

## American women and U.S. accession to the International Labour Organisation

Jaci Eisenberg\*

The Graduate Institute, Geneva

### **Introduction<sup>1</sup>**

American women were double outsiders in interwar (1919-1939) international Geneva.<sup>2</sup> They were outsiders in one degree as Americans, citizens of a nation which had refrained from joining the League of Nations in 1919 through a rejection of the Treaty of Versailles. They were outsiders in another degree by gender: though American women gained suffrage in 1920 with the passage of the 19th Amendment, they lagged in representation in political bodies, particularly at the federal level, and this had direct repercussions on their representation on the international scene. They also lagged in influence – likely due to this structural exclusion – which made that they often had to lobby the international system or their national governments from the outside, with little to no inside connection.<sup>3</sup>

This work traces the crucial role played by American women in achieving American accession to the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The ILO was an arm of the League of Nations with competence in labour questions and comprised of a secretariat, known as the International Labour Office; a steering committee, known as the Governing Body; and an annual labour conference of representatives of member states, the International Labour Conference (ILC). The particularity of the ILO was that decisions in the annual conference and steering committee were taken by a tripartite body – governments, employers, and workers in a 2:1:1

---

\* Jaci Eisenberg is a PhD Candidate, Department of International History, the Graduate Institute (IHEID), Geneva, Switzerland, [jaci.eisenberg@graduateinstitute.ch](mailto:jaci.eisenberg@graduateinstitute.ch). The author has previously worked for the International Labour Office.

ratio of representation. This meant that governments were not the only parties in international legislative decisions – stakeholders across the labour spectrum were involved. Though this discussion is presented in past tense, the ILO was the one League of Nations entity which escaped World War II unscathed and, beyond merely standing, thriving.<sup>4</sup> It is still in existence today as a specialised agency of the United Nations system.

The case study of American women and their influence on American accession to the ILO is important primarily because it is an examination from a perspective – that of double outsiders – not portrayed in relevant literature on the League of Nations universe. More important, it is one of the few instances where activism by American women in interwar international Geneva was successful.<sup>5</sup> The American government acceded to the ILO in 1934 after many years of advocacy by the ILO, by elements within the American government, and by external activists. This work examines American women's influence in ensuring U.S. accession to the ILO through partly biographical portraits of three personalities representing the ILO and the U.S. government. First is Alice Squires Cheyney, an employee of the ILO in Washington, who very rarely appears in printed accounts of U.S.-ILO relations.<sup>6</sup> She managed to do much to promote the ILO to American audiences within the confines of her employment. Her efforts were successful, but regrettably she was abused by the very system which she helped to edify. The second figure is Mary Anderson, chief of the U.S. Department of Labor's Women's Bureau, a mid-to-upper level figure caught in the middle of political machinations. Finally, there is the well-known case Frances Perkins, U.S. Secretary of Labor under Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Perkins was the most influential actor of the three covered, and it was she who built on the progress of the smaller efforts, moved forward to high-level negotiations, and finally delivered U.S. accession.

The goal in presenting this separate portrait of American women working to secure U.S. accession to the ILO is to illuminate some as-yet neglected aspects of this adventure. In separating these side-lined personalities and highlighting them apart, they can be added back in to the traditional narrative of how the U.S. acceded to the ILO in 1934. This separation in order to emphasise is a “radical” step which ensures that gender is taken into account in the study of international history, one advocated for by academics like Glenda Sluga.<sup>7</sup> In so doing, this work makes twin contributions to international history and gender history. Putting women’s contributions to securing U.S. accession to the ILO at the forefront of a narrative which has heretofore largely neglected them<sup>8</sup> is appropriate because it is unlikely that the U.S. would have joined the ILO as early as 1934 without their concerted, enduring contributions.

### **Alice Squires Cheyney**

A Washington Office was established by the ILO on 5 May 1920, after the U.S. Senate had finally and completely rejected the Treaty of Versailles. This move solidified an avenue of cooperation which had existed since the first session of the ILC was held in Washington, D.C., in October and November 1919. Branch and Correspondent’s Offices became a key part of the ILO’s policy strategy, with others opening in Paris, London, Berlin, Rome, Tokyo, Delhi, and Shanghai in the interwar period.<sup>9</sup> The most important task of the Washington Office was to supply information regarding the social and industrial conditions of labour in the United States to the ILO for use in reports and to inform policymaking. The institution of the Washington Office also permitted the ILO to continue lobbying for American accession on-site. The Washington Office was never very large: up to 1923 staff numbers varied from four to seven; and with a new director in office in 1924, it stabilised at three to four.<sup>10</sup>

The Washington Office was a permanent olive branch extended to the US, something which was required if any hope of U.S. accession was to be kept alive after the U.S. rejection of the Treaty of Versailles. While the American Federation of Labor (AFL), the chief U.S. federation of labour union, had initially been enthusiastic about the idea of an international labour hub, even going so far as to send its president, Samuel Gompers, to Paris in spring 1919 to take part in the Versailles conference's Commission on International Labour Legislation (the very body that founded the ILO), a growing disinterest in labour internationalism and indeed a rising distaste in European socialism during the remainder of Gompers' presidency made relations with ILO Director Thomas somewhat tenuous.<sup>11</sup> Relations between the AFL and the ILO improved with William Green's takeover of the AFL presidency in 1925, particularly via the friendly overtures he authorised the secretary of the AFL's Workers Education Bureau, Spencer Miller, to undertake with the ILO - moves which resulted in the ILO conducting its business with the U.S. government through the AFL.<sup>12</sup>

The Washington Office staff member who had the greatest impact on U.S. accession to the ILO was Alice Squires Cheyney (1888-1968), charged with U.S. public relations at the Washington Office.<sup>13</sup> Cheyney held an undergraduate degree from Vassar (1909) and a Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania (1921), where her father, Edward Potts Cheyney, taught. Her career path prior to joining the ILO attested to a deep interest in the issues pertinent to this organisation. After her undergraduate degree she had worked as an agent for the Philadelphia Children's Bureau, and later for the Federal Children's Bureau.<sup>14</sup> Her doctoral thesis entitled "The Definition of Social Work" was republished by the American Association of Social Workers in 1926 as a primer for laymen and aspiring social workers.<sup>15</sup> Cheyney was also an agent for the Massachusetts Commission on Minimum Wage Boards and for the New York State

Factory Investigating Commission. During World War I she became a volunteer social worker, and after the war she lectured extensively on industrial problems, to both academics and practitioners.<sup>16</sup>

Cheyney was keenly interested in the League before she began working for the ILO. From the summer of 1927, Cheyney was hired by the US League of Nations Association's American Committee in Geneva to aid in their summer visitor reception program. The purpose of this program was to greet Anglophones – especially Americans – visiting the League of Nations installations in Geneva, and to overtly promote the League to these wealthy Americans (to travel to Geneva in the interwar period implied a certain level of wealth), in the hopes that ground-level support would flow upwards and effect change in the US government. Manley Ottmer Hudson, League of Nations Legal Section member and Harvard Law Public International Law professor, was in charge of the recruitment of the visitor reception aides, and chose to keep Cheyney on for several years. After two years which she seems to have spent on a general rotation like all other summer visitor-reception season hires, she was stationed at the ILO in 1929 as the key point of contact for summer visitors – this was especially noted by the ILO in its Office Instruction 13/1929.<sup>17</sup>

The earliest discussion of Cheyney's hiring by the ILO began in late summer 1928. Initially Cheyney was to be hired by the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association (LNNPA), a private advocacy organisation based in the United States with an outpost in Geneva, to focus on the ILO. However, the internal reorganisation of this LNNPA made this impossible. Washington Office Director Leifur Magnusson then agreed to hire Cheyney at the ILO office in Washington from January 1929, on the understanding that she would go to Geneva at her own expense for two to three months beforehand, in late 1928, so she could learn about the ILO

directly at headquarters. Once there, Cheyney received a short contract: she was employed from mid-September to mid-November 1928 to author a textbook on the League of Nations and the ILO. Beginning December 1928 she was a part-time employee at the Washington Office of the ILO, and by 1930 she was listed on the main ILO staff list as “Assistant” at the Washington Office.

