply was not made public.¹⁵² Yet, the fact that the heads of the National Student Association secretly received millions of dollars from the CIA was revealed on 14 February 1967. Then, there came the confession of CIA's former director, William F. Raborn in an interview with *US News and World Report* (July 18, 1966) and he explained that the CIA gathered information through various persons at the Foreign Service, including labor attachés, as elements of the intelligence community.¹⁵³

As journalist George Morris put it lucidly, the same Congress enacted laws setting up the CIA and the Taft-Hartley Act, severely restricting the activities and powers of labor unions as of 23 June 1947. The latter requires officers of every union applying for the services of the National Labor Relations Board and a right to have

¹⁵⁰ George Morris. *CIA and American Labor: The Subversion of the AFL-CIO's Foreign Policy* (New York: International Publishers, 1967), 10.

¹⁵¹ Morris, 12.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 13.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 33.

its name on a collective bargaining election ballot, to submit to the government an affidavit that they were not communists. Its purpose was to purge unions of militant progressive leadership and opponents of Cold War and eliminate anything un-American.

To summarize the connection between the CIA and the labor unions, the labor historically has provided a channel through which the CIA could penetrate foreign labor sectors. They offered a useful cover for intelligence operatives and supported undercover operations. In reality, both midlevel staff and top level members of the unions were identified as intelligence agents, who operated in direct assistance of the U.S. embassies and the CIA overseas.¹⁵⁴

After having a brief glance at the formation of the AFL, the CIO, international labor movements, the Soviet global strategy on labor based on control of workers under the communist regime and on influencing workers in Europe through the rhetoric of workers' brotherhood, the significance of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan can be understood better. During a period between 1945 and mid-1960s, tripartite acceptance of American expansionism supported many initiatives extending the global reach of the United States such as the Marshall Plan, The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the Alliance for Progress until this consensus was shaken by the Vietnam conflict.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ Sims, 28.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 13.

3.4. The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan: Repercussions in the World and in Turkey

To draw the general picture of the initiation of the European recovery efforts, on March 12, 1947, President Harry Truman asked for the delivery of a \$ 400 million aid program to Greece and Turkey. Three hundred million dollars was to be allocated to Greece, due to its politically more precarious situation, while Turkey was to receive \$100 million.¹⁵⁶ Truman's speech was the first officially announced break with the Soviets, however on Capitol Hill, the Truman Doctrine was regarded as a victory. On April 1947, a bill that approved aid to Greece and Turkey passed the U.S. Senate by a resounding majority of 67 to 23; and on May 8, 1947, it passed the U.S. House by 289 to 107.¹⁵⁷

Ever since President Truman had called for aid to Greece and Turkey, the American Communists, opposing the plan, had been mobilizing, and promoting mass meetings, sending telegrams and letters to exert pressure on the Congress.¹⁵⁸ These reactions in domestic policy led Truman to take measures for an anti-communist hunt through the Employee Loyalty Review Board to ensure against the infiltration of disloyal persons into the government.¹⁵⁹

As for Turkey, many government officials, deputies as well as President İsmet İnönü warmly appreciated President Truman's message on aid to Greece and Turkey.¹⁶⁰ Truman's speech also had repercussions in the Turkish media.¹⁶¹ For

¹⁵⁶ William Hale. *The Political and Economic Development of Turkey* (London: Croom Helm, 1981), 115.

¹⁵⁷ Charles L. Mee, *The Marshall Plan* (New York: Simon and Schuster Inc., 1984), 74.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 71.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 71.

¹⁶⁰ From Wilson, American Embassy to Ankara, to Secretary of State, Washington D.C., March 15, 1947 in Department of State, Incoming Telegrams, No.: 1451. Department of State Microfilms No 867.00/3-1447 at the American Library at the American Embassy to Ankara.

¹⁶¹ From Wilson, Ankara, to the Secretary of State, March, 14, 1947. No, 195. The telegram covers the news excerpts dating March 14, 1947. Department of State Microfilms No 867.00/3-1447 at the American Library at the American Embassy to Ankara.

instance, *Cumhuriyet* of March 14, 1947 said, with reference to this speech, “a turning point in world events; President Truman’s speech calls forth profound satisfaction all over the country. Here is the idealistic American to which all civilization owes gratitude.” *Vatan* of March 15, 1947 said that “the message calls forth general satisfaction; it is unselfish action devoid of imperialistic designs, a unique occasion for our country.”¹⁶² As to *Vakit* March 14, 1947; “A new future in the making for Turkey. Truman’s speech is a categorical command for expansionist policy of Russia to stop.” Dailies such as *Tasvir*, *Demokrasi*, *Son Telegraf*, *Memleket*, *Tanin*, *Gece Postası* and *Ulus*¹⁶³ underlined the significance of the plan for Turkey and world peace. In addition, the Democrat Party leader, Celal Bayar, along with President İsmet İnönü said in his interview with *Kuvvet*, on March 14, 1947 that:

We welcome with great satisfaction and gratitude that President Truman offers aid to Turkey. The Great American Democracy, knowing well the dangers totalitarian regimes pose for world peace and human freedom, did not abandon the UN Charter as only theory but proved it will not hesitate to make sacrifices for its realization.

In the meantime, Turkish businessmen and economists were also positive about the aid.¹⁶⁴ For example, in *Ulus*, March 14, 1947, economist Mekin Onaran stated that although credit terms were not yet known, it was understood that the aim of the aid was to strengthen Turkey economically. The President of Ankara Commerce Industry and Chamber, Vehbi Koç held the belief that ‘American aid to Turkey has also widened world economy and international trade.’

¹⁶² *Vatan*. Headline. 15 March 1947.

¹⁶³ All these newspapers are dated 14-15-16 March 1947.

¹⁶⁴ From Ambassador Wilson to Secretary of State, March 15, 1947; no. 196. Department of State Microfilms No 867.00/3-1447 at the American Library at the American Embassy to Ankara.

On the other hand, Russia was keeping tabs on Turkey in conjunction with the Truman doctrine and was very dissatisfied with the situation. For example, the Moscow Turkish language broadcast on March 15, 1947 warned the Turks:

Turks' acceptance of American aid means their enslavement. Turkish people today face a frightening spectacle. They face attempts made to replace chains broken in the war of independence. Turks know well that Uncle Sam is not lending money because of altruism. Even the deaf Sultan [making a pun on a Turkish saying and President İnönü's deafness] had heard that in order to control the use of money, Americans will send civil and military delegations to Turkey. This means that the first condition of aid is control of Turkish economy and army. Turkish reactionaries claim American aid will restore the Turkish economy, but American papers say the greater part will be comprised of war materiel now in Germany and Austria. Clearly ancient cannon, old wagons and planes will not help the economic crisis raging in Turkey. Atatürk opposed foreign loans which enslaved people. Today, American aid will increase the burden carried by Turkish people and separate Turkey from the democratic world...¹⁶⁵

Apparently, the Soviet Union was totally against American aid and involvement into Turkey, following its consequent notes, declaring Russia's claims on the Turkish Straits and the rectification of the frontier to give Kars and Ardahan to them.¹⁶⁶

Simultaneously, the Secretary of the State Dean Acheson formed an Ad Hoc Committee, which was charged with studying the Greek and Turkish problems to see 'what situations elsewhere in the world...may require analogous financial, technical and military aid on America's part.'¹⁶⁷ The Ad-Hoc Committee carried out a very swift analysis of countries which might need American aid, in addition to Turkey and Greece, and the Committee prepared two main lists: first, the countries which needed economic and military aid were Italy, France, Korea, Iran, Austria and Hungary;

¹⁶⁵ From Bursley to Secretary of State, March 20, 1947, No 213. Department of State Microfilms No 867.00/3-1947 at the American Library at the American Embassy to Ankara.

¹⁶⁶ "US Aid to Turkey: Tension Caused By Soviet Demands." *The Times*. (3 April 1947).

¹⁶⁷ Mee, 75.

second, with less urgent need were as Great Britain, Belgium, Luxembourg, Czechoslovakia and Poland.¹⁶⁸ Finally, Acheson's Ad Hoc Committee concluded that:

The broad purpose of the US Aid and assistance is to extend in terms of the U.S. national interest the objective recently enunciated by the President, Greece and Turkey, by economic stability and orderly political processes, opposing the spread of chaos and extremism, preventing advancement of Communist influence and use of armed minorities, and orienting other foreign nations to the US. In addition, the U.S will probably continue to undertake to alleviate starvation and suffering as such where this action is consistent with US interests.¹⁶⁹

For Turkey, economic assistance was critical to improve its military capacity as a priority to deter Stalin. More importantly, Turkey's inclusion into Truman's program was a clear signal to the Soviet Union that the United States was prepared to make a material rather than a purely symbolic contribution to the defense of Turkey.¹⁷⁰ As Necmeddin Sadak, Minister of Foreign Affairs, explained, "the Truman Doctrine was a great comfort to the Turkish people, for it made them feel that they were no longer isolated."¹⁷¹ However, the Turkish Government was very cautious at the beginning concerning the extensiveness and continuous American supervision of the aid, due to Soviet pressure.¹⁷² Hence, between 1948 and 1952, Turkey received \$225.1 million in economic aid, under the European Recovery Program (ERP), and around \$200 million in military aid. Although the Turks complained that this aid was not enough and admitted to the Marshall Project after some delay, availability of such funds was a great asset.¹⁷³ Over time, the provision

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 76.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 90.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 115.

¹⁷¹ Necmeddin Sadak, "Turkey Faces the Soviets". *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 27. 1949 in William Hale *The Political and Economic Development of Turkey* (London: Croom Helm, 1981), 82.

¹⁷² "Interim Greece-Turkey Assistance Committee: Survey Mission to Investigate Turkish Needs for Assistance.", May 5, 1947. GAC D-26.

¹⁷³ William Hale, *The Political and Economic Development of Turkey*. (London: Croom Helm, 1981), 74-75.

of solely military assistance appeared insufficient and anti-Communist preparedness required social and economic stabilization and reform.¹⁷⁴ Thus, the Marshall aid's scope was enlarged to cover domains such as the economy, agriculture, labor unions and nutrition. Production and labor force mattered for the Marshall Plan, in order to fight communism on multiple fronts.

3.5 Why Was Labor Important For The Marshall Plan?

Before moving onto the American influence on Turkish trade unionization, it will be appropriate first to understand how labor became so important as to be included into the Marshall Plan. To begin with the American influence on European labor and its inception, American organized labor viewed the Economic Recovery Program and the productivity program, in particular, as a made-to-order framework within which to carry its message about trade unions in Europe.

According to the Labor advisors of the ECA, the productivity drive provided the best vehicle by which to 'export' the notion of collective bargaining. The duty of the ECA Labor advisers and the Labor Information Officers was to advise the ECA on matters such as European labor conditions and manpower utilization. However, their ultimate goal, from the US labor standpoint, was to pass on the conviction that collective bargaining and free-trade unionism were absolutely necessary to the rebuilding of strong economies.¹⁷⁵

Support of the labor force through the Marshall Plan was important in two respects; first, it increased production in the aid receiving countries and second, labor worked as an anti-communist tool. For instance, between 1948 and 1951, Italy,

¹⁷⁴ Charles Maier, "Supranational Concepts and National Continuity in the Framework of the Marshall Plan". In Michael Hogan. *The Marshall Plan: A Retrospective* (London: Westview Press, 1984); 32.

