

exploited, meaning.

What seems to have been lacking in Vatican policies—and may not be realized fully even today—is an awareness that the niceties of state-to-state diplomatic relations must occasionally give way. In their place there must be something approaching a call to the people for effective and active nonviolent resistance to its rulers. This obviously goes beyond the purely “spiritual” resistance of penance and prayer so regularly encouraged. Pius XII, in asking *Osservatore Romano*’s Berlin correspondent if he should have called upon the millions of Catholics in Hitler’s army to lay down their arms, apparently took it for granted that the only conceivable answer to the question was “no.” After all, as he went on to note, they had taken an oath and owed obedience! By the same token, the avowed readiness of a Pius XI to “deal even with the devil in person” to save a few souls and prevent greater evil has a truly heroic ring that may begin to sound hollow when the “greater evil” is that which most threatens oneself.

There is a temptation, I agree, to overromanticize martyrdom—a temptation not always avoided in the papal rhetoric, one might suggest. Stehle, however, seems in places too inclined to come to terms with—or at least not to condemn—the even more tempting appeals of compromise. Compromise so easily grows into actual complicity. Recognizing that he is introducing a conflict “almost as old as the Catholic Church itself” and one that is “rooted in her dual nature as spiritual and historic community,” Stehle goes on to declare: “in times of external oppression, martyrdom cannot be raised to a moral imperative for every single believer, and even less to a guiding principle of church policy: the latter is dictated, especially in such cases, by the historical will to survive, which tries to ‘save what can be saved.’ ”

One may disagree with his conclusion and its troublesome implications, but the issue goes well beyond the more limited focus of this excellent study to challenge the reader to address the profound question of the proper relationship between spiritual and secular authority in the light of his or her responsibilities as citizen and believer. [WV]

**THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION:
AN AMERICAN VIEW**
by Walter Galenson

(University of Wisconsin Press; 333 pp.; \$21.50/\$7.75)

Stephen J. Rosen

The International Labor Organization has been in existence for over seventy years. A creation of the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, the ILO has concentrated on standards of work, hours of work, minimum wages, child labor, women workers, occupational safety and health standards, collective bargaining, education, and workers’ security. In spite of this impressive array of concerns, few Americans are familiar with the organization. Those who *are* informed about the ILO often harbor doubts about its value.

Samuel Gompers was president of the American Federation of Labor when the ILO was founded. Gompers and the young union movement first supported U.S. involvement in the organization, then reversed their endorsement. Gompers was a firm believer in American capitalism and steered the AFL away from left-wing influences. Congressional support for the ILO was also limited.

Franklin D. Roosevelt’s election renewed U.S. interest in the ILO. Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins supported closer ties with the group and, in 1934, the U.S. joined. In 1938 the Senate ratified five conventions dealing with seamen’s working conditions. The newly founded Congress of Industrial Organizations and the AFL both fought for the right to represent the U.S., with the AFL ultimately designated labor’s representative.

From the beginning the three components of the delegation to the ILO—labor, employers, and government—had reservations about involvement. Employers were particularly reluctant to participate during the ‘30s; those businessmen who did were for the most part New Deal liberals.

This stormy history has been repeated through the years, and no one is better prepared to describe the events and analyze the controversies than Walter Galenson, a professor at Cornell’s School of International and Labor Relations. For many years he

was also directly involved as a consultant to the ILO, and he has written or been co-author of nine books on international labor. The present volume is a methodical and well-constructed analysis of the ILO and the problems that surround it. Moreover, the format makes the book an excellent reference work. The text contains fine notes and very good bibliographical material, and each chapter deals with a specific area of ILO activities. As the title implies, the problems of the ILO are addressed from the perspective of the United States.

The problems are both structural and operational. Not unlike the United Nations, controversy surrounds the authority and veto rights given to the permanent members of the ILO. Both organized labor and management have been upset with the influence of the Communist and Arab blocs. This, along with the U.S. Government’s inability to develop effective policy within the ILO, led to a U.S. withdrawal in 1977. The Carter administration was not enthusiastic about the U.S. withdrawal, and in 1980 the United States decided to rejoin. As a spokesman for the Labor Department said: “It was felt that we gained all we could from withdrawal and that this was a good time to return if we were to retain our influence in the ILO.” Our allies had agreed to support the U.S. in securing a greater number of staff positions and upholding our vested interests.

Had the situation changed? Not really, according to Professor Galenson. The two main reasons for U.S. withdrawal—politicization and violation of due process—continued to be true of ILO operations. Anti-Israeli resolutions remained the overriding interest of member states. Still, United States representatives expressed cautious optimism about the future of the ILO. Galenson believes that the U.S. might be a nonmember to this day had the Carter administration given Ronald Reagan the opportunity to decide the reentry question.