It would seem that these contracts were deliberately short-term, in order to reinforce the notion that Americans had no official role in the ILO until their government agreed to accede: only one American (male) had been a permanent full-time employee at the ILO’s Geneva headquarters – Royal Meeker, head of the Scientific Division – and this was only for the three years immediately following the establishment of the ILO. The nature of Cheyney’s short-term contracts was more akin to those given to Herbert Feis, an American professor of Economics at the University of Kansas and later the University of Cincinnati, who worked for the ILO during the summers between 1922 and 1927.<sup>18</sup>

Cheyney’s time at the ILO in Geneva in late 1928 can largely be attributed to Hudson’s intervention, whom she knew well from her work with the American Committee in Geneva’s visitor reception efforts. In 1929, Hudson tasked Cheyney with preparing a pamphlet on the ILO (“The I.L.O. Illustrated”),<sup>19</sup> ultimately published by the World Peace Foundation, the ILO’s publication sales agent in the U.S. throughout the 1920s.<sup>20</sup> While she disapproved of some of the editorial changes made by the World Peace Foundation without her consent, she conceded that the final pamphlet was a useful publicity tool.<sup>21</sup> Pamphlets were a, if not the, most important tool in the promotion of the ILO. Washington Director Magnusson explained: “The preparation and circulation of pamphlet material is particularly important in the United States where knowledge of the I.L.O. is limited, and is more effective than lecturing and speech-making because of its

more far-reaching and impersonal character.”<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, the ILO Publications Committee, based in Geneva, had doubts about its value as official propaganda. Though it agreed to buy several hundred copies from the World Peace Foundation, it was for distribution through the American Committee in Geneva of the League of Nations Association (ACIG), a private advocacy organisation, rather than through the ILO itself.<sup>23</sup> Despite the scepticism surrounding her pamphlet, Cheyney’s added value was clear to ILO Director Albert Thomas. In mid-1929 he counselled Leifur Magnusson to re-hire Cheyney: “we certainly think you would be well-advised to do so.”<sup>24</sup>

In 1929 there was a discussion between the Director of the Washington Office and ILO Deputy Director Butler as to whether it would be possible to hire an American journalist to publicise, liaise and entertain for the ILO. The model in mind was American journalist Arthur Sweetser, member of the League of Nations Information Section, who had so ably done these things for the League of Nations, blurring the lines between work and personal advocacy. Magnusson explained:

Specifically for the purpose I think you would go far and do worse than to get Miss Cheyney to make this trial of combining an American correspondent in the Office with your proposed journalistic work. It has the advantage that you can get her for three or four thousand dollars, for I am positive you can not get a man to do the job. However much our feminists may dislike the situation, that is precisely what it is in the economic world of supply and demand.<sup>25</sup>

Butler replied that Cheyney’s qualifications alone entitled her to such a position, were it feasible to create one, but that “[a]t the same time if there were any means of obtaining a man who could do for us what Sweetser does for the League we should probably prefer that alternative if it were at all feasible.”<sup>26</sup> Butler’s response is surprising on two fronts. Not only did it run counter to the ILO’s guiding principle of equal pay for equal work,<sup>27</sup> but it also neglected a full appreciation of

the reasons behind Sweeter's success, which included his valuable networks and good reputation, not to mention his upper social class and the social mobility financed by his wife's fortune.<sup>28</sup>

It is understandable that, in the face of cooperation without participation from the United States, the ILO would be keen to mimic any modicum of success obtained by the League of Nations. Though this instance was in contradiction with the ILO's stated guidelines for work, it is not surprising that women were held to a different set of standards, even inside its own organisation. The ILO's work in the first half of the twentieth century was firmly protectionist. Women were thought to require special protective legislation at work, and the ILO was happy to regulate, with conventions covering maternity (no. 3) and women's night work (nos. 4 and 41). Herein the problem of women's status in the interwar period: even though the end of the first world war brought a wave of women's suffrage in many parts of the Western world,<sup>29</sup> equality across all facets of life was slow to catch up.

Cheyney's responsibilities covered a broad range of publicity outlets. From 1928 to early 1930 Cheyney spoke to twelve different groups about the ILO, many of them women's groups based in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts.<sup>30</sup> Cheyney also authored guidelines for a model ILC for university students. Her most meticulous work was an exhaustive comparison of international labour standards and U.S. labour legislation, entitled *International Labour Standards and American Legislation: A Comparison*, and published in August 1931 as volume 2, number 8 of the Geneva Research Centre's "Geneva Special Studies" publication series. In Butler's comments, we see her true talent lay in making the ILO digestible and recognizable to American audiences. Butler approved of Cheyney's comparative study, but attached the following caveat, illustrating the divide between the largely European organisation he headed and the United

States: “I am afraid that the employers here will use it as proof that one of their principal competitors [the United States] is a long way behind Europe in the matter of social legislation!”<sup>31</sup>

Cheyney’s most important task as an employee of the ILO was as editor of a special issue (no. 166, March 1933) of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, dedicated in its entirety to the ILO. Her foreword in the issue noted that the goal of this publication was not to laud the ILO, but that it ended up being laudatory “because of the seeming impossibility of finding persons to present such a reasoned and substantiated negative criticism as would deserve a place in the present presentation.”<sup>32</sup> Cheyney made sure that the pieces included in this issue were authored by prominent figures in the United States, or by practitioners in the ILO who could give clear explanations, and, most important, that the entire issue made clear the value of the ILO to the United States. In undertaking this gargantuan task, that was, to firmly persuade the American policy-making establishment that U.S. membership in the ILO was worthwhile, Cheyney promoted an advertorial style. Prominent academic James Shotwell, a member of Woodrow Wilson’s Inquiry who had been intimately involved with the Commission on International Labour Legislation in 1919,<sup>33</sup> published a provocatively-titled piece: “The International Labor Organization as an Alternative to Violent Revolution.”<sup>34</sup> One section of this issue, on “The Organization in Action,” included seven contributions (including one by Cheyney) explaining exactly how the machinery of the ILO worked. The final section comprised six contributions covering U.S. relations with the ILO. Cheyney’s final contribution to the volume, ending this section of the issue by comparing international labour standards to U.S. labour legislation, confirmed what academic Carl Ratzlaff of Harvard had stated in *The American Economic Review* the previous year: ILO conventions did indeed help member states raise their labour standards. Cheyney’s argument, however, diverged from Ratzlaff’s in noting

that international labour standards could function as an equaliser for the global market, increasing the potential audience for American goods.<sup>35</sup> Cheyney's editing of the issue received plaudits from the League of Nations Association's Advisory Committee to the Washington Office of the ILO.<sup>36</sup> Ratzlaff's contribution, Cheyney's edited journal issue, and the publication in 1934 of the first volume of Shotwell's opus on the ILO, *The Origins of the International Labor Organization*, showed that academia fully supported the idea of U.S. membership in the ILO.