¹⁷⁵ Imanuel Wexler, *The Marshall Plan Revisited: The European Recovery Program in Economic Perspective* (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983), 276.

France and the United Kingdom, respectively registered an increase in production at 98.4%, 80.3% and 67.6%, though living standards were low.¹⁷⁶ Working classes in Germany, Great Britain and Scandinavian countries were protected by powerful trade unions. Joining with the local expenditure of the Marshall funds, they were able to work for the amelioration of living standards.¹⁷⁷ On the other hand, trade unions in Italy and France were poorly organized and more pro-communist.¹⁷⁸

The labor component was already incorporated into the Marshall Plan as of 1947. American trade unions endorsed the ERP in public statements, emphasizing the significance of ‘increased production’ and ‘economic integrations in Western Europe.’¹⁷⁹ They urged the inclusion of the workers into management of the recovery program and had begun, even before the Marshall Plan, to cooperate with public officials in forming the international aspects of American labor policy.¹⁸⁰ The Labor Department organized an Office of International Labor Affairs under Philip Kaiser and a Trade Union Advisory Committee, cooperating with Kaiser and other officials in the War and State Departments, to frame overseas labor policy.¹⁸¹ Furthermore, the State Department created the new post of labor attaché, staffed by men with close ties to the American trade unions and collaborated with the American Federation of Labor (AFL) to combat communism in the European labor movement.¹⁸² Although

¹⁷⁶ William Gomberg, “Labor's Participation in the European Productivity Program: A Study in Frustration.” *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 74 No. 2 (June 1959), 241.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 241.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 241.

¹⁷⁹ AFL's Declaration on Foreign Policy, quoted in Bruce Topp 2070 to Harriman, November 24, 1948, in Michael Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*.

¹⁸⁰ AFL Memorandum to the President, December 19, 1947, in Michael Hogan. *The Marshall Plan*.

¹⁸¹ Hogan, 141.

¹⁸² Peter Weiler. “The United States, International Labor and the Cold War: The Breakup of the World Federation of Trade Unions,” *Diplomatic History* 5 (Winter 1981): 1-22; From Kaiser to Eric Kocher of American Embassy, Brussels, November 6, 1947 in Michael Hogan. *The Marshall Plan*.

there was some resistance at the beginning, a foundation was laid upon which individuals seeking to integrate labor into the Marshall Plan were able to build.¹⁸³

Kaiser represented labor's views on the interdepartmental steering committee, studying the recovery program. The officials of both the AFL and Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) served on the Harriman Committee.¹⁸⁴ Finally, the Secretary of State, George Marshall, decided to appoint labor leaders to important ambassadorial positions and asked the AFL for a list of possible appointees to the ECA.¹⁸⁵

Arlon Lyon of the Railway Labor Executives Association, George Meany of the AFL and James Carey of the CIO were appointed to the ECA's Public Advisory Board.¹⁸⁶ Paul Hoffman, chief of the agency, asked William Green, the second long-term president of the American Federation of Labor, and Philip Murray, the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), to nominate candidates for labor posts. Clinton Golden, former vice president of the Steelworkers Union, nominated by the CIO and Bert Jewell, formerly associated with the Railway Workers department of the AFL, were appointed to head the Washington office of labor affairs as Chief Labor Advisor to Hoffman.¹⁸⁷ Boris Shiskin, former research director of the AFL, was appointed to head the Paris office of Labor and Manpower Division in order to coordinate all national missions abroad, including Turkey.¹⁸⁸ It was

¹⁸³ For opposition to the trend, see David H. Stowe's memorandum to John R. Steelman, January 20, 1948, in Michael Hogan.

¹⁸⁴ "Kaiser letter to Kocher," November 6, 1947, Kaiser papers box 2, folder: Labor Attaches and State Department Officials- General Correspondence; and unsigned 'Attitude of Labor Towards the ERP,' February 2, 1948, in Michael J. Hogan.

¹⁸⁵ Memorandum of Conversation between State Department and AFL officials, April 6, 1948. Memorandum of Conversation between State Department and AFL officials February 25, 1948; Lovett letters to President William Green of the AFL, April 14, and 26 and June 17, 1948, Green letter to Lovett, April 20, 1948, Lovett letter to Green April 26, 1948; in Michael Hogan.

¹⁸⁶ Hogan, 142.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 243. See also, Michael J. Hogan. *The Marshall Plan* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 141-142.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 243.

standard practice for the European Cooperation Administration to rely on organized labor to nominate candidates for various missions, which had no operating responsibilities, but acted in an advisory capacity.¹⁸⁹

The labor advisors sent invitations to European countries to participate in the administration of American aid and thus aroused high expectations in organized labor. The labor representatives appointed by the ECA were expected to supplement the work of the State Department's labor attachés, to develop ties between American and European labor organizations and to formulate policies regarding economic, social, technical and other problems that affected European workers and their trade unions.¹⁹⁰ For instance, Irving Brown, AFL's roving minister abroad,¹⁹¹ expressed these expectations by drawing up a list of six objectives, two of which were:

First, labor must safeguard collective bargaining, trade union standards and agreements and social legislation and engage in training and retraining programs and above all, maintain the principles of free labor. Second, labor must obtain the wholehearted and enthusiastic support of the workers in this tremendous production effort which will fail unless European labor is aroused to all out enthusiastic support.¹⁹²

The administrators of the Marshall Plan hoped to increase productivity in Europe and to this end, technology, labor force and new production means had to be introduced to Europe. Europe had been borrowing American ideas since the late nineteenth century; yet, American technology advanced dramatically during the war and the postwar surveys in Britain and in other European countries revealed huge differences as far as per capita output was concerned.¹⁹³ Surveys suggested that the causes of the differences were not just technical, but reflected deep differences in

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 243.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 142.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 244. Irving Brown, as the representative of the AFL-CIO carried out labor activities in Germany, France, Greece, Turkey and many African countries.

¹⁹² Irving Brown, "The Marshall Plan." *American Federationist*, Volume VLI, No.1 (1955), 36.

¹⁹³ Killick, 160.

cultural and workplace attitudes between Europe and America.¹⁹⁴ Thus, at the end of 1948, the ECA launched technical assistance projects, engineering schemes and production surveys, the goal of which was to stimulate greater efficiency in European industrial production through the amalgamation of American production techniques, styles of business organization, and labor management partnerships.¹⁹⁵ For instance, the ECA allocated \$1.5 million for technical assistance in Greece.

Furthermore, the ECA engaged in educating European employers and unionists by sending productivity teams to the USA, and by establishing productivity centers in Europe, which demonstrated American ideas. In the short term, European productivity increased rapidly during the ERP period of four years. Between 1948 and 1952, the United States channeled some \$13 million in economic aid and technical assistance to 16 European countries and the aggregate gross national product rose more than 30% while industrial production increased by 40% over prewar levels.¹⁹⁶

Nonetheless, European managers and workers, being used to narrow markets, low volumes, craft skills, labor solidarity, lack of price competition and government controls, took time to adapt to a more open mass-production system.¹⁹⁷ American productivity being so much higher than the European countries in the early twentieth century, may be ascribed to factors such as a massive, uniform and protected market; the economies of scale, existence of large corporations, better economic organization of natural resources as well as favorable interaction between industry and agriculture, supported by effective transport.¹⁹⁸ France sent 450 missions to the USA while

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 160.

¹⁹⁵ Hogan, 142.

¹⁹⁶ Killick, 161 and Kathleen E. Hug. *The Marshall Plan*. (Lexington, Virginia: The George C. Marshall Foundation).

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 161.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 183.

Britain sent only 66 for labor union and productivity training purposes.¹⁹⁹ As for Turkey, it sent 600 missions to the United States for unionization training of 2-month duration.

3.4. Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the early Cold War and large scale anti-communism struggle of the AFL, which did not come out of nowhere yet systematically designed the AFL International Affairs section, the CIA, the Department of State; and the Marshall Plan's philosophy of war against and containment of the socialist and communist movement, within the working classes in Europe, drew the aim of the initiative.

The war had weakened the European countries and making them more prone to the sphere of influence of the U.S.S.R.. To a great extent, the AFL's anti-communist campaigns were successful though in some countries such as Italy, Greece and France, the communist presence in labor was minimized. This situation cannot be deemed as a flaw of the American labor strategy; yet, it is correlated with the effectiveness of the related governments' and national labor confederations' solutions.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 161.

CHAPTER IV

FIRST ENCOUNTER: AMERICAN LABOR AID TO TURKEY

4.1 Introduction

The first encounter between the Turkish trade unions and the American labor unionists, working under the Marshall Plan, started in 1951. It was led by Irving Brown, the representative of the AFL-CIO. He traveled by train to İstanbul and appeared at the first assembly of the labor unions in İstanbul, without invitation. As of that moment, Irving Brown became one of the architects for the establishment of Turkey's first confederation.

The aim of this chapter is to have a closer look on Irving Brown and American know-how trade off as well as training they received. This chapter heavily relies on primary sources from the George Meany Archives. Unfortunately, no sources were available at the Türk-İş Library in Ankara. The available ones were not related with the subject matter of this thesis and the related ones had to be thrown away since they were not stored under special condition or the during the coup d'états, some of the documents related to early relations were burnt. The best sources to prove visits of Irving Brown were the news excerpts from various Turkish dailies. So, the research conducted at the Turkish Grand National Assembly has been of great help.

This section will illustrate how America's global labor strategy was systematic and fruitful and the labor unions it contributed still survive in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Near East and Europe.

4.2. Irving Brown: an AFL Cold War Strategist

Before moving into the activities of Irving Brown and the repercussions of his visit, it will be appropriate first to know who he was. Back in 1945, the Communists were united, dedicated, and were ruthless taking over the powerful industrial unions in France, Italy, Britain and Germany. They took orders from Moscow and Stalin had established the World Federation of Trade Unions through which he hoped to dominate the workforce in the industrial West.²⁰⁰ However, Stalin's attempts failed and American labor union leaders, having fought to prevent Communist takeover of the American labor movement in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s, noticed the danger and moved to counter it with the help of CIA, especially in the anti-communist struggle in France.²⁰¹ Its point-men in the field, the executives of the AFL, Irving Brown and Jay Lovestone, set up office in Paris and worked primarily in France, Germany, Italy and Britain. Irving Brown's efforts were so significant that after his death in November 1988, President Ronald Reagan conferred on him the Medal of Freedom.²⁰²

To have a glance at Irving Brown's life, he was born on 20 November 1911 to worker parents, did a degree in economics in New York and worked at factories. Between 1932 and 1942, he was the administrator of Automobile Workers Federation and took active role at General Motors and Ford Strikes. He moved to

²⁰⁰ "Irving Brown RIP." *National Review*, 7 April 1989, Issue 6, Vol. 41, p.18. Also see *Le Monde and Liberation*, 16 February 1989.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 18. Also see Ben Rathbun, *The Point Man: Irving Brown and the Deadly Post-1945 Struggle For Europe and Africa*. (Washington: Minerva Press, 1996).