There is more to the ILO, however, than just political dissension. Two chapters deal with more positive aspects of the organization. The U.S. has given strong support to efforts in the area of industrial training, productivity studies, social security, industrial relations, labor standards,

testing and certification standards, and vocational rehabilitation; and this support has been seconded by U.S. trade unions. Organized labor has supported worker-education programs and safety research. But failure to assess compliance with these various programs remains a weakness of the ILO.

The ILO constitution provides means for setting rules and recommending standards. When clear and practical rules can be developed, a convention usually results. Once the convention has been adopted, every member state considers whether to enshrine the policy in national legislation. This is done with varying frequency by ILO members. France has the highest rate, the U.S. the lowest. Under the American constitutional system, most ILO conventions and recommendations require legislative action by the states, not just by the Federal government.

Trade unions in the U.S. have supported many of these conventions, such as standards for higher wages, freedom of association, and humane treatment of workers. Such goals conform to U.S. policy and help make American labor more competitive. Recent losses in union membership can be attributed to the relocation of firms abroad, where wage rates are much lower and safety and health standards often are nonexistent. But employers in the U.S. are quite skeptical about the standard-setting of the ILO. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce regards as hypocrisy the passage of legislation that embraces convention standards. Given the world political situation and the inability to monitor the implementation of convention standards, its position is difficult to ignore. However, Professor Galenson feels the United States can play an important role in this situation: "The United States ought to use its influence to improve the policing standards and to require countries that do not honor their obligations to withdraw their ratifications. Standard-setting, with all its faults, should be encouraged and strengthened."

The book is kind in its criticism of the United States; foreign critics might analyze events differently. Yet American labor and business from the earliest years have believed that the ILO should deal with workers'

problems and not with political doctrines unrelated to the labor market. They feel ILO projects ought to promote a better work environment. Unfortunately, the book fails to describe adequately the philosophical foundation upon which this position rests. This is its only weakness. Galenson has provided excellent and well-researched information on the ILO. This volume is a worthwhile addition to one's library of labor studies.

WASHINGTON DESPATCHES

1941-1945

by **Isaiah Berlin**

edited by **H. G. Nicholas**

(University of Chicago Press; xii+700 pp.; \$40.00)

Gerald Freund

A funny thing happened to Isaiah Berlin on his way to the Soviet Union in 1940. Tutor at New College, Oxford University, fluent in Russian, and knowledgeable about the Soviet Union, he was on his way via the United States and Japan to an assignment in Moscow when word came that he no longer was wanted there. Stuck in Washington, he briefly took a position in the British embassy then returned to Oxford — only to be informed by the Ministry of Information that he was overdue at the ministry's New York office. Crossing the Atlantic again late in 1940, a bleak period in Britain's wartime fortunes, Berlin became a member of the newly established British Information Services. His special responsibilities were to report on the British war effort to sections of the American press and to survey and analyze American opinion for the Ministry of Information at home. The quality of his reports impressed not only his superiors in London but also officials of the British embassy in Washington who, after Pearl Harbor, achieved his transfer from New York to take charge of political surveys of the American scene.

Thus began an assignment in which Isaiah Berlin was to have a significant impact on the critical Anglo-American wartime alliance. Officially headed "Weekly Political Summary" (later split into two weekly dispatches because of their length), Berlin's

reports ostensibly were simply a part of the cyphered telegraphic traffic from the Washington embassy.

These reports, published here for the first time, have been edited by the distinguished Oxford historian and student of American government H. G. Nicholas, who was one of those at the receiving end in London. The publication makes fully comprehensible their singular importance in the interpretation of wartime America by British officialdom and, in turn, their impact on Britain's policies toward its principal ally.

Berlin's quest for information was insatiable. He was interested, as was the growing number of readers back home, in every facet of American society: the evolution of the economy to peaks of wartime productivity; political events at every level of government; morale on the home front; the changing political fortunes of political leaders in Congress and the Executive branch; the press's unaccustomed role in arousing patriotism and accepting censorship; the trade union movement in disarray; the opinions and actions of minorities on the political Right and Left; the influence of Jews, the Irish; the continuing discrimination against Negroes. His trenchant analyses of the changes in political climate in response to the ebb and flow of battlefield fortunes are inseparable from his chronicles, given unpretentiously, entirely without the didactic superiority that often characterizes ambassadorial dispatches.

In pursuit of his commission Berlin traveled widely in the United States: to Texas, where he visited RAF trainees but also a shipyard in Houston and a bomber factory in Fort Worth ("An encouraging spirit of determination everywhere and universal pro-British feeling"); and through the West and Midwest following Willkie's campaign trail, hearing his warning against British "intervention in American politics" ("a matter on which we know that he has long felt rather strongly," Berlin noted). But Berlin's chief source of information beyond the press and broadcast media were the people in high places in government, the economy, the military, in universities, and in cultural institutions, to many of whom he became a personal friend, a trusted confidant. Thus he was able