Cheyney's devotion to the ILO was all-consuming, but unfortunately her successes were not enough to ensure her stable employment by the ILO. Over the course of the 1930s Cheyney was denied proper employment: in 1933, for example, she agreed to a four-month layoff, of which she spent the better part studying the ILO and working for other internationalist causes.<sup>37</sup> On returning to the ILO in Washington, as another woman had been hired full-time for research work, she was left with only a part-time post – only after some manoeuvring did it become full-time.<sup>38</sup> Once the United States joined the ILO in 1934, the favouritism displayed by John Gilbert Winant - the highest ranking American in the ILO after accession – in selecting American women candidates for the ILO left Cheyney in the dust in Washington.<sup>39</sup>

In 1936, Cheyney was transferred to the ILO in Geneva as a member of section of the Women's Bureau. She was given a contract, but it was not a permanent one: rather it was a seven years' temporary (renewable) contract.<sup>40</sup> In 1939, at the age of 51, in light of budgetary shortfalls, she was offered a favourable early retirement package, and took it.<sup>41</sup> Looking for jobs in the United States a year later, she found herself considered a "Rip Van Winkle" from her twelve years with the ILO. She only eventually found work with the Wage Hour Administration in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey, after she lowered her desired annual salary to \$1.<sup>42</sup>

After the war and the death of her father, Cheyney tried to re-establish links with the ILO, in order to maintain her credentials as a lecturer on international issues. She was continually rejected, a curious response to the twelve important years she spent enthusiastically serving the ILO.<sup>43</sup>

### **Mary Anderson**

By the early 1930s, it was not at all unusual for non-member states of the ILO to be represented at the annual sessions of the ILC by observer delegations – typically appointed by the government in question – who merely attended, instead of participating in, the world labour parliament. Despite United States non-accession, the American government, particularly the Department of Labor, still had an interest in some of the goings-on in Geneva, and was amenable to the idea of observers. In 1931, U.S. Secretary of Labor William N. Doak arranged for Mary Anderson, Chief of the U.S. Department of Labor's Women's Bureau, to represent him in a personal and completely unofficial capacity at the 15<sup>th</sup> session of the international labour conference, which was scheduled to begin in late May 1931.<sup>44</sup> Mary Anderson (1872-1964), a Swedish immigrant to the United States, was exceedingly appropriate for a decision-making labour post, as she had been a labourer herself. For eighteen years she toiled as a shoe factory operator, and this spurred her to join the National Women's Trade Union League of the United States (NWTUL) as an organiser.<sup>45</sup> It was in this capacity that she went to Paris in 1919, to represent the desires of the NWTUL to the peace conference, with Rosa Schneiderman.<sup>46</sup> Mary Anderson became the head of the Women's Bureau at its inception in 1920, and remained in this post through 1944.

Anderson was sent because the United States was keenly interested in the proposed amendment of the Women's Night Work Convention (ILO Convention no. 4), and her presence in Geneva would allow information on the American situation to be presented at a moment's notice.<sup>47</sup> The amendment up for debate declared that the Night Work Convention was not valid for "persons holding positions of supervision or management," and gave states the option of shifting the period during which night work was absolutely prohibited from 10pm to 5am, to 11pm to 6am.<sup>48</sup> Anderson stood ready to take responsibility for her testimony without reference to her official capacity, even willing to act as an assessor (a non-member expert), if asked. ILO Director Albert Thomas was aware that Anderson's presence was to be an unofficial one, but he nevertheless reported that he intended to use her appearance to the political benefit of the ILO.<sup>49</sup>

However, Anderson's foray into international Geneva was over before it started. Anderson sailed for Europe on 13 May 1931,<sup>50</sup> and the publicity she had arranged to run during her travels unfortunately indicated she was attending officially on behalf of the U.S. government. Such attendance was not permitted; while the U.S. government allowed attendance at conferences of experts founded by bodies created by the Treaty of Versailles, it did not include that at conferences of bodies categorised under Parts I and XIII of the Treaty – and a session of the international labour conference certainly fell under Part XIII: Labour, which housed the first constitution of the ILO.<sup>51</sup>

American equal rights activists, predominantly the National Women's Party (NWP), seized on Anderson's misstep and exploited the fact that she was not supposed to be there in the press. The *New York Times* recounted:

The question is not whether a 'delegate' or a 'representative' has been sent by the Department of Labor to the International Labor Conference in Geneva; but whether or not some person representing the

Department of Labor of the United States will be present at that conference and exert influence or advocate arguments to maintain an international labor conference which is based on industrial inequality. The ultimate industrial emancipation of women is inevitable; and the United States should not be the country which tries to delay it.<sup>52</sup>

Anderson, in her role as head of the Women's Bureau, promoted protectionism for women labourers: that is, she believed that the fact that women workers were biologically different from male workers entitled women labourers to special protections and accommodations in the workplace. In contrast, equal rights activists sought the removal of existing and non-promotion of new differences in labour regulation for men and women workers. This doctrinal difference between the equal rights activists and the protectionist was largely a domestic (U.S.) debate, but this opportunity to claim an international victory at the expense of the protectionists did not escape the NWP.

Given the unfavourable publicity, the State Department cancelled Anderson's trip,<sup>53</sup> as cooperation between the United States and the ILO at the conference level was beyond what was acceptable to U.S. public opinion at that moment.<sup>54</sup> To maintain propriety after this scandal, the Departments of Labor and State forbade Anderson from travelling into Geneva:<sup>55</sup> she ended up in neighbouring France, "sitting on the top of the Salève brooding over Geneva, and no one [in Geneva had] any official knowledge of her presence."<sup>56</sup> The *New York Times* erroneously, at one point, believed her to be taking shelter in London.<sup>57</sup>

The ILO was deeply disappointed by this turn of events, and let speculation about who was to blame for Anderson's last-minute removal run wild. Washington Office Director Magnusson first suspected the "equal rights women,"<sup>58</sup> as did ILO Director Thomas.<sup>59</sup> Magnusson later pondered whether U.S. Assistant Secretary of Labor Robe Carl White, who had expressed his dislike of the ILO while attending the 1928 session of the ILC,<sup>60</sup> had seen the chain

of gaffes – Anderson’s poorly worded publicity, followed by the NWP’s opportunism in gloating about this blunder – and had taken advantage of the situation to harp on the ILO.<sup>61</sup> In terms of legislation affecting women workers, Anderson would have been an excellent ally for the ILO, given that during the interwar period it favoured protectionist international labour instruments.<sup>62</sup>

Anderson’s withdrawal created fear in Geneva internationalist circles that the United States was definitively forsaking the League – not only jumping ship, but also “[going] out of its way to give [the I.L.O.] a slap.” The ILO quickly moved in to damage-control mode and stressed that the U.S. government had never notified the ILO it was sending Anderson or indeed anyone to attend.<sup>63</sup> The American Minister to Bern, Hugh Wilson, came to Geneva to explain to Thomas exactly what had happened and to try and mitigate some of the more egregious after-effects of this situation. Thomas intended to meet Anderson, notwithstanding the fracas.<sup>64</sup> He and Deputy Director Butler met her over a two-day period in Geneva after the session of the conference had closed. Anderson was so scared of sympathising with the work in Geneva that she did not ask many questions, and the visit was ultimately deemed unproductive.<sup>65</sup>

With the installation of U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in March 1933, manoeuvring in favour of the ILO was facilitated. A bit after Roosevelt’s first hundred days, Magnusson suggested to President Roosevelt’s Secretary that Roosevelt meet with the ILO Director, who was now Harold Butler (he had taken over in mid-1932 after Albert Thomas’ untimely death).<sup>66</sup> The meeting took place on 13 November.<sup>67</sup> Butler’s installation as Director was instrumental in getting Roosevelt to warm up to the ILO. Butler focused on unemployment as a key scourge affecting workers, of great interest to the U.S. government at the time given the ongoing effects of the Great Depression. More generally, beyond Roosevelt, Butler, a Brit, was

infinitely more relatable to the American people than Thomas, the hard-driving French socialist.<sup>68</sup>

The U.S. government sanctioned an observer delegation to the 17<sup>th</sup> session of the international labour conference (1933) in Geneva. Of the four observers appointed in late May, the lone woman appointed was also put in charge: none other than Mary Anderson.<sup>69</sup> Under the newly-installed Roosevelt administration, Anderson's previous gaffe was overlooked – the weight of her labour credentials was more important than a one-off misstep. Not to mention that Roosevelt began a concerted effort to include women in a broad spectrum of powerful positions;<sup>70</sup> a trend which continued in international labour conference delegations throughout his presidency.<sup>71</sup> Anderson's appointment by Roosevelt made clear to equal rights feminists that protectionism would be the U.S. government's stance on women's working issues in the ILO.