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 18.

Europe in 1945 to collect information about the situation of the labor unions in Europe and expanded his activities such as analysis of freedom of association level, financing, modes production and ideologies of the unions as well as establishment of contact with them. As of 1945, he pursued the same activities in Africa, the Middle-East and the Far East. Specifically, his activities in North Africa were against the colonization of France and the UK. In 1949, he fervently supported the establishment of the ICFTU. In 1955, he was the representative of the ICFTU at the UN and between 1973 and 1987, he was again the head of the AFL-CIO office in Paris. All his life, he adopted the principle of win-win. He was a legendary unionist. All his life, he opened his crusade against the totalitarian Russia. As the European representative of the AFL, he provided financial assistance and training to European labor union just in the aftermath of World War.²⁰³

Irving Brown's journey started in Spring 1945. During the war, as representative of the AFL-CIO, he worked in close cooperation with government and provided intelligence to the U.S. Army specifically through German and French Armies. Yet, his connections were already established in 1944 in Washington with the German and French émigrés of war.²⁰⁴ His duty was to organize anti-Nazi labor movement. In order to go to Paris, he went to Norway first in early 1945 and visited all Nordic countries to prepare them for imminent post-war period. Presence of American unionists with European origins and the émigrés were most influential factors in the establishment of contacts against the Nazis. Brown closely cooperated with workers at International Transport Confederation and German transport unions. Some of them were keeping tabs on the itinerary of the Nazi trains and providing

²⁰³ Obituary on Irving Brown. *Le Monde/Liberation* 16 February 1989.

²⁰⁴ Öztürk, 80

intelligence to Brown regarding Nazi attacks and Brown was reporting the situation to the American armies.²⁰⁵

In 1946, he came to Paris and the AFL decided to open an official representation office in Brussels rather than Brown's hotel room in Paris. Along with his first target group of German and French unions, he immediately contacted the Italian and Greek unions since communism was felt more in these countries. In late 1946, he went to Italy and Greece. Anti-communist unionists did not know how to effectively get organized against the communists ones and they asked for assistance from Irving Brown.²⁰⁶ According to Brown, the Marshall Plan provided both economic and social aid in unionization field in Italy and Greece.²⁰⁷ By the same token, the first fragmentations among the French and Italian confederations occurred on account of dissidence on the rejection of the Marshall aid. The first break-away of non-communist unions from the CIGL unions took place in 1948.

In many countries where communism was on the rise, the communists were against the Marshall Plan since it would remodel their economies according to capitalism. However, these countries were also in need of economic restructuring and many of them got poor because of war. For this reason, the public opinion had hot debates on approval or rejection of the Plan. As an extension of American labor strategy, Brown also visited Cyprus in 1950. His major objective was to sustain solidarity between the Turks and the Greeks because they was immense dissidence between both parties of the island. With this end, Brown paid many visits that he could not even recall.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 22-23.

²⁰⁶ Öztürk, 81-82.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 82.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 84-85

According to Brown, the provision of assistance through the Marshall Plan was vital because many countries in Europe were poor and the USSR wanted to keep them in this situation. There were many violent strikes preventing economic restructuring in Europe. Hence, a struggle started within the international union confederations on account of the Marshall Plan.²⁰⁹ The strong stance of communist unions was posing a threat to the politics of European countries and the USSR was using the communist unions as a ploy to keep these countries under its sphere of influence. If there had been no American assistance, democracy-wise, there would be definitely a different picture, today.²¹⁰

After 1960, believing that his mission was satisfactory in Europe, Brown focused over South America, Africa and the Middle East. Within this framework, upon intensive work of Irving Brown, the AFILD in South America, the AALC in Africa and the AAFLI in Asia were founded respectively in 1962, 1964 and 1968.²¹¹

Irving Brown believed that America needed to assume a determining role in forming free labor unionism; and this was the official policy as stated by General Eisenhower, after the victory in World War II.²¹²

4.3. Irving Brown and His First Visit to Turkey

Irving Brown's definition of duty was clear; to organize resistance against the Nazis through illegal channels and help restructuring of German, French, Italian and many other European unions, devastated because of war. With this end, the AFL mapped out a strategy to fight against communism because Russia had become popular among European unionists and in Turkey, communist unionists were not

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 24

²¹⁰ Ibid., 23.

²¹¹ Ibid., 67

²¹² Kenan Öztürk. *Amerikan Sendikacılığı ve Türkiye: İlk İlişkiler*. (İstanbul: Tüstav, 2004), 20.

favorable. However, Turkish unions had not met any international confederation and did not have any idea about collective bargaining methods.

When Brown was visiting Greek labor unions in Athens in 17 March 1951, he received information from them that Turkish unions would be holding a meeting in İstanbul to talk about freedom of association issues. Hence, without getting an invitation, he immediately took a train to İstanbul on 18 March 1951 to see the first assembly of the labor unions in İstanbul, in March 1951.²¹³ There, Brown made a quick gap analysis and informed Turkish trade unionists about collective bargaining and the American system. On 17 April 1951, he wrote a comprehensive report on his trade union mission to Turkey. The report contained lots of information about anti-communism and the skills of the unionists regarding the freedom of association.²¹⁴ His visit drew the attention of the Turkish government as well as the Soviets.

The labor attaché at the American Embassy to Ankara was reporting the following regarding the first visit of Irving Brown:

Since Mr. Brown's visit, a careful watch has been kept both of Turkish newspapers and Soviet-Turkish language broadcasts. There has been no reference whatsoever to his visit in the monitored Soviet-Turkish broadcasts. As far as the Turkish press is concerned, the report has been perfectly clear, straightforward and of a purely factual nature.²¹⁵

Two major Turkish dailies, *Ulus* and *Kudret* also paid attention to Irving Brown's visit. For example, *Ulus*, on March 26, 1951 reported:

The İstanbul Trade Union Federation held its convention yesterday at the Cibali tobacco plant with the participation of Irving Brown, a member of the executive committee of the International Free Trade Union Federation, as well as with the participation of the Argentine Labor Attaché, S. Margia. Interests of various labor groups were discussed.

²¹³ Ibid., 9.

²¹⁴ See Annex for Irving Brown. 'A Trade Union Mission to Turkey.' 17 April 1951. RG 18-004. Irving Brown's Records. 36/16, the George Meany Archives.

²¹⁵ From Eric Kocher, Labor Attache to Irving Brown, April 25, 1951. The George Meany Archives 36/14 RG 18-004 Records of Irving Brown.

Kudret of March 23, 1951 was more informative about the identity and activities of Irving Brown:

Irving Brown, a representative of the International Confederation of Trade Unions, established with the participation of 52 countries and representing 53 million workers, contacted the heads of various trade unions in İstanbul yesterday. He told them that 16 million out of 60 million workers were trade union members and that he had been in jail for having defended labor problems. The heads of the Turkish trade unions explained to him their ideas on strikes and stressed that it would be appropriate that an article be added to the Trade Union Law, permitting trade unions to engage in politics, so as to be able to protect the right of workers.

Irving Brown kept a report of his visit to İstanbul. In his report dated April 17, 1951, after pointing to general organizational weaknesses of Turkish trade unions, he stated that it was important to encourage them to get amalgamated into the ICFTU. Furthermore, he suggested that Turkey should be included into the Atlantic Pact or in some system of mutual alliance or collective security with the Western powers against any future aggression by the USSR.²¹⁶ Brown, in his report, also noted:

Without such a sense of security, the Democratic world's most Eastern outpost will be weakened and the hopes for a more democratic and freer trade union movement will be greatly jeopardized. And what is even more dangerous, the lack of such assurances from the West will put a higher premium on the necessity of doing business with Joe Stalin.²¹⁷

Thus, Brown came to certain conclusions about Turkey, along with describing its political, economic and trade union conditions in his report:

- First, he suggested that constant visits should be paid to trade unionists in Turkey and national trade union centers should be encouraged to send representatives to the U.S. and they should be materially supported.

²¹⁶ Irving Brown Report on "A Trade Union Mission to Turkey". April 17, 1951, p.21. in the George Meany Archives RG 18-004 Records of Irving Brown 36/16.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

- An ICFTU representative should be given the task of working with the Turkish unions in the field of working conditions, collective bargaining contracts and labor legislations.
- Immediate relations between Turkey and Greece should be coordinated.
- The organizational department of the ICFTU should send a collection of model agreements, constitutions and related materials to the Turkish trade unionists as soon as possible.
- The ICFTU should officially acknowledge the conversation which took place between Turkish Minister of Labor and Irving Brown, the ICFTU representative concerning the former's request that we assist in the future trade union work and drafting labor legislation in Turkey.
- That a representative be sent to other Middle East countries, especially to Egypt, before any Middle East conference was held and that provision be made for the Turks to play a leading role in this future activity.
- Even though a national trade union does not yet exist in Turkey, provision should be made for an observer at the Milan Congress with perhaps a representative of İstanbul, Ankara and the Coal Miners.
- Wherever possible, the democratic countries, especially the U.S.A. and Great Britain, should appoint Labor Attachés to their embassies in Ankara.
- Arrange for Turkish trade unionists to come to the schools and educational seminars of other national trade union centers and the ICFTU.

- Draw Turkey further into the common defense and community of the Democratic world; no hesitation should be shown or time lost by the free trade unions to ask the Atlantic Pact nations to guarantee Turkey's border against aggression by mutual pacts and alliance with the Western forces.

These ten articles constituted the road map of the ECA regarding improvement of the labor component as an anti-communist tool. Irving Brown conceptualized his philosophy for the course of action to be pursued for and by Turkey, the underlying assumption of which was common security concerns and the Communist threat. Within this framework, he suggested Turkey's inclusion into the Atlantic Pact. Furthermore, he tailored an active role for Turkey to play in the Middle East so that those countries could adopt Turkey as a model. Upon this report, education and training activities were implemented and 600 Turkish unionists were sent to the U.S.A to receive training about collective bargaining and the American way of life. As Brown stated, the American government had an economic aid schedule to labor unions in all countries in Europe, including Turkish unionists. The assistance was channeled to Turkish government through AID.²¹⁸

Ali Rauf Akan, journalist from *Gece Postası* was also close friend of Brown and he accompanied him to İstanbul, İzmir and Ankara as translator. Akan went to the USA in November 1951 and he wrote his memoir in a new series in *Gece Postası*. He wrote his memoir on American industry and unions in a news series, in which he promoted American way of unionization and life style and evil side of communism

²¹⁸ However, the research I conducted on the original documents of Marshall Plan Agreements or State correspondence or Assembly minutes do not tell us how much money was transferred. Financial and training assistance is confirmed by unionists at Türk-İş yet nobody knows the amount.

as a threat to democracy.²¹⁹ Ali Rauf Akan went to the USA again wrote a 64 page long report in 1952 entitled ‘What have the Turkish labor unions leaders seen in the United States?’

Various groups of workers traveled from New York to San Francisco, Kansas City, Denver, Chicago, Detroit, Cincinnati, Knoxville and Washington, D.C. They investigated the labor movement and activities in several areas of the United States. Everywhere, they found strong, rich and active local unions. That they even had their own press, bureaus, newspapers and printing shops was striking for the Turkish mission. Like central unions, they had huge buildings.²²⁰ What was interesting for the Turkish mission was that they observed a health center with 185 doctors, which was owned by the Women’s Garment Workers Union. In addition, most workers had their own cars. Apartments were provided to families.

Akan recorded their observations and the interesting points regarding the American way of life, labor, production facilities and sense of liberty. The most striking fact he observed was the fact that American labor unions had tremendous financial resources. Akan reported that the American worker’s aversion to Communism may be explained by his love of democracy and freedom and his attitude toward life.²²¹ Akan also observed that the average American is a modest person but takes pride in his work, his machine or his new invention. He is proud of his apparatus, designs and laboratories just as a good father is proud of the physical

²¹⁹ Ali Rauf Akan, “Amerika’dan Geliyorum”, 31 October 1951; ‘İşte Amerika”, 1 November 1951; “Birleşik Amerika ve Biz”, 3 November 1951; “İşte Sendikacılık”, 5 October 1951; “Demokratik Gelişmemiz ve Amerika”, 7 November 1951

²²⁰ Ali Rauf Akan, ‘Report on What the Turkish Labor Leaders Have Seen in America.’ Part I the George Meany Archives. RG 18-004 Records of Irving Brown 36/15, Circa 1952, 2.

²²¹ Ibid., 6.

and mental growth of his children.²²² This was the image of a hardworking American, enthusiastic to produce.

Akan also had many impressions about various aspects of the trade unions. For instance, American labor unions were not directly engaged in politics and were not in pursuit of seats in the Congress or the Cabinet. Collective bargaining was its chief concern, but not politics. Workers had individual rights and liberties. Motion picture actors also had a union. Workers received 60% of the average national income. The American worker was both a producer and a consumer. Women and men worked together and young female workers were not under the supervision of their parents, but they had self-control.

In the meantime, Akan and his mission met French as well as Turkish and Greek immigrants from Turkey, working at the Ford and Buick factories, steel, textile factories and atom bomb bureaus. They talked about the heritage they shared. Akan also reported that Turkey had a positive image due to its contribution to the American forces in the Korean War. For example, the boss of a factory, in Chicago which they visited, took a gun out of his drawer and said ‘I keep this for Stalin’. Akan responded that Turks were also good at using guns, and the boss of the factory replied that this had been confirmed in Korea.²²³ He added that the heroism displayed in Korea led every American to admire the Turkish nation. As to the observation of the mission regarding daily life, they were amazed by the way American houses were constructed and remarked on kitchen disposers. Furthermore, street cars operated in a way that people did not have to introduce their tickets but only identities. Television was common. And every worker had a car and the family ties were close.

²²² Ibid., 7.

²²³ Ibid., 11.

At the end of two month training, approximately 600 Turkish trade union leaders had finished exploring the American labor system and way of life. They came back to Turkey to implement what they had seen. They seized upon the opportunity to find out about American productivity and how industrial relations were organized differently from Communist trade union organizations. Turkish unionists were not knowledgeable about the unionization types in France, Italy or Britain. Thus, America's effort to enlighten Turkish unionists about the freedom of association, organization and collective bargaining was in fact of pre-emptive nature vis-à-vis possible influence of a communist type of unionization.

The interactions continued both in the form of correspondence and field visits paid by American labor representatives to Turkish industrial sites. Brown came to Turkey twice after his first visit and in his second visit, he met with the Minister of Labor to emphasize the necessity for a Turkish confederation and the Turkey's membership into the ICFTU in order to fight communism. Democrat Party in power made a pledge to support the establishment of such a confederation.

Finally, a national federation of Turkish trade unions, which was to be known as *Türk-İş*, was established in 1952. On December 6, 1952, *Türk-İş* made an application to the Turkish Prime Ministry for permission to be a member of the ICFTU.²²⁴ Establishment of such a federation and improvement among the unions at the organizational level was important, because the AFL expected;

the federation to improve the workers' standards and conditions, to develop increasing social responsibility, and to become the most effective force in promoting peace and freedom and in protecting human liberty against Communist subversion and dictatorship.²²⁵

²²⁴ From İsmail İnan, President of Turkish Labor Confederation to Irving Brown, March 30, 1953, George Meany Archives, 36/14 RG 18-004 Records of Irving Brown.

²²⁵ From Matthew Woll, First Vice-President AFL Chairman, International Relations and Free Trade Union Committees, AFL., to President of Republic of Turkey, Celal Bayar, December 29, 1954, George Meany Archives, RG 18 International Affairs Department, Jay Lovestone Files 1939-1974.

The AFL Free Trade Union Committee appreciated the determination of the Turkish federation of labor unions in resisting Communist intrigue and their courageous opposition to Soviet imperial aggression.²²⁶ It may be observed from the foregoing that the language used by the AFL always underlined anti-Communism and Soviet aggression and the significance of labor unions in this fight.

In cooperation with the ECA, thanks to Irving Brown in 1951, arrangements were initiated for a one year period in the field of operation of employment service organization so as to develop the use of country' s manpower resources and its economy.²²⁷ The AFL-CIO representatives visited Turkey very often. To illustrate Turkey's strategic importance to the United States, Irving Brown's speech, delivered at the 71st Convention of the American Federation of Labor on September 17, 1952, should be reviewed because it draws the general ideology and the objectives pursued by the U.S.A.

Turkey is becoming more and more the shining star in the NATO Constellation. With their twenty divisions on foot and their great record in Korea, the Turks are cocky, proud and a nation of tough fighters. But now this military reputation is being matched in the economic and social spheres as the industrialization of the country proceeds. Thanks to American assistance, Turkey became a wheat exporter in 1952. This economic and military progress is now being paralleled by the development of a trade union organization. This is the first time Turkey will have a national trade union federation. Thus Turkey is expected to have:

- A democratic, non-Communist trade union leadership coming from the workshops of the nation
- A trade union movement to defend the economic and social interests of the workers, permitting labor to participate in the humanization of the industrialization process now under way

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ From Faruk Kadam, The National Employment Service System to Robert L. Thomas, Consultant, MSA TA 77-65, February 5, 1952. George Meany Archives RG 18, 004 Records of Irving Brown 36/15.

- A labor movement which can help in the strengthening of the free trade union and democratic nationalist movement in the Middle East where an unholy combination of Communists and extreme fanatic nationalism is threatening the independence and freedom of the underdeveloped areas.²²⁸

Finally, Brown said that before Stalin succeeded in consolidating his regime and in exterminating all resistance, the West must engage a political program to free satellite nations from Stalinist control. Accordingly, liberation could come through the media such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, as well as efficient social and labor policies.²²⁹

The AFL's cooperation efforts continued in 1953 and 1954, too. The labor attaché to the US Embassy to Ankara, Millen Buch was dealing with labor union affairs and reporting to the Department of State and the AFL. This way, the AFL was following up the developments at Turkish labor unions. For instance, First Vice-President of the AFL and the head of the International Affairs Matthew Woll sent a letter to President Celal Bayar, to call of the trial of 556 Turkish longshoremen for stopping working between 16 July and 20 July 1954 in order to obtain better working conditions. Woll asked for 'assistance of the President for the interest of the common cause binding the people of Turkey and the United States.'²³⁰

Mutual relations continued and the AFL supported the participation of Türk-İş into international labor conferences. However, although the Democrat Party was supportive of a docile labor movement in order to consolidate its power, it began to

²²⁸ Irving Brown. "The Middle East Danger Sport: United States Must Alter Moslem Policy. Speech delivered at the 71st Convention of the American Federation of Labor." New York, September 17, 1952, in *Vital Speeches of the Day*, (1 October 1952) Vol. 18 Issue 24, 751-756.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, 755.

²³⁰ From Matthew Woll, the first Vice-President of the A.F.L to President Celal Bayar. 29 December 1954, Washington. RG 18 International Affairs Jay Lovestone Files 1939-1974 at the George Meany Archives

suppress the strikes when the economy of the country for the first time witnessed high inflation as of 1954.

4.4. Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated how earnest and well-planned the AFL and Irving Brown was. American trade unions strongly and without hesitance supported the global strategy of their country. Irving Brown's adventure in Germany, work in intelligence field and money transfers from the CIA to the AFL raised questions from time to time about whether Brown was a CIA agent. He, himself rejected this assumption when Dr. Kenan Öztürk asked him this question. He may not be an official agent of the CIA yet one thing is sure that he dedicated his life to internationalization of labor movement and dissemination of American way of unionization in the bipolar setting of the world.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The Marshall Plan, as a revelation of American *exceptionalism*, was an extraordinarily successful operation in Europe including Turkey. The most important fact about the Marshall Plan was that it created a capacity and a spirit of cooperation and integration. It gave flesh and blood and moral purpose to the Atlantic idea and in the process, made acceptable, possible and constructive the hegemonic position of the United States vis-à-vis Europe. It changed the lives of a European generation for twenty-five to thirty years.²³¹

With this end, all the military, economic and social tenets of the Plan were realized and to great extent, they resulted in success. In conjunction with the labor aspect of the Marshall Plan, Turkey carried out positive reforms in the field of labor such as introduction of collective bargaining and improved rights to strike. As Irving Brown envisaged, Turkey's newly founded Federation of Labor was expected to direct and control American economic aid as well as influence the general economic and social life of the nation²³² and the AFL's overseas anti-communist policy and ideology became successful with its policy pursuing to help to establish a non-communist type of confederation in Turkey.

²³¹ Harold Von Cleveland, "If There Had Been No Marshall Plan" in *The Marshall Plan: A Retrospective* (London: Westview Press, 1984), 64.

²³² Irving Brown, "The Middle East Danger Sport: United States Must Alter Moslem Policy. Speech delivered at the 71st Convention of the American Federation of Labor." New York, (September 17, 1952), 756.

On the other hand, limited number of socialist unionists began to challenge the establishment of Türk-İş, the AFL of Turkey and this challenge was institutionalized under DİSK (Revolutionary Labor Unions Confederation), the CIO of Turkey. Hence, this shows that large scale labor assistance to Turkey and efforts of Turkish unionists could not clearly eradicate the socialist unionists. The latter began to smear again in the 1960s and 1970s and defended the involvement of unions into political life. However, this ideology of DİSK caused left and right clashes among the collegiate students and the society ultimately creating an urge for coup d'états. In other words, the AFL's and the ILO resolution regarding the non-involvement of trade unions into political life was confirmed once more.

This ultimate picture of the 1950s can be also interpreted this way. The working class emerged in the USA as of 1860s while the Ottoman Empire's working class was limited. The struggle of American workers for decent working conditions, its unionization efforts, hesitance between socialism and capitalism, American character's influence in the choice of the latter, rise of radicalism and its eradication, as well as their organizational problems during the 1920s and the financially toughest time of the country in the 1930s, have been elaborated in details in order to enhance a better understanding of Cold War era.