Anderson was tasked with following the discussions regarding the proposed forty-hour week,<sup>72</sup> a discussion which would be immortalised in ILO convention no. 47 two years later. The U.S. observer delegation's report to Secretary Perkins was superficially positive.<sup>73</sup> The main problem lay in the fact that, as observers, they could not participate in deciding matters of importance. As the report witnessed, "We felt very keenly that the inability of the United States delegation to participate directly in this discussion and in voting had much bearing on the results of the discussion of the 40-hour week."<sup>74</sup> As a solution to the American inability to contribute to international labour discussions, Anderson contemplated more and deeper links between the United States and the ILO, "unhesitatingly recommend[ing] that the United States affiliate with the International Labor Office so as to be in a position to be in full collaboration with the other 58 countries that comprise this organisation," indeed before the next session of the ILC, scheduled for spring 1934.<sup>75</sup>

## **Frances Perkins**

Née Fannie Coralie Perkins, Frances Perkins (1880-1965) was a graduate of Mount Holyoke College who received her practical training at Jane Addams' Hull House in Chicago. Moving to New York to continue her settlement work and undertake a Master's degree in Political Science at Columbia University, she became Secretary of the National Consumers' League and mingled with the likes of the NWTUL. The terrible Triangle Shirtwaist fire of 1911, which she witnessed first-hand, and her role as part of the New York State Factory Safety Commission's examination of the incident, nurtured her strong belief in the necessity of social protections and reforms. Working in New York State Government, she was appointed the first New York State Commissioner of Labor by the then-Governor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.<sup>76</sup>

Perkins became Roosevelt's Secretary of Labor in March 1933 in a trailblazing appointment. Though the first appointment of a woman to a federal position had occurred in 1912 under U.S. President William Howard Taft (Julia Lathrop was appointed head of the Department of Labor's Children's Bureau), it took the installation of Roosevelt in the presidency to see a woman appointed to a Cabinet post.<sup>77</sup> Perkins accepted the post with the caveat that she would be allowed to dictate the major part of the agenda.<sup>78</sup> Butler sent Perkins a letter in summer 1933 asking her to take up the matter of U.S. adhesion to the ILO with Roosevelt.<sup>79</sup> Butler emphasised that the key to accession was that all interested parties needed to be sure of the desired outcome, as well as understand that there was a real separation between the League of Nations and the ILO.<sup>80</sup> With the report of the 1933 U.S. observer delegation – Anderson's report – submitted to Perkins in August,<sup>81</sup> information and testimonials in favour of U.S. accession to the ILO were beginning to accumulate.

Perkins worked hard to deliver accession. She spoke with Roosevelt about joining the ILO; Roosevelt assented and counselled her to obtain the full support of those in Congress in charge of Foreign Policy. She went forward to meet with the key actors – Secretary of State Cordell Hull and members of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee – individually to persuade them. As a convincing piece of evidence she circulated a report written by Prentiss Gilbert, U.S. Consul at Geneva, which clearly separated the ILO from the League of Nations.<sup>82</sup> Additionally, in late November 1933, Perkins announced that she was creating a committee of higher-level officials to promote U.S. membership in the ILO within the Department of Labor. This committee was to be chaired by Isador Lubin, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and comprised of Charles Wyzanski, Jr., labour solicitor in the Department of Justice, and Jean Flexner of the Department of Labor Children’s Bureau, previously of the Brookings Institution and the ILO.<sup>83</sup> The goal of this body was to “canvass membership issues,” but unfortunately the project stopped rather abruptly due to unclear management, noted to be a broader problem in the U.S. Department of Labor.<sup>84</sup>

Perkins’ serious efforts were undermined by longstanding prejudices against women in power. As the first female Cabinet member – the highest-ranking woman to have ever officially served the American government – she was seen as a case apart. In introducing Perkins to the Good Neighbor League dinner held in her honour in New York City, John Gilbert Winant, of Roosevelt’s Social Security Board at the time (previously and after, of the ILO), noted that Perkins’ capabilities, those which had gotten her hired in the first place, “added to the dignity of women service to the nation.”<sup>85</sup> Her accomplishments were categorised as exceptional because she was a woman, not because they were exceptional regardless of who achieved them. Winant’s introduction shows that despite women having obtained suffrage in the US, women were still not

commonly thought of as full citizens in practice: women's civic action was, therefore, always exceptional because it was never expected. Even after breaking one of the most significant barriers for American women in domestic politics in taking up a Cabinet-level post, Perkins was still victim to gender prejudices.

Accession occurred in 1934 with much give and take on both sides to bring it to fruition. The Governing Body moved the start date of the 18<sup>th</sup> session of the International Labour conference from April back to June in order to accommodate the U.S. Congressional schedule.<sup>86</sup> A delegation of American observers (one woman, four men) was put together for the same conference. The procedure for the United States to officially become part of the ILO, however, was one step removed from straightforward. Since the United States had not joined through ratification of the Treaty of Versailles,<sup>87</sup> the United States would have to be invited to join by the labour conference, just like Germany and Austria were invited at the first session of the ILC in autumn 1919.<sup>88</sup> In addition to the invitation from the ILO, the U.S. Congress, the arm of government charged with international treaties, would have to agree to membership. In discussion with Leifur Magnusson about the modalities of U.S. adhesion to the ILO, Frances Perkins proved that the Roosevelt administration was very much interested in the ILO and invested in the success of the membership bid: "... as a matter of strategy the President told her in any case the resolution should be introduced as late in the [congressional] session as possible: the more the chance to talk, the more the chance to build up animosities and drag out old grudges."<sup>89</sup> This strategy was reasonable given the animosity of the United States for the League: no advance notice meant that the administration could ensure the relevant parties in Congress "had become fully conversant with the matter and [become] capable of defending the favourable opinion at which it was hoped they would arrive." However this strategizing, necessarily leading

to some silence from Washington, was not fully understood by the ILO in Geneva, causing some doubts that the ILO's careful lobbying would prevail.<sup>90</sup>

Butler was adamant that the United States extend an olive branch to the ILO first, so as not to create unwanted discussions in the U.S. Congress, and this indeed is how the wheels for accession started into motion.<sup>91</sup> The second session of the 73<sup>rd</sup> U.S. Congress ran from 3 January – 18 June 1934, and on June 6<sup>th</sup>, just two weeks to close, Senator Joseph Taylor Robinson of Arkansas introduced Senate Joint Resolution 131 authorizing President Roosevelt to accept membership for the United States in the ILO.<sup>92</sup> This joint resolution was, at the origin, based on a draft prepared by James Shotwell at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, Key Pittman.<sup>93</sup> Perkins renewed her individual lobbying of the members of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee,<sup>94</sup> even visiting Senator William Borah every two weeks to push for passage. In so doing she neglected the members of the House. Very dramatically the joint resolution was pushed by President Roosevelt through the House<sup>95</sup> 236 to 110<sup>96</sup> on June 18<sup>th</sup>, closing date of the 73<sup>rd</sup> Congress.<sup>97</sup> The Senate approved unanimously of the measure.<sup>98</sup> Robinson's resolution was required before 18 June 1934 if the U.S. government wished to keep momentum and join the ILO before 1935, where the 74<sup>th</sup> Congress would open on 3 January 1935. Ever fearful of the possible ties between the League and the ILO, in approving of U.S. membership to the ILO, Congress specifically stated that U.S. membership not imply any obligations under the League Covenant.<sup>99</sup> This stood in contrast to the USSR who had joined both the ILO and the League in 1934, the latter predominantly to aid the community of nations in dealing with Germany.<sup>100</sup>

News of the U.S. pre-authorization of membership in the ILO was welcomed by the ILC delegates,<sup>101</sup> and it made it easy for the ILC to extend an invitation of membership to the United

States. On 22 June 1934, at the 23<sup>rd</sup> sitting, the Selection Committee of the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the ILC briefly discussed and then unanimously invited the United States to join the ILO.<sup>102</sup> The U.S. observer delegation, who had attended many sessions from the 10<sup>th</sup> sitting onwards – some had even spoken on the ILO Director’s Report and the U.S. National Recovery Programme<sup>103</sup> - “then entered the Conference hall and were greeted with prolonged applause, the Delegates rising in their places and applauding.”<sup>104</sup> Butler excitedly cabled Perkins: “Invitation voted unanimously with great enthusiasm stop as you may imagine this is to me greatest event that can happen during my office stop we need american help badly to push shorter hours and other projects stop only regret was your absence from historic meeting.”<sup>105</sup> The decision became official on the United States side on 20 August 1934, when U.S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull wired notice to Geneva of American acceptance of the invitation,<sup>106</sup> and U.S. Consul Prentiss Gilbert relayed the information to Acting Director Edward J. Phelan at the ILO.<sup>107</sup>

## Conclusions

In highlighting these women apart we can best identify the tools they wielded to make an impact, the challenges they faced in action, and ultimately, their specific contributions to U.S. accession to the ILO. Alice Cheyney, Mary Anderson, and Frances Perkins all worked towards the same goal, but in very different ways with varying means, capacities, and limitations. Cheyney worked within the defined limits of her job at the ILO to advocate for U.S. accession, and was quite successful with her efforts, in as much as they helped to solidify academia’s support for U.S. accession to the ILO. However, her efforts amounted to very little personal prestige, and indeed her time involved with the ILO led to some lasting consequences for her career. Anderson, an official of the U.S. government, had more influence than Cheyney, but was

initially hindered in the exercise of her functions by machinations surrounding diplomatic protocol. Nevertheless, when the tense atmosphere lightened, she continued her work, and penned an influential report. Perkins, with the support of Butler and instructions and support from Roosevelt – the very highest levels of the ILO and of the U.S. government - deftly delivered the Senate to the cause.

This examination of American women’s contributions to obtaining U.S. accession to the ILO does not pretend to be a complete recounting of the events influencing U.S. accession to the ILO. Indeed, one cannot look at American women in international Geneva, or indeed any group of figures in another location or time period, completely isolated from their fellow actors and contexts, even if it is the stated goal of the work. As discussed in this article, these three women, all at varying levels of importance, had very supportive and influential male counterparts or colleagues. In the US, this notably included President Roosevelt, James Shotwell, and Manley Hudson, and at the ILO in Geneva and Washington this included Harold Butler and Leifur Magnusson, respectively. Nor can the story of these three women alone explain why the US adhered to the ILO: these women were not in a position to deliver accession on their own because, on a basic level, Congress was required to validate the move. Moreover, the impact of external factors cannot be discounted: as noted in discussing Anderson and Perkins’ contributions, the climate towards accession was the most promising under President Roosevelt that it had been to date. Nevertheless, examining women’s special contributions apart highlights their unique contributions, the sum of which makes a compelling point for the value of their actions.

In singling out these three actors, it is evident that American women contributed to obtaining U.S. accession to the ILO through a multi-level path. Indeed, it can be seen that the

three women discussed here each pick up where the previous woman left off. Cheyney started the work towards accession among US policymakers and audiences, Anderson continued this task at a higher level of government, and Perkins ignited the final push where it mattered, in the Senate. Cheyney had to navigate the most uncertain route: she acted in the thick of it, when the end result was far from guaranteed, or even visible. Yet she went above and beyond the requirements of her job, brushing up on the ILO and promoting it in her own time. Anderson was slightly better off, being in a position to deliver game-changing opinions and support. Though prevented once from doing so, when conditions permitted she resumed her activities in a very important way. Perkins, the woman well-situated to effect change, was cognizant of her privilege, and thus very carefully wielded her power. Beyond highlighting some heretofore unmentioned (women) actors, this analytical framework allows, for the first time, this unique chain of action carried out by these varied actors to be illuminated, establishing a new narrative about U.S. accession to the ILO.

---

<sup>1</sup> This work was originally presented on the panel “Sex and Success?: America between the wars” at the inaugural 49<sup>th</sup> Parallel journal conference in 2012. The author would like to acknowledge the grants provided by the Smith College Libraries (Caroline D. Bain Scholar-in-Residence fellowship), and the Roosevelt (research grant) and Radcliffe (dissertation grant) Institutes, which permitted the author to complete research for this paper at the Sophia Smith Archives, Northampton, Massachusetts (hereafter, SSA); the FDR Presidential Library and Archives in Hyde Park, New York (hereafter, FDRA); and the Schlesinger Library in Cambridge, Massachusetts (hereafter, SL). The author would also like to thank Aurélie Éliisa Gfeller, the blind reviewer, and the journal editors for their valuable comments on this work.

<sup>2</sup> “American” refers, in this work, to citizens of the United States of America alone. While the “double outsider” framework employed in this work was established in early 2010, it must be acknowledge that it appears to be a common framework for studying women in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, even if the outsider qualities vary. See, for instance, Melissa S. Fisher, *Wall Street Women* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2012), 29.

<sup>3</sup> Carol Ann Miller, “Lobbying the League: Women’s International Organizations and the League of Nations,” (Ph.D. Dissertation, St. Hilda’s College, University of Oxford, 1992), tells the story of women’s lobbying across many nationalities, including some Americans, for example on 184ff.

<sup>4</sup> The ILO’s continued existence during the Second World War was in large part due to the initiative of its then-Director, American John Gilbert Winant. Winant arranged for the headquarters of the ILO to be moved to McGill University in Montreal, Canada, once the ILO’s initial contingency plan of Vichy, France, turned out to be impossible given the events of 1940.

<sup>5</sup> Please see my PhD thesis: Jaci Eisenberg, “American women and international Geneva, 1919-1939,” (Ph.D. diss, IHEID, 2014).

<sup>6</sup> The sole instance: Edward C. Lorenz, *Defining Global Justice: The History of U.S. International Labor Standards Policy* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 98-99.

<sup>7</sup> Glenda Sluga, “Gender,” in Patrick Finney, ed., *Palgrave Advances in International History* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 312.

<sup>8</sup> Key works touching on U.S. accession to the ILO that neglect or downplay the contributions of American women, save for mention of Frances Perkins: Gary B. Ostrower, “The American Decision to join the International Labor Organization,” *Labor History* (Fall 1975): 495-504, and John B. Tipton, *Participation of the United States in the International Labor Organization* (Illinois: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1959). Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s Ph.D. thesis does mention Mary Anderson in addition to Frances Perkins. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, “The United States and the International Labor Organization, 1889-1934,” (Ph.D. diss., Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, 1960), 492-500. Harold Josephson’s biography of James T. Shotwell includes source material from an interview with Carol Riegelman (Mrs. Isador) Lubin, for a time during the interwar, Second World War, and postwar periods a member of the ILO secretariat. In the interview Riegelman Lubin, who had been Shotwell’s secretary and research assistant in the early 1930s, maintained that Perkins perpetuated the myth that she succeeded in achieving US membership to the ILO alone. Harold Josephson, *James T. Shotwell and the Rise of Internationalism in America* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1975), 207.

<sup>9</sup> The Berlin Office closed in 1933 with the installation of the Nazi government.

<sup>10</sup> *Memorandum: Work of the Washington Branch*, no. 1122, from the Director of the Washington Branch (Leifur Magnusson) to the Director of the ILO (Albert Thomas), 23 January 1930, 4, C 200/0 - Washington Correspondent: Observations on the Resolution of the 44th Session of G.B. concerning the correspondent's offices (1929), International Labour Office archives, Geneva, Switzerland (hereafter, ILOA).

<sup>11</sup> Moynihan, 412-423.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 423-432 (especially 432).

<sup>13</sup> *Memorandum: Work of the Washington Branch*, no. 1122, from the Director of the Washington Branch (Leifur Magnusson) to the Director of the ILO (Albert Thomas), 23 January 1930, 4, C 200/0 - Washington Correspondent: Observations on the Resolution of the 44th Session of G.B. concerning the correspondent's offices (1929), ILOA.

<sup>14</sup> Personal notice, undated, P.2247 – Miss A. Cheyney, ILOA.

<sup>15</sup> Philip Klein, “Foreword,” in Alice S. Cheyney, *The Nature and Scope of Social Work* (New York: American Association of Social Workers, 1926), 3-4.

<sup>16</sup> Personal notice, undated, P.2247 – Miss A. Cheyney, ILOA.