Since American unionization movement has deeper roots, it experiences with radicalism in the course of its adolescence, reached maturity during the Great Depression and World War II. American labor unions were extremely supportive of their country's Cold War strategy. They knew that Communism was requiring the establishment of a system contradicting the individualist and liberal American character. For this reason, labor became an intrinsic value of post-world war and government as well as the CIA funneled millions of dollars to reshape European

industrial relations and modes of production. So far, from various examples, it was seen that the labor intervention became very influential in Western Europe while it failed in Eastern Europe, remaining under the Soviet sphere of influence. Nonetheless, since Turkish labor unions had no idea about the international unionization experiences and had to form a working class immediately on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire following the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923; it was fragile to communism and could not experience its due course. America's contribution had been of great help in terms of improvement of organization skills and collective bargaining. Yet, the right to strike remained as an unresolved issue until 1960.

Democrat Party government made a pledge to support the development of a labor confederation vis-à-vis any possible rise of communism among the unions. As Irving Brown stated, money was channeled by American government through AID to Turkish Ministry of Labor. Since no record is available on the amount of money, this side of the story remains blurry.

Democrat Party *per se* benefited from America's contribution to Turkish labor field to a great extent since there was a similar psychology of Red Scare in Turkey. Thus, elimination of communist actors would remove obstacles from its way. In order to strengthen its military and economy, the Democrat Party in Turkey carried out fruitful development programs, in coordination with America, between 1950 and 1954. However, after 1954, the economy began to plunge. Foreign debt doubled between 1950 and 1959.²³³ Hence, America decided to suspend the economic aid until further measures were taken by the government.²³⁴ Furthermore, Marshall Aid had ended in 1952. However, the Plan had promoted the relations of

²³³ Mustafa Albayrak, *Türk Siyasi Tarihinde Demokrat Parti: 1946-1960* (Democrat Party in Turkish Political History) (Ankara: BRC Basım Matbaacılık, 2004), 360.

²³⁴ Namik Zeki Arel, *Ulus* (9 March 1960).

Turkey with the United States of America vis-à-vis the Communist threat and opened new international vistas for American-style organized labor in Turkey, “the Democratic world’s most Eastern outpost.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives and Special Papers

Truman Papers at the Truman Library.
Philip M. Kaiser Papers at the Truman Library.
Records of Irving Brown at the George Meany Archives.
American Embassy to Ankara, Incoming Telegrams from the U.S. Department of State.

Official Documents

- “An Address to a Joint Session of Congress.” 2 April 1917, 8.30 p.m. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 41, January 24-April 6, 1917. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 526-27.
- Brown, Irving. ‘A Trade Union Mission to Turkey.’ 17 April 1951. RG 18-004. Irving Brown Records. 36/16, the George Meany Archives.
- “Espionage Act.” *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 47, March 13-May 12, 1918. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 365.
- “From Paul Oscar Huntin to President Woodrow Wilson.” Washinton D.C April 27, 1917). *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 42, April 7-June 23, 1917. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 146.
- “From Allen W. Ricker to Colonel Edward Mandell House.” New York April 30, 1918. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 47, March 13-May 12, 1918. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 471.
- “From Henry Morgenthau to President Woodrow Wilson.” November 26, 1917. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 45, November 11-January 15, 1918. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 123.
- “From Joseph Patrick Tumulty with Enclosure to the President.” December 14, 1917. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 45, November 11-January 15, 1918. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 288).
- “From Robert Lansing with Enclosure to President Woodrow Wilson.” Washington September 18, 1918. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 51, September

14-November 8, 1918. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), 61-62.

“From Matthew Woll, the first Vice-President of the A.F.L to President Celal” Bayar.” 29 December 1954, Washington. RG 18 International Affairs Jay Lovestone Files 1939-1974 at the George Meany Archives.

New York Senate, Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities. “Refuse to Kill or Be Killed.” *Revolutionary Radicalism*, part 1, “Revolutionary and Subversive Movements Abroad and at Home” 1 (Albany, 1920): 854-855.

New York Senate, Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities. “War Proclamation and Program Adopted at National Convention, Socialist Party, St Louis, Mo., April 1917.” *Revolutionary Radicalism*, part 1, “Revolutionary and Subversive Movements Abroad and at Home” 1 (Albany, 1920): 613-618.

New York Senate, Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities. “Refuse to Kill or Be Killed.” *Revolutionary Radicalism*, part 1, “Revolutionary and Subversive Movements Abroad and at Home” 1 (Albany, 1920): 854-855.)

“The Zimmerman Telegram” 1917. Thomas Paterson, *Major Problems in American Foreign Policy Volume II: Since 1914*, 50.

Newspapers

Cumhuriyet

Demokrasi

Gece Postası

Kudret

Le Monde

Libération

Memleket

New York Times

Son Telegraf

Tanin

Tasvir

The Times

Ulus

Vatan

Articles

Brown, Irving. "The Middle East Danger Sport: United States Must Alter Moslem Policy. Speech delivered at the 71st Convention of the American Federation of Labor." New York, September 17, 1952, in *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 10/1/1952 Vol. 18 Issue 24, 751-756.

"Interim Greece-Turkey Assistance Committee: Survey Mission to Investigate Turkish Needs for Assistance." May 5, 1947. GAC D-26.

"Irving Brown RIP." *National Review*, 4/7/1989, Vol. 41 Issue 6, 18.

Gregory, Ross. "Rights, Honor and Interests." in *Major Problems in American Foreign Policy. Volume II: Since 1914*. (Massachusetts: D.C Heath and Co., 1989).

Greene, Jack. "The American Revolution and Modern Revolutions." In *Understanding the American Revolution*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.

Gomberg, William. "Labor's Participation in the European Productivity Program: A Study in Frustration." *Political Science Quarterly*, 1959, 241-253

Lovestone, Jay. "The Grand Offensive Against the Workers. In *The Government Strikebreaker: The Study of the Role of the Government in the Recent Industrial Crisis*. New York: Workers Party of American, 1923, 9-16. in Loren Baritz.

Peter Weiler. "The United States, International Labor and the Cold War: The Breakup of the World Federation of Trade Unions," *Diplomatic History* 5 (Winter 1981): 1-22

Russell, Philips. "Thoughts About Russia." *International Socialist Review*, 18, no. 1 (July 7, 1917):21.

Sadak, Necmeddin. "Turkey Faces the Soviets". *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 27. 1949.

_____. "The Communist Party Manifesto and Program". *The Communist* 1, no.1 (27 September 1919): 6-9.

Books

Albayrak, Mustafa, *Türk Siyasi Tarihinde Demokrat Parti: 1946-1960*. Ankara: BRC Basım Matbaacılık, 2004.

- Baritz, Loren. *The American Left: Radical Political Thought in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Boris, Eileen and Nelson Lichtenstein. *Major Problems in the History of American Workers*. Massachusetts: D.C Heath and Co., 1991.
- Brown, Irving. "The Marshall Plan." *American Federationist*, Volume VLI, No.1, 36-42.
- Clements, Kendrick A. *Woodrow Wilson: World Statesman*. Chicago: G.K. Hall, 1999.
- Davis, Collin J. *Power at Odds: The 1922 National Railroad Shopmen's Strike*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- Diggins, John Patrick. *The Rise and Fall of the American Left*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1992.
- Federico, Romero. *The United States and the European Trade Union Movement, 1944-1951*. Chapel Hill: University of Carolina Press, 1992.
- Fragher, John Mack et al. *Out of Many: A History of the American People*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003.
- Foner, Philip S.. *History of Labor Movements in the United States*. Vol.3. (New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- Foner, Philip S. *The Policies and Practices of the American Federation of Labor, 1900-1909*. New York: International Publishers, 1964.
- Foner, Philip S.. *U.S. Labor Movement and Latin America*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1988.
- Gardner, Lloyd C.. *Imperial America: American Foreign Policy Since 1898*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1976.
- Hale, William. *The Political and Economic Development of Turkey*. London: Croom Helm, 1981.
- Hale, William. *Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000*. London: Frank Cass, 2000.
- Heckscher, August. *Woodrow Wilson. Biography*. New York: MacMillan Co., 1991.
- Hoffman Stanley and Charles Maier. *The Marshall Plan: A Retroperspective*. London: Westview Press, 1984.
- Hogan, Michael J. *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- Hug, Kathleen E. *The Marshall Plan*. The George C. Marshall Foundation.
- Işık, Yüksel. *Türk Solu ve Sendikal Hareket (Turkish Left and Unionist Movement)*. Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi, 1995
- Koç, Yıldırım. *Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı ve Sendikacılık Tarihi (Turkish Workers' Class and History of Unionization)*. İstanbul: Analiz Basım, 2003.
- Killick, John. *The United States and European Construction 1945-1960*. Edinburgh: Keele University Press, 1997.
- LaFeber, Walter. *The American Age: U.S Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad 1750 to the Present*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1994.
- LaFeber, Walter. *The New Empire*. Ithaca: NY, Cornell University Press 1963.
- Leffler, Melvyn. *Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1994.
- Link, Arthur S. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Volume 41, January 24-April 6, 1917; Volume 42, April 7-June 23, 1917; Volume 45, November 11-January 15, 1918; Volume 47, March 13, May 12, 1918; Volume 51, September 14-November 8, 1918. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Gary Marks. *It Did Not Happen Here: Why Socialism Failed in the United States*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 2000.
- Mee, Charles L. *The Marshall Plan*. New York: Simon and Schuster Inc., 1984.
- Morris, George. *CIA and American Labor: The Subversion of the AFL-CIO's Foreign Policy*. New York: International Publishers, 1967.
- Öztürk, Kenan. *Amerikan Sendikacılığı ve Türkiye: İlk İlişkiler, AFL-CIO'nun Avrupa Temsilcisiyle Söyleşi. (American Unionism and Turkey: Interviews with Irving Brown, Representative of the AFL-CIO)*. İstanbul: Tüstav, 2004.
- Paterson, Thomas. *Major Problems in American Foreign Policy Volume II: Since 1914*. Massachusetts: D.C Heath and Co., 1989.
- Rathbun, Ben. *The Point Man: Irving Brown and the Deadly Post-1945 struggle for Europe and Africa*. Washington: Minerva Press, 1996.
- Rayback, Joseph G.. *A History of American Labor*. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Salvatore, Nick. *Eugene V. Debs: Citizen and Socialist, Biography*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1982.

Schulzinger, Robert D. *U.S Diplomacy Since 1900*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Scammell, W.M.. *The International Economy Since 1945*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Sims, Beth. *Workers of the World Undermined: American Labor's Role in US Foreign Policy*. Boston: South End Press, 1992.

Sülker, Kemal. *Türkiye Sendikacılık Tarihi. (Turkish Labor Unions History)*. İstanbul: Tüstav, 2004.