<sup>17</sup> Eisenberg, “American women and international Geneva, 1919-1939,” chapter 5: “American women and US accession to the ILO,” 338-348. The source material for the sections pertaining to Cheyney came from several

---

folders in box 37 of the Manley O. Hudson papers, Harvard Law Library Historic and Special Collections, Cambridge, Massachusetts (hereafter, HLL).

<sup>18</sup> Moynihan, 455.

<sup>19</sup> Letter of Alice Cheyney (in Lucerne) to Manley Hudson, 7 June or 6 July 1929, 1-2, box 37, folder 5 - ACIG, 1929: Misc. corr.: Comm, summer jobs, visitors; official reports, Manley O. Hudson papers, HLL.

<sup>20</sup> Moynihan, 458.

<sup>21</sup> Letter of Alice Cheyney (in Lucerne) to Manley Hudson, 7 June or 6 July 1929, 1-2, box 37, folder 5 - ACIG, 1929: Misc. corr.: Comm, summer jobs, visitors; official reports, Manley O. Hudson papers, HLL.

<sup>22</sup> *Memorandum: Work of the Washington Branch*, no. 1122, from the Director of the Washington Branch (Leifur Magnusson) to the Director of the ILO (Albert Thomas), 23 January 1930, 10, C 200/0 - Washington Correspondent: Observations on the Resolution of the 44th Session of G.B. concerning the correspondent's offices (1929), ILOA.

<sup>23</sup> Note: meeting of the Publications Committee, 26 June 1929, 3-4, C 200/2 - Washington Office: Administrative changes (1929), ILOA.

<sup>24</sup> Excerpt: from the Director of the ILO, Geneva, to the Director of the Washington Office re: your no. 754 of 21 June 1929, C 200/2 - Washington Office: Administrative changes (1929), ILOA.

<sup>25</sup> Letter of Leifur Magnusson to Harold Butler, no. 976, 27 November 1929, 1, XC 61/1/2 (J2) - USA.

Correspondence Office, Washington, 1929-1931 (Leifur Magnusson), ILOA. It is difficult to compare the salaries of the Washington Office staff, when mentioned in files – a rare occurrence - with the salaries of those employed at Geneva headquarters, if they were not translated by the ILO into Swiss francs (CHF). This is due to the fact that the official ILO budgets were planned in CHF from 1922 to 1948, and no direct historical exchange rate exists between the United States dollar (USD) and the CHF. Nevertheless there is one piece of evidence indicating this was a low rate. Harold Butler replied to Leifur Magnusson that, "... I am quite sure that one could not get a capable journalist for three or four thousand dollars..." It was a moot point, the funds were unavailable anyways. Letter of Harold Butler to Leifur Magnusson, 11 December 1929, XC 61/1/2 (J2) – USA, Correspondence Office, Washington, 1929-1931 (Leifur Magnusson), ILOA.

<sup>26</sup> Letter of Harold Butler to Leifur Magnusson, 11 December 1929, XC 61/1/2 (J2) – USA, Correspondence Office, Washington, 1929-1931 (Leifur Magnusson), ILOA.

<sup>27</sup> Treaty of Versailles, Part XIII: Labor, Article 427. Permanent Labour Organisation, *Constitution and Rules* (Geneva: ILO, October 1921), 17. At the time, it was merely a "guiding principle"; in 1951 it was enshrined in international law as ILO convention no. 100 – Equal Remuneration. C.100 came into force in 1953.

<sup>28</sup> Please see my PhD thesis: Eisenberg, "American women and international Geneva, 1919-1939," in particular chapter 2: "Citizens of the World: American women and international education."

<sup>29</sup> Selected dates of women's suffrage: 1918 – Austria, Belgium; 1919 – Germany; 1920 – United States; 1918/1928 – United Kingdom. French women only received suffrage in 1944. Anne Winslow, ed., *Women, Politics, and the United Nations* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995), 185-186.

<sup>30</sup> *Memorandum: Work of the Washington Branch*, no. 1122, from the Director of the Washington Branch (Leifur Magnusson) to the Director of the ILO (Albert Thomas), 23 January 1930, 10, C 200/0 - Washington Correspondent: Observations on the Resolution of the 44th Session of G.B. concerning the correspondent's offices (1929), ILOA.

<sup>31</sup> Letter of Harold Butler to Alice Cheyney, 2 September 1931, C 202/29/1 – Washington Office: Miss Cheyney, general correspondence (1929), ILOA.

<sup>32</sup> Alice Cheyney, "Foreword," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 166 (The ILO) (March 1933): no pagination.

<sup>33</sup> Josephson, chapter 5: "A Peace with Social Justice," 79-98.

<sup>34</sup> James Shotwell, "The International Labor Organization as an Alternative to Violent Revolution," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 166 (The ILO) (March 1933): 18-25.

<sup>35</sup> Lorenz, 98-99.

<sup>36</sup> "Minutes of the ILO Executive Committee of the Advisory Committee, 20 March 1933", by Marion Elderton (Acting Secretary), 1, folder 1- League of Nations, International Labor Office: General (1933-1950), box 81, Mary van Kleeck papers, SSA.

---

<sup>37</sup> “Proposal for Study at Geneva,” 1, attached to letter of Alice Cheyney to Harold Butler, no. 2943, 31 January 1933, C 202/29/1/2 – Miss Cheyney’s Visit to Geneva 1933, ILOA; personal letter of Alice Cheyney to Harold Butler, no. 4575, 5 February 1936, 1, P.2247 – Miss A. Cheyney, ILOA.

<sup>38</sup> Personal letter of Alice Cheyney to Harold Butler, no. 4575, 5 February 1936, 1, P.2247 – Miss A. Cheyney, ILOA.

<sup>39</sup> Geoffrey Partington, “John Gilbert Winant at Geneva: the Testimony of Sir Walter Crocker,” *National Observer* 58 (Spring 2003) [http://www.nationalobserver.net/2003\_spring\_110.htm, accessed 13 Apr. 2011]; Jaci Eisenberg, “American women in international Geneva, 1919-1939: a prosopography,” *Women’s History Magazine* 71 (Spring 2013): 4-11.

<sup>40</sup> Formulaire no. 2 – Demande d’admission à la caisse des pensions du personnel de la Société des Nations (1936), League of Nations Pension file no. 1171 – Alice Squires Cheyney, ILOA. Remarkably her pension file contains no mention of her employment at the ILO from 1928 to 1935 – her work at the ILO in Washington, D.C., did not count towards pensionable credit. On the varying lengths of contracts in the League of Nations constellation, see Egon F. Ranshofen-Wertheimer, *The International Secretariat: A Great Experiment in International Administration* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1945), 302-304.

<sup>41</sup> Letter of John Gilbert Winant to Alice Cheyney, 20 January 1933; letter of Alice Cheyney to John Gilbert Winant, 25 January 1939; letter of Alice Cheyney to E.J. Phelan, 3 March 1939 – all in P.2247 – Miss A. Cheyney, ILOA.

<sup>42</sup> Letter of Alice Cheyney to Clara Mortenson Beyer, 12 February 1940, 1, folder 53 - General correspondence (1940), box 4, Clara Mortenson Beyer papers (A-159), SL.

<sup>43</sup> All correspondence from 1947 and 1948, P.2247 – Miss A. Cheyney, ILOA.

<sup>44</sup> Letter of Leifur Magnusson to Albert Thomas, no. 1867, 31 March 1931, C 202/12/1 - Washington Correspondent: Mr. Magnusson, personal correspondence with Mr. Albert Thomas (1930-1932), ILOA.

<sup>45</sup> *Programme of the International Congress of Women, called by the National Council of Women of the United States, July 16-22, 1933, Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois*, 39, Folder International Council of Women, 1933-1935, Box World Executive Committee 08.10 - Other Organisations (1933-1935), World Young Women’s Christian Association Archives, Geneva, Switzerland.

<sup>46</sup> Carol Riegelman Lubin and Anne Winslow, *Social Justice for Women: The International Labor Organization and Women* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1990), 23.

<sup>47</sup> Letter of William N. Doak to Albert Thomas (official copy to Leifur Magnusson), 12 May 1931, C 202/12/1 - Washington Correspondent: Mr. Magnusson, personal correspondence with Mr. Albert Thomas (1930-1932), ILOA.

<sup>48</sup> Draft letter to William Green (AFL), undated, 5, CAT 5/30/2/6 – Women – American, ILOA.

<sup>49</sup> Letter of Albert Thomas to Leifur Magnusson, 15 April 1931, C 202/12/1 - Washington Correspondent: Mr. Magnusson, personal correspondence with Mr. Albert Thomas (1930-1932), ILOA.

<sup>50</sup> Personal letter of Leifur Magnusson to Harold Butler, no. 1845, 23 March 1931, XC 61/1/2 (J2) - USA. Correspondence Office, Washington, 1929-1931 (Leifur Magnusson), ILOA.

<sup>51</sup> Letter of Leifur Magnusson to Albert Thomas, no. 1989, 26 May 1931, C 202/12/1 – Washington Correspondent: Mr. Magnusson, personal correspondence with Mr. Albert Thomas (1930-1932), ILOA.

<sup>52</sup> “Doak Cancels Part in League Labor Meeting, Ordering Our Woman Observer Not to Attend,” *New York Times*, 24 May 1931, 1.

<sup>53</sup> Letter of Leifur Magnusson to Albert Thomas, no. 1989, 26 May 1931, C 202/12/1 – Washington Correspondent: Mr. Magnusson, personal correspondence with Mr. Albert Thomas (1930-1932), ILOA.

<sup>54</sup> “Mr. Wilson, the American Minister at Berne, and Mr. Prentiss Gilbert called on the Director to-day,” 1 June 1931, 1, CAT 5/30/2/1 – Informations diverses, ILOA.

<sup>55</sup> Personal letter of Leifur Magnusson to Harold Butler, no. 1972, 18 May 1931, 1, XC 61/1/2 (J2) - USA. Correspondence Office, Washington, 1929-1931 (Leifur Magnusson), ILOA.

<sup>56</sup> Personal letter of Harold Butler to Leifur Magnusson, 4 June 1931, 1, XC 61/1/2 (J2) - USA. Correspondence Office, Washington, 1929-1931 (Leifur Magnusson), ILOA.

<sup>57</sup> “Geneva is Amazed by Doak’s Action,” *New York Times*, 25 May 1931, 8.

<sup>58</sup> Personal letter of Leifur Magnusson to Harold Butler, no. 1972, 18 May 1931, 2, XC 61/1/2 (J2) - USA. Correspondence Office, Washington, 1929-1931 (Leifur Magnusson), ILOA.

<sup>59</sup> “Mr. Wilson, the American Minister at Berne, and Mr. Prentiss Gilbert called on the Director to-day,” 1 June 1931, 1-2, CAT 5/30/2/1 – Informations diverses, ILOA.

- 
- <sup>60</sup> While Robe Carl White's attendance as an observer at the 1928 session ILC is mentioned by James Myers, and his distaste for the ILO is cited in letters like the one cited in the next footnote, as he was an observer, the exact nature of his remarks and actions at the 1928 session of the ILC were not included in the verbatim record. James Myers, "American Relations with the International Labor Office, 1919-1932," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 166 (The ILO) (March 1933): 141-142.
- <sup>61</sup> Letter of Leifur Magnusson to Albert Thomas, no. 2001, 1 June 1931, C 202/12/1 - Washington Correspondent: Mr. Magnusson. Personal correspondence with Mr. Albert Thomas (1930-1932), ILOA. The same letter appears in XC 61/1/2 (J2), ILOA.
- <sup>62</sup> Susan D. Becker, *The Origins of the Equal Rights Amendment: American Feminism Between the Wars* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 25.
- <sup>63</sup> "Geneva is Amazed by Doak's Action," *New York Times*, 25 May 1931, 8.
- <sup>64</sup> Letter of Albert Thomas to Leifur Magnusson, 5 June 1931, C 202/12/1 - Washington Correspondent: Mr. Magnusson, personal correspondence with Mr. Albert Thomas (1930-1932), ILOA.
- <sup>65</sup> Personal letter of Harold Butler to Leifur Magnusson, 24 June 1931, 1, XC 61/1/2 (J2) - USA. Correspondence Office, Washington, 1929-1931 (Leifur Magnusson), ILOA.
- <sup>66</sup> Letter of Leifur Magnusson to Marvin H. McIntyre (Secretary to the President, White House), 19 October 1933, OF 499 - 1933-1936 - ILC, FDRA.
- <sup>67</sup> FDR Day-By-Day, FDRA. Meeting took place at 3pm, and included Turner Battle (unknown figure).
- <sup>68</sup> Lorenz, *Defining Global Justice*, 96.
- <sup>69</sup> Department of State - Division of International Conference - from Mr. Forster to Mr. Southgate re: approval by the President of the official observers appointed by this Government to attend the 17th Session of the ILC at Geneva, 2 June 1933, 1, OF 499 - 1933-1936 - ILC, FDRA.
- <sup>70</sup> List of women appointed to Federal positions by President Roosevelt, undated, OF 120 - Women - 1933-36, FDRA.
- <sup>71</sup> To name the women appointed as part of the U.S. governmental delegation to the international labor conferences in the 1930s: Ethel Bagg Bullard, observer (1934 - accession occurred during the conference); Grace Abbott, government delegate (1935, 1937); Frieda Miller, government delegate (1936, 1938 - shared with Frances Perkins); Frances Perkins (1938 - shared with Frieda Miller).
- <sup>72</sup> Informal report to Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins from Mary Anderson, head of the 1933 ILC U.S. observer delegation, for release 11 July 1933, 4, XH 5/61/3 - American participation at I.L. Conference 1933, ILOA.
- <sup>73</sup> U.S. Department of Labor Serial No. R. 66, Report of United States Delegation at the International Labor Conference, Geneva, June 1933, to the Secretary of Labor (Washington: U.S. GPO, 1934), 1, XT 61/3/1 - Mr. Phelan's mission to the United States (March 1934), ILOA.
- <sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.
- <sup>75</sup> "Report of the Official Observers for the United States at the 17<sup>th</sup> International Labor Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, June 8-30, 1933, report date 15 August 1933, 15, 17, XH 5/61/3 - American participation at I.L. Conference 1933, ILOA.
- <sup>76</sup> Kirstin Downey, *The Woman Behind the New Deal: The Life and Legacy of Frances Perkins - Social Security, Unemployment Insurance, and the Minimum Wage* (New York: Anchor Books, 2010), *passim.*; Winifred D. Wandersee, "'I'd rather pass a law than organize a union': France Perkins and the Reformist Approach to Organized Labor," *Labor History* 34, no. 1 (Winter 1993): 5-32.
- <sup>77</sup> Janet M. Martin, "The Recruitment of Women to Cabinet and Subcabinet Posts," *The Western Political Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (March 1989): 162-163. It would take another twenty years for a woman to be again appointed to a U.S. Cabinet post - Oveta Culp Hobby, the first Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, appointed in 1953. *Ibid.*, 163.
- <sup>78</sup> Gordon Berg, "Frances Perkins and the flowering of economic and social policies," *Monthly Labor Review* (June 1989), 28; Downey, *The Woman Behind the New Deal*, 122-123.
- <sup>79</sup> Frances Perkins, *The Roosevelt I Knew* (New York: The Viking Press, 1946), 339.
- <sup>80</sup> Edward Phelan (volume compiled after Phelan's death by the ILO), *Edward Phelan and the ILO: The life and views of an international social actor* (Geneva: ILO, 2009), "Some reminiscences of the International Labour Organisation," 236.