Wexler, Imanuel. *The Marshall Plan Revisited: The European Recovery Program in Economic Perspective*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Weinstein, James. *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State, 1900-1918*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Dissertation:

Jensen, Gordon M.. "The National Civic Federation: American Business in an Age of Social Change and Social Reform, 1900-1910" (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton 1956)

Öztürk, Kenan. "L'Experience Türk-İş dans le Mouvement Syndical en Turquie" (Dissertation du Doctorat. L'Université de Paris VIII. 1990).

APPENDIX A



Kore sendika delegasyonu, Türk sendikacılar ve I. Brown Kore'de yaralanan Türk askerini hastahanedeki ziyaret ediyorlar.

Fotoğrafın arkasındaki not şöyle: June 1951 in İstanbul, Korean unionists visiting Turkish veterans. "Basın-foto" Beyoğlu, Sakızağacı No: 3 İstanbul.



Türk sendikacılar, Koreli sendikacılar ve I. Brown bir lokantada.

Fotoğrafın arkasındaki not şöyle: İstanbul, June 1951, Korean and Turkish trade unionist. "Basın-foto" Beyoğlu, Sakızağacı No: 3 İstanbul.

(Fotoğrafları I. Brown ABD'den, kendi özel arşivinden getirtmişti.)



Gazeteci Ali Rauf Akan ile I. Brown.

*Fotoğrafın arkasındaki not şöyle: Island of Prinkips, Sunday June 3, 1951
I. B. with Ali Rauf Akan.*

Bu fotoğrafı I. Brown ABD'den, kendi özel albümünden getirtmiştir.

APPENDIX B

A TRADE UNION MISSION TO TURKEY

This is a report on a mission to explore the labor and trade union situation in Turkey. Starting from Greece on March 18th, I left Alexandropolis by train to go to Pythion, the last Greek town before crossing the Turkish border. Arrangements had been made with trade union friends in Alexandropolis to meet the Greek and Turkish station masters at Pythion. Alexandropolis is a small town on the sea with a relatively important port and fishing village completely surrounded by an agricultural area of tobacco. I proceeded to Pythion with the representative of the Greek Railroad Workers stationed at Alexandropolis. After a three hour ride on the Diesel train through the flooded areas of Greece which reveals part of the tragic economic situation, we arrived at Pythion where I met both the Greek and Turkish station masters and on this Greek-Turkish border first contact with the Turkish labor situation was made. The Greek station master greeted me with great friendship - warm and open. The Turk was subdued, extremely polite, diplomatic but friendly. The latter answered all questions on trade union matters with a smile but did not hesitate a moment to make the best possible arrangements for my trip on the train and for my reception in Istanbul. After some conversation with both station masters and a meal of cheese, bread and some strong Raki (a drink which I have come to refer to as a Turkish "pernod"), the Turk promised that when the "Express" for Istanbul would arrive at Pythion within a few minutes of our conversation, he would inform the conductors and the Pullman men of my mission and make all arrangements for me on the train to Istanbul which would permit me to speak freely with the conductors and other trainmen. He also promised to wire ahead to Istanbul to the station master there to make arrangements for me in Istanbul.

NOTICE: This material may be protected under the copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code). This copy is for reference use only. No further reproduction may be made without permission. The George Meany Memorial Archives, 10000 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20903, (301) 441-4441; 431-0365 (Fax)

When the train arrived in Pythion I bid good-bye to my Greek and Turkish railroad friends and boarded the train to greet my new-found Turkish railroad friends. For the next 8 1/2 hours the train proceeded on its way to Istanbul, passing through the poor countryside of Turkey which in itself told the story of the miserable conditions under which 80 p.c. of the population live. Housing was abominable - if housing is the right word. The train was not too comfortable and I estimated that the alleged express made a stop on the average of every 15 minutes. However, what was most important, I had the opportunity of talking with many Turks, especially railroad workers which gave me my first introduction to Turkish life. At the outset, the workers were quite hesitant to talk about such strange subjects as trade unions and labor legislation. After getting over his first hesitation and warming up to this subject, the wagon-lit man (in a train with no wagon-lit) stated that up until recently trade unions were dangerous things to talk about but that since the victory of the Democratic Party in 1950, it was something which more and more was in the wind. It was definitely my first impression that workers identified their interests with the Democratic Party and looked forward to what could be called a New Deal for labor. The railroadmen were especially happy about the introduction of old age pensions which although low were better than the previous situation where no provision existed for retiring and old workers. In fact, this primitive beginning in the field of social security summed up the extent of the railroadworkers' knowledge of trade unions. They were completely uninformed as to what was going on in this field but did reflect the fact that something was happening. They kept saying that "we know that unions are now going to be organized in Turkey, but we don't know anything about them". I later discovered that unions are still not allowed on the government railroads, but

those working for the wagon-lit company did have a union.

Aside from the expected proud nationalist feelings of the Turks which was revealed in all our conversations, especially with one of the customs men on the train who was still ready to fight the Bulgarians, the Greeks and the Russians one at a time or all together, this was about the sum and substance of my conversations on the train, but what is more important than what they actually said was the definite impression that in the past year workers had begun to feel that a new economy was developing, social legislation was being introduced and improved and that the trade union movement was being born. All of which seemed to be identified in the minds of workers with the coming to power of the Democratic Party which had been all-out in the political campaign for both the right of free enterprise and the right to strike as contrasted to the Republic Party and the system of State-controlled trade unions. Although this may be an over simplification, it was quite clear on my first day in Turkey as well as my last when I left Turkey on March 26th, that this trend towards less State control and more free enterprise as contrasted with the trend towards nationalization in Western Europe was one of the differentiating factors between Turkey and Western Europe. It is the reverse of major post-war trends in Europe. However, Turkey and her citizens are equally proud of the fact that they have become part of the Westernization process and have left behind the fez and the veiled women.

After this long and interesting ride to Istanbul, I was quite surprised to be met at the Istanbul station by the station master who had been notified of my arrival by his colleague at Pythion on the Greek-Turkish border. After the usual greetings which were extremely polite and courteous, I proceeded to open up the discussion on the question of trade unionism in Turkey. The reaction was the same as his fellow station master in Pythion. He shied off completely by saying this was a question beyond his personal competence, but he was quite certain that there were other friends and contacts in Istanbul who could be of

greater service to me on such a subject. I did not press the question and proceeded to the hotel where he had made very excellent arrangements. From here on out I was in. I began to make contacts both in Istanbul and in Ankara in what can be called the budding labor movement of Turkey. In various industries and service trades I must have met individually, in groups and meetings close to 600 workers, some of whom are officers of union, others merely members or delegates to various central bodies and to congresses. I visited trade union offices, men on the jobs, the port, homes, Labor Ministry officials. I saw workers on the job, in their unions and meetings, with Government officials and off the job at "play" - their "rakı" is not too easy to take but I held my own which did not hurt in discovering what makes Turkish workers tick.

From all these meetings and contacts it is quite clear that in the past year there has been a real upsurge in the organization of trade unions. Especially since the victory of the Democratic Party, trade unions have practically doubled in number and in total membership. Although there is no national federation of trade unions, all developments on local and regional levels are moving in that direction. Five regional federations exist: in Istanbul, Ankara, Bursa, Izmir and Çukurova. The biggest federation is the Istanbul Federation of Labor which has 44 local unions and a membership of about 27,000. The major unions are concentrated in textile, flour mills, electric and motor transportation, government monopolies, tobacco and cigarettes, iron and metal goods, etc. For example, out of a membership of approximately 27,000 in the Istanbul Federation of Labor two-thirds are concentrated in nine industries.

Out of a total industrial working class of 368,000 it is estimated there are about 100,000 workers in the unions of Turkey.

One of the biggest unions is the Coal Miners organization in Zonguldak, one of the Black Sea ports. It is hard to say what the actual number of coal miners is since it is partly seasonal work, but the report is that the trade union of the coal miners is extremely powerful and has a very large treasury. I do hope that this organization which is located on the Black Sea can be visited by myself on a return visit or by some ICFTU representative. Along with this national federation of coal miners, there are only two or three others -- in the hotel and restaurant and I believe the textile industries.

Unions in Turkey were begun as far back as 1909. Until 1950 control by the State has been extremely rigid, although since 1947 this rigidity has been relaxed. As has already been pointed out, the victory of the Democratic Party in May 1950 speeded up this process of decontrol of the trade unions, but it is too soon to say that the process has been completed. The Government through the Ministry of Labor still retains controls over the unions and in many cases may have even been responsible for creating unions. Here is where Turkish officials keep insisting on the differences with trade unions in the Western world. Officials of the Ministry of Labor emphasized the fact that Turkey is highly agrarian, and very little initiative has come from the workers themselves in the creation of unions. They also emphasize their deep concern with what may happen in the transition period from a state of restrictions to one of complete freedom to organize, especially in the light of a possible threat of Communist Party infiltration. This is a consideration which cannot be dismissed too lightly but must be placed in its proper perspective.

There appears to be some, although not as yet serious, internal frictions in the unions due to political and personality differences. There is strict legislation against the entrance of the trade unions into political party affairs.

There is even a law forbidding any political activity upon the part of the trade unions. Actually, there are three or four trade unionists who have become deputies in the Parliament from the Democratic Party in the last elections. They have since resigned their trade union posts but still retain their interest and, I suspect, their influence in the trade unions. The defeat of the present President of the Istanbul Federation of Labor for political office in the last elections and the victory of one of the leaders of the Textile Workers, Altinil, reflects not only differences between these individuals but between the two dominant political parties and their attitude towards the right to strike which was the leading issue raised by the Democratic Party in the last elections. Now, people want to know whether or not the Government will carry through its promises and how far it will go in the direction of granting the right to strike. This whole "disentangling" process now going on in Turkey - i.e. to extricate labor and the trade unions from State control - involves the repealing or at least modification of existing labor and social legislation. This is a highly political process and no matter how many times the Turks state their loyalty to non-political trade union action, the political obstacles remain as predominant factors. And it was quite clear in all my discussions with workers and trade unionists that the issue of the right to strike, the repeal of restrictive trade union laws and the adoption of new labor legislation was uppermost in the minds of both trade union members and officers.

There are practically no collective bargaining agreements in existence in Turkey. Since the workers are forbidden to strike and the employers the right of lock-out, compulsory arbitration arrangements plus a system of labor courts resolves all questions in dispute. Wages and working conditions are the concern of the Ministry of Labor. The Ministry of Labor through its regional offices

sends out factory inspectors to look after working conditions in industry and trade. I suspect that these inspectors may also take on semi-police functions relative to the running of unions and keeping an eye on internal developments, especially as related to the question of Communist infiltration. This practice seems to be in a state of decline, but no one can deny that under present legislation it may still exist and interfere with the actual development of an independent trade union movement.

In considering the trade union movement of Turkey, one must never forget (and few Turks ever let you forget) that Turkey lives and has lived for hundreds of years in the shadow of the great Russian bear. The Turks are even more anti-Russian than anti-Communist. Deep concern with the problem of security and defense against the U.S.S.R., both externally and internally, colors every aspect of the Turkish situation including that of the trade unions. There is virtually a spy complex. This age old traditional fear of Russia is easily explained by the reality of a common border - in fact the only common border that the anti-Communist world has with the Soviet Union. And on the other side of that common border are millions of people living in the U.S.S.R. who are Turkish in origin and who still speak the language. I heard all sorts of stories about infiltration of spies and of secret trials that were supposed to have taken place in Eruzum, one of the extreme Eastern outposts of Turkey. Police surveillance is certainly maintained and no one can deny this necessity in Turkey. There is no reason to believe that such a surveillance is not maintained over the internal life of the unions. That it exists was partially confirmed in my own mind by private off the record conversations with individuals close to the unions and to the Labor Ministry who were in a position to know.

As a result of this anti-Russian and anti-Communist atmosphere, there

exists legislation restricting affiliation to international organizations which applies most definitely and directly to the trade unions. Such legislation is directed primarily against Soviet-controlled international organizations like the WFTU, the Cominform, etc. Affiliation to international bodies can be achieved if the Government, through the Council of Ministers, sanctions such an action. In a conversation with the Minister of Labor and the Under-Secretary of Labor, I was assured that if and when a national trade union federation becomes organized in Turkey and application for affiliation to the ICFTU is made, there would be no opposition on the part of the Government since the interest, advice and counsel of the ICFTU in the field of trade unionism and labor legislation was welcomed. They even suggested that we could be of immediate assistance to them in the drafting of new labor legislation as well as the repeal or modification of existing laws now being considered.

Another outstanding aspect of trade union developments here as contrasted to other countries where trade unions are first beginning and where the industrialization process is relatively new is the fact that the workers themselves are building the unions. The officers are all workers from the shops. This contrasts with a country like India where the leadership is primarily composed of intellectuals like lawyers, social workers, etc. Here, in Turkey, unions are being built by workers who come to very poor union headquarters after their regular day's work has been finished. Unions are being built from the bottom up. There are very few paid officers and a paid union functionary is a rare bird and is the exception rather than the rule. The President of the Istanbul Federation of Labor, Zühtü Tedeş, is still working as an electrician in a flour-mill and can only devote time to the union and to work in the union headquarters after he has finished his day at the flour-mill. He has been

working for over 25 years on the job and represents the kind of leadership which is developing out of the shops. This is one of the most striking contrasts with trade union developments in other industrially backward areas throughout the Middle and Far East.

Why and how have unions developed in Turkey? This question can only be answered and understood within the framework of Turkish history and the Westernization process started by Ataturk after the first World War. Trade unions were conceived and accepted in large measure as one of the elements inherent in industrialization. The authoritarian State and its masters looked upon unions as one of the means to control the growing industrial labor supply. This also fitted in rather neatly with the idea that unions could be utilized as a means to combat those elements who not only opposed the Westernization process, but who also opposed the whole policy of the State on industrial and political organization. It combined rather well with the anti-Communist laws. Repressive measures cloaked in quasi-social policies could be more effectively put over through the alleged trade unions. Thus, up until recent times, the State-conceived unions were instruments to beat the Communists at their own game while aiding in the general plan to halt any attempted spread of Communism as an ideology and a political party.

It would be wrong, however, to consider trade union developments in Turkey merely as a negative expression of the State's desire for security against Communism. The convictions of sincerely progressive Government leaders and functionaries have also played an important role in encouraging the creation of labor unions. This is true of individuals in the Ministry of Labor, and especially the present under-secretary, Mr. Muslih Fer. I believe he was sincere when he kept emphasizing to me that unions are necessary in themselves

rather than as instruments to be used against enemies of the State. Mr. Fer represents that strong tendency in Turkish politics today which is pushing for the revision of present labor legislation in order to permit a freer development of trade union organization. Towards achieving this goal he outlined an entire program of legislation which the present government is now preparing for Parliament. This program includes such proposals as the repeal of the ban on strikes although certain conditions and restrictions will be maintained in the key public service industries; an unfair labor practices law; paid weekly rest days and paid national holidays with double time for any work done on the seventh consecutive day of a single week; mandatory paid vacations with eligibility and length of time related to the seniority of workers; certain ILO conventions on discrimination and inspection of labor conditions will also be submitted for adoption to Parliament; minimum wage law committees are being set up; and already labor courts are being instituted to deal with labor disputes which are beginning to arise in various parts of the country. This partial example of the Government's program indicates the rising supremacy of those elements who wish to combine an advanced social legislation with a free trade union movement. Perhaps the best test of the sincerity of the Ministry of Labor officials is the attitude expressed by one of them concerning his visit to Argentine in 1948. He expressed disgust with what he saw of the Peronista movement and was quite unequivocal, "undiplomatic" and honest in his denunciation of the dictatorial methods which reminded him of the "Führer complex" of the Hitler days.

I was to learn later that in Istanbul the Labor Attaché of the Argentinian Embassy had wormed his way into a close relationship with the inexperienced trade union leaders. He was advising them ^{on} all trade union matters -- organization, structure, etc. -- while at the same time putting over his propaganda for Evita.

Since my visit to Istanbul I do not think that Mr. Peron and his representative will play much of a role there. Before leaving Istanbul, I was happy to note that the Istanbul Federation of Labor's office no longer displayed the banner of Mr. Peron's C.G.T. which was on the wall when I first arrived. This incident indicates the naïveté of the Turkish trade union leaders who are seeking advice and counsel. They found no one else around, either in or out of government, who could sit down with them and discuss their immediate problems of collective bargaining agreements, constitutions, statutes and labor legislation. This alone almost justifies the trip and points the way to what kind of aid can be given by the ICFTU to these green but constantly learning trade union leaders of Turkey.

While recognizing the historical factors which brought about trade unions in Turkey, the great driving force today, however, is the fundamental desire upon the part of the workers to develop organizations to improve their economic and social situation and begin to play for the first time a role in influencing national policy. The upsurge of trade unionism in Turkey coincides with one of the greatest political upsets in modern times. The election of the Democratic Party in a landslide vote was in part due to the stirring of the masses both in the workshops and on the farm who identified their hope for a little better life with the aims and slogans of the Democratic Party. One of the major slogans of the political campaign of the Democratic Party was the promise to repeal the law forbidding workers to engage in strikes. This promise on the part of the Democratic Party to grant a greater amount of freedom, especially in the field of labor unions and social security legislation captured the imagination of the great masses. For Turkish workers this amounted to their New Deal program and they are beginning to enter the unions in greater numbers than ever.

Bad economic conditions are driving workers to organize. As past fears

disappear and more freedom is granted and practiced, the trade unions will begin to move towards greater collective bargaining in the field of wages, hours and working conditions. Up until the present there are still many controls. Wages average from a minimum of a little more than a dollar a day to a maximum of five dollars per day for an exceptionally highly skilled worker. The cost of living is not very much lower than that of the Western world.

It must be pointed out, however, that the entire national economic state of the nation is so poor that one cannot expect great or fast changes in the lot of the workers until there is a general improvement of the national production and income. These normal economic difficulties will be intensified by the eventual influx of 250,000 refugees to be expelled from Bulgaria -- already 53,000 have returned under the most dire conditions.

Turkey is still in the throes of its industrial revolution and the standards of living of farmers and workers are about as low as I have seen anywhere outside of the miserable state of life in India and other Asian countries. But there are no great, & vast differences between top management and workers as can be seen in the U.S.S.R. and the East. The absence of unreasonable economic contrasts contributes to a state of social stability. While Turkey is perhaps one of the most socially stable countries in the entire Middle Eastern area (and this was confirmed by one of the most outstanding experts on the Communist movement in that part of the world) there is no question that the workers of Turkey must begin to get a better deal. No one can deny that, in spite of this stable situation, the growing role of the labor movement in economic and political affairs is the next big stage of development in Turkish life.

As a result of conversations and meetings with trade unionists in their extremely poor and modest headquarters, I came away with the impression that

slowly but surely there is being organized a corps of cadres and leaders who will be quite capable of heading up a militant national trade union movement. When I was in Ankara, I was extremely impressed with Ismail Aras, one of the heads of the recently created National Federation of Hotel, Restaurant and Amusement Workers. He is Vice-President and General Secretary of this Federation and is at the same time the leader of the Ankara Federation of Labor. He is a man of 35 years of age who has worked all his life since the age of 16. He is now displaying a spirit of dynamism and energy which has resulted in his Federation being one of the most effective in securing satisfaction for the demands of the workers he represents. He has also been able to secure a strong position for the labor movement in discussions now taking place in Ankara for the repeal of labor and social legislation. I spent two days with him and his associates which include, however, not only workers and trade unionists, but a number of young people in the newspaper world who are interested in trade unions and in getting as much publicity as possible for the labor movement. Although I feel relatively certain that most of these individuals are sincere and honest in their cooperation it would be well to watch this phase of trade union activity with extreme caution in order to prevent any outside influence from getting control of the labor movement for non-labor purposes. I am not yet convinced that this is the case, but I have an uneasy feeling about this kind of relationship where we are dealing with a new and inexperienced labor leadership.

In Ankara, I learned that a regional and local organization was being built up in the leading industrial areas of Turkey with elections for office taking place every two years. Elections proceed more or less along similar lines to trade unions in the West although there is, as in Greece, an exceedingly high proportion of regional Congress delegates to membership. For example, the Istanbul

Federation Congress which I attended on March 25th had 500 delegates representing about 30,000 members. This however was not the case in Ismail Aras' Restaurant Union which had a Congress of only 38 delegates representing about 10,000. According to information received in Ankara, dues ranged from 1/2 Turkish Lira to 2 1/2 Turkish Liras per month which is approximately 17 cents to 85 cents a month. There is no other source of income for the present unions and this explains the fact that very few unions can afford permanent officers as yet. Most of the work of the unions is done by officers who receive no pay and who do their union work after they have finished their eight hours in the shop. There is a display of interest, self-sacrifice and enthusiasm which is quite similar to the early efforts to build unions in Europe and the USA. It was fascinating to sit in the local union offices of Ankara and Istanbul and start a conversation with two or three union men and notice that after an hour or so the conversation had attracted 15, 20 and in some cases 50 people all piled into a room which seemed to be bursting at the seams. (There are no luxurious union headquarters as yet) This was a testimony not only to the interest and enthusiasm of these workers but to the fact that this is an independently organized affair with neither State nor employer patronage.

In most of the conversations which took place with workers and with officers of unions, the discussions on the right to strike predominated. Although the Government is proposing legislation granting the conditional right to strike, Ismail Aras and his organization are proposing their own legislation which, although more unconditional than the Government's in the field where unions are organizing, still recognizes the need for protecting the national interest, especially in the strategic industries. There is no unanimity of opinion nor complete clarity on this question of the right to strike. In the various debates

which are now going on in the trade union halls there is reflected the various shades of moderation and extremism which are usually found in trade union councils. Although these differences revolve mostly about whether or not the right to strike shall be conditional or unconditional, the organized workers of Turkey regard the issue of the right to strike as the test in determining whether or not unions in their country shall be free or Government controlled. Men like Aras feel that whether or not the right of free collective bargaining can be established and practiced depends on whether or not in the last analysis the unions shall have the right to strike against an employer. It should be pointed out also that the differences existing on this question reflect to a certain degree political loyalties. The extent of workers' concern with this issue is also determined by the type of industry in which they are organized, i.e. whether or not it is private or State controlled. The greatest push for the unconditional right to strike comes from those elements in private industry as contrasted to those who are working in State and public service industries where unions are either completely controlled or do not or cannot exist at all.

In the present Labor Code there is an article forbidding organizations and unions to engage in political activities, stipulating that unions must be confined to the professional interests of the workers. This principle is generally enunciated and set forth with great solemnity by both Government and trade union officials. Yet it is quite clear that the political role of unions and the relationships of unions to politics are actual realities in practice. The process of disentangling the unions from State control and direction is imposing political tasks on the unions and forcing the Government to deal with trade unions and their leaders as political factors. This was brought home to me time and time again by the great number of questions which union members and officers asked about the relationship of trade unions to politics in other countries, especially in the

United States.

Not only was the interest in politics a result of their concern about the question of the right to strike and collective bargaining, but also a result of their tremendous interest in the need for social insurance for the workers. Up until recently this did not exist and I can still remember the railroad conductor who told me that the only thing that he knew about unions and about labor legislation in Turkey was the fact that since the Democratic Party had come to power, legislation had been adopted giving him some kind of old age pension which although small was something to look forward to when he retired in the near future. This was the kind of security which workers were looking for and which they identified with the coming of a strong trade union organization. There was certainly no hope of security in their old age from the terribly low wages received by them. Much of what I learned from Aras and his friends in Ankara was repeated by his trade union associates in Istanbul. There I spent some busy days talking with workers both in the trade union offices and the shops. In fact, the President of the Istanbul Federation of Labor, Zühtü Teşey, as I have already mentioned, is still working as chief electrician in the flour-mill. In order to get to see him, since he was on the night shift when I was in Istanbul, I went out to the flour-mill one night with a Turkish newspaper friend who acted as my guide and interpreter. Since he had a newspaper pass I was able to get into the mill and to the surprise of Mr. Teşey presented myself as the representative of the ICFTU. After getting over his first shock, the traditional Turkish coffee was ordered and there I proceeded to talk with this 55-year old trade union leader, seated in front of the electric power controls which he tended. We discussed pretty much the same problems I have already presented as being on the minds of the Turkish trade unionists. Although I must say that he was more moderate, more prudent and

mature in his demands and outlook. Perhaps this coincides with the fact that he was a defeated candidate on the Republican Party ticket. He certainly reflected a more conservative stand but was extremely anxious to get all the advice and help from the ICTU that could be gotten on trade union constitutions, working conditions, collective bargaining agreements and labor legislation. (Here I must interject to report that this was a reaction and request heard everywhere in discussions with Turkish workers.) He introduced me to the workers of the shop. Amidst plenty of flour dust which stuck to me for several hours after leaving the mill, the impression left was that here was a working class which had labored and suffered for a long time under very low standards and although remaining extremely patriotic and loyal to their country, they were getting extremely restive and moving slowly but surely towards trade union organization and that they were going to be heard from soon.

I visited the trade union office of the Istanbul Federation of Labor several times and spent several interesting hours getting information from workers which paralleled what I had learned from Aras and Tedey. But I think what was most interesting about the conversations with workers crammed into their miserable, broken down union offices was not so much what I asked but the type of questions which they threw at me such as: 1) How do you organize unions in the West? 2) Could you give us copies of collective bargaining agreements and could you tell us how we can go about starting such practices here in Turkey? 3) What do you think of the right to strike? Does it exist in Western Europe and the USA and are there any conditions or reservations on the right to strike and what are they? 4) What role do the unions play in politics? What relations do they have to political parties and to the Government? 5) Tell us about your social security system. How is it run? What are the contributions and how are

the contributions raised ? 6) What is the structure of your national trade union organization ? Should we organize a national trade union Federation before we have organized national federations in the various industries or should we wait until all of the basic industries and trades have set up their federations? What shall be the basis of the national Federation and the national Congress ?

7) Could you arrange for the exchange of trade union delegations, especially with other organizations in the Middle East and also with Greece ?

These questions give you an idea of what the role of the ICFTU can be in Turkey. For we must take on this task of helping the Turkish workers themselves to answer these questions. The right answers will mean the creation of a living functioning Turkish National Federation of Labor affiliated to the ICFTU.

One of the last meetings which I attended before leaving Turkey was the Congress of the Istanbul Federation of Labor where over 500 delegates attended representing not more than 30,000 workers. What was extremely encouraging about this meeting was the range from extremely young men of 25 years of age to men of 60 years. One of the textile workers, about 28 years old, delivered a speech which was excellent in every way -- good trade union sense, balanced and penetrating. I spoke to him immediately after he was finished and learned that he was studying the English and German languages every day after work. He was eager to learn everything he could about trade unionism so that one day he could really qualify to become a "trade union official" and help alleviate the conditions under which he and his people now worked. The young man typified this cross section of young, middle aged and old men who spoke their mind without any hesitation concerning basic problems of conditions of work, wages, social security, problems of young workers and the beginnings of unemployment which for the first time is being mentioned in the newspapers as a serious and almost critical problem.

But not only did they deal with these basic economic issues, they also spent hours debating the financial report of their treasurer, examining every cent of a budget which amounted to about 6,000 liras a year or about \$2,000. I can testify to the fact that the treasurer got a thorough going ^{over} before the assembly adopted his report. This financial discussion at the Congress revealed not only their extreme care in how money was being handled, but stressed the point already made that the Istanbul Federation of Labor was being built out of the contributions of the workers themselves. The fact that the meeting was being held on a Sunday in a hall which was given to them by the management was appreciated by the delegates, but it was also interesting to hear some of the delegates state publicly their great regret and even "shame" that they were unable to have their own meeting hall and that they had to meet on the premises of the employer due to lack of funds. But these were free men at least for one day as they expressed in no uncertain terms their open and outright criticism of the Ministry of Labor and in the presence of representatives of the Ministry who had been invited to attend this trade union session. The meeting was conducted in a rather elementary and inexperienced fashion and there was not too much control by the chair of the assembled delegates who did not seem to be inhibited whenever they felt like indicating approval or disapproval of what certain speakers said. But in spite of all these obvious and expected shortcomings, the definite impression was left that here was a group of men and women representing a movement which was being born under some of the most adverse economic conditions that I have ever seen. In most cases they are exhibiting some good sound instinct, asking the proper questions and demanding the proper kind of help from their trade union friends and allies in the world. All of them expressed gratitude that a representative of the international labor movement had come to their meeting. They wanted to keep up the contact, they wanted to get any and all material we could give in

assisting them to develop a real trade union movement. They hoped that as a national trade union organization could be created, which men like Ismail Aras felt would come about at the end of 1951 or the beginning of 1952, their affiliation to the ICFTU could be arranged. We must immediately see to it that all trade union material from America, Europe and the ICFTU is sent to them. There must be a follow-through on this visit to Turkey through constant contact not only by written word but by the personal assistance and contact of trade union representatives who can aid them in drawing up constitutions, helping form the structure of their organization and assisting not only the unions but the Ministry of Labor and the Government in the drafting and the adoption of new labor and social legislation.

Communism is at the lowest ebb of any country I have ever visited. The danger I have pointed out, is due to a deep and traditional hatred of Russia rather than Communism, but without being an alarmist I must emphasize that the present transition period from State-controlled unions to free trade unions may and can provide a new field for Communist efforts to exploit the trade unions in a country where low economic standards of workers will always provide a fertile field for demagogues. There are Communists who must be working already in and through these unions. Certain individuals have been spotted and some have past records but they still remain a small minority. Whether they grow in influence or not depends in large measure on how wisely this transition is handled by the Government, the unions and the employers. This will have great bearing on whether or not Communism in Turkey can be kept out not only by repressive measures but by wise and just social measures.

This proximity to the U.S.S.R. influences the entire political and economic life of Turkey. Since 1942, Turkey has had over 700,000 men under arms. Economically, this is a burden which would even be difficult to bear for a more

NOTICE: This material may be protected under the copyright law of the U.S. Code. This copy is for reference use only. No further reproduction may be made without permission. The George Meany Memorial Archives, 10000 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20913. (301) 411-5441; 431-0385 (Fax)

prosperous country. Yet this valiant but economically poor nation not only bears it but has a batallion in the Korean war which has acquitted itself with great honors. Now the Turkish people are being asked to increase their military burden while the U.S.A. continues its military and economic aid program. But Turkish nation, especially the extreme nationalists and the newspapers, are clamoring for their inclusion in the Atlantic Pact or in some system of mutual alliance or collective security with the Western powers against any future aggression by the U.S.S.R. This is a question not only of Turkey's deserved right to protection by her more powerful allies but is absolutely necessary in order to guarantee the continuation of Turkey's all out military and economic defense effort. Without such a sense of security, the Democratic world's most Eastern outpost will be weakened and the hopes for a more democratic and freer trade union movement will be greatly jeopardized. And what is even more dangerous the lack of such assurances from the West will put a higher premium on the necessity of doing business with Joe Stalin.

Given the political, economic and trade union factors described in this report as now operating in Turkey, I suggest as a modest beginning on the part of the ICFTU the following program:

1. My visit should be followed by constant visits of trade unionists to Turkey. National trade union centers should be encouraged to send representatives and their material from time to time to assist in the kind of work I have outlined.
2. An ICFTU representative should be given the task of working with the Turkish unions in the field of working conditions, collective bargaining contracts and labor legislation.
3. Immediate relations between Turkey and the Greeks in the trade union field should be established and encouraged since both the Turks and the Greeks have indicated their desire along these lines.

NOTICE: This material may be protected under the copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code). This copy is for reference use only. No further reproduction may be made without permission of The George Meany Memorial Archives, 10000 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20903. (301) 431-5444; 431-0385 (Fax)

4. The organizational Department of the ICFTU should send a collection of model agreements, constitutions and related material to the Turkish trade unionists as soon as possible.

5. The ICFTU should officially acknowledge the conversation which took place between the Minister of Labor and Irving Brown, the ICFTU representative concerning the former's request that we assist in the future trade union work and drafting of labor legislation in Turkey.

6. That a representative be sent to other Middle East countries, especially Egypt, before any Middle East conference be held and that provision be made for the Turks to play a leading role in this future activity.

7. Even though a national trade union organization does not yet exist in Turkey, provision should be made for an observer at the Milan Congress with perhaps a representative of Istanbul, Ankara and the Coal Miners.

8. Wherever possible the democratic countries, especially the U.S.A. and Great Britain, should appoint Labor Attachés to their embassies in Ankara.

9. Arrange for Turkish trade unionists to come to the schools and educational seminars of other national trade union centers and the ICFTU.

10. To draw Turkey further into the common defense and community of the Democratic world, no hesitation should be shown or time lost by the free trade unions to ask the Atlantic Pact nations to guarantee Turkey's border against aggression by mutual pacts and alliance with the Western forces.

Irving Brown