- 
- <sup>81</sup> “Report of the Official Observers for the United States at the 17<sup>th</sup> International Labor Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, June 8-30, 1933,” report date 15 August 1933, XH 5/61/3 – American participation at I.L. Conference 1933, ILOA.
- <sup>82</sup> Perkins, *The Roosevelt I Knew*, 340ff.
- <sup>83</sup> U.S. Department of Labor (Copies from National Archives and Records Administration II, Record Group 257), memo of the Secretary to Mr. Wyzanski, 22 November 1933, box 2, Bernard Bellush papers, FDRA.
- <sup>84</sup> Personal letter of Alice Cheyney to Harold Butler, no. 3697, 14 June 1934, 2, XH 6/61/1 – American membership of the International Labour Organisation, ILOA.
- <sup>85</sup> Underline in original document. Text for the radio introduction by John Gilbert Winant to the Frances Perkins Dinner, Hotel Biltmore, NYC, on 7 October 1936 at 19h30, folder Frances Perkins, box 163, Papers, 1935 - February 1941, John Gilbert Winant papers, FDRA.
- <sup>86</sup> ILO, *International Labour Conference. Eighteenth Session, Geneva, 1934. Record of Proceedings*, (Geneva: ILO), vi.
- <sup>87</sup> Treaty of Versailles, Part XIII: Labor, Article 387. *Constitution and Rules*, 4.
- <sup>88</sup> “Procedure for Admission to the International Labour Organisation,” undated, unsigned, 6, XT 61/3/1 - Mr. Phelan's mission to the United States (March 1934), ILOA.
- <sup>89</sup> Secret personal letter of Leifur Magnússon to Harold Butler, no. 3645, 25 April 1934, 1, XH 5/61/2 – American participation in League and I.L.O., ILOA.
- <sup>90</sup> Phelan, *Edward Phelan and the ILO*, “Some reminiscences of the International Labour Organisation,” 237.
- <sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 238.
- <sup>92</sup> Memo of Alice Cheyney, 7 June 1934, 1-2, XH 5/61/2 – American participation in League and I.L.O., ILOA.
- <sup>93</sup> Josephson, 207.
- <sup>94</sup> Perkins, *The Roosevelt I Knew*, 342-343; George Martin, *Madam Secretary: Frances Perkins* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976), 427-428.
- <sup>95</sup> Secret letter of Arthur Sweetser to Harold Butler, 28 June 1934, 1-2, XH 6/61/1 – American membership of International Labour Organisation, ILOA.
- <sup>96</sup> Martin, *Madam Secretary*, 428; Downey, *The Woman Behind the New Deal*, 196.
- <sup>97</sup> Copy of unsigned telegram (probably from Arthur Sweetser) to League Secretary General Joseph Avenol, 18 June 1934, XH 5/61/2 – American participation in League and I.L.O., ILOA. Lorenz labelled this down-to-the-wire push for membership as governmental “subterfuge” to ensure accession. Lorenz, 99.
- <sup>98</sup> Martin, *Madam Secretary*, 428; Downey, *The Woman Behind the New Deal*, 196.
- <sup>99</sup> “United States Pays ILO,” *New York Times*, 11 September 1935.
- <sup>100</sup> Lubin and Winslow, *Social Justice for Women*, 22.
- <sup>101</sup> ILO, *International Labour Conference. Eighteenth Session, Geneva, 1934. Record of Proceedings*, (Geneva: ILO), 457-462.
- <sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 463-469. Phelan, *Edward Phelan and the ILO*, 238-9.
- <sup>103</sup> ILO, *International Labour Conference. Eighteenth Session, Geneva, 1934. Record of Proceedings*, (Geneva: ILO), 95, 210, 232, 272, 369.
- <sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, 466.
- <sup>105</sup> Personal cable of Harold Butler to Frances Perkins, 23 June 1934, XH 6/61/1 – American membership of International Labour Organisation, ILOA.
- <sup>106</sup> Tipton, 46.
- <sup>107</sup> Confidential note of Edward Phelan to Harold Butler, 25 August 1934, 1, XH 6/61/1 – American membership of International Labour Organisation, ILOA.

---

## Bibliography

### *Primary sources*

#### *Archival*

FDR Presidential Library and Archives, Hyde Park, New York

Bernard Bellush papers

FDR Day-By-Day

John Gilbert Winant papers, Papers, 1935 - February 1941

Official Files

Harvard Law Library Historic and Special Collections, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Manley O. Hudson papers

International Labor Office Archives, Geneva, Switzerland

Butler Cabinet (files begin with X...)

C – Correspondent's Office files

League of Nations Joint Pension Fund files

P – Personnel files

Thomas Cabinet (CAT)

Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Clara Mortenson Beyer papers (A-159)

Sophia Smith Archives, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts

Mary van Kleeck papers

World Young Women's Christian Association Archives, Geneva, Switzerland

World Executive Committee papers 08 - Other Organizations39, WEC08.10, ICW/NCW  
1933 Congress Guide

#### *Published*

Cheyney, Alice. "Foreword." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 166 (The ILO) (March 1933): no pagination.

International Labour Office. *International Labour Conference. Eighteenth Session, Geneva, 1934. Record of Proceedings*. Geneva: ILO.

Klein, Philip. "Foreword." In Alice S. Cheyney. *The Nature and Scope of Social Work*, 3-4. New York: American Association of Social Workers, 1926).

---

Perkins, Frances. *The Roosevelt I Knew*. New York: The Viking Press, 1946.

Permanent Labour Organisation. *Constitution and Rules*. Geneva: ILO, October 1921.

Riegelman Lubin, Carol and Anne Winslow. *Social Justice for Women: The International Labor Organization and Women*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990.

Shotwell, James. "The International Labor Organization as an Alternative to Violent Revolution." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 166 (The ILO) (March 1933): 18-25.

*Secondary sources*

Becker, Susan D. *The Origins of the Equal Rights Amendment: American Feminism Between the Wars*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Berg, Gordon. "Frances Perkins and the flowering of economic and social policies." *Monthly Labor Review* (June 1989): 28-32.

Downey, Kirstin. *The Woman Behind the New Deal: The Life and Legacy of Frances Perkins – Social Security, Unemployment Insurance, and the Minimum Wage*. New York: Anchor Books, 2010.

Eisenberg, Jaci. "American women and international Geneva, 1919-1939." Ph.D. diss., IHEID, 2014.

----- . "American women in international Geneva, 1919-1939: a prosopography," *Women's History Magazine* 71 (Spring 2013): 4-11.

Fisher, Melissa S. *Wall Street Women*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2012.

Josephson, Harold. *James T. Shotwell and the Rise of Internaitonalism in America*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1975.

Lorenz, Edward C. *Defining Global Justice: The History of U.S. International Labor Standards Policy*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

Martin, George. *Madam Secretary: Frances Perkins*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Martin, Janet M. "The Recruitment of Women to Cabinet and Subcabinet Posts." *The Western Political Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (March 1989): 161-172.

Miller, Carol Ann. "Lobbying the League: Women's International Organizations and the League of Nations." Ph.D. Dissertation, St. Hilda's College, University of Oxford, 1992.

---

Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. "The United States and the International Labor Organization, 1889-1934." Ph.D. diss., Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, 1960.

Myers, James. "American Relations with the International Labor Office, 1919-1932." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 166 (The ILO) (March 1933): 135-145.

Ostrower, Gary B. "The American Decision to join the International Labor Organization." *Labor History* (Fall 1975): 495-504.

Partington, Geoffrey. "John Gilbert Winant at Geneva: the Testimony of Sir Walter Crocker." *National Observer* 58 (Spring 2003) [[http://www.nationalobserver.net/2003\\_spring\\_110.htm](http://www.nationalobserver.net/2003_spring_110.htm), accessed 13 Apr. 2011].

Phelan, Edward (volume compiled after Phelan's death by the ILO). *Edward Phelan and the ILO: The life and views of an international social actor*. Geneva: ILO, 2009.

Ranshofen-Wertheimer, Egon F. *The International Secretariat: A Great Experiment in International Administration*. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1945.

Sluga, Glenda. "Gender." In Patrick Finney, ed. *Palgrave Advances in International History*, 300-319. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Tipton, John B. *Participation of the United States in the International Labor Organization*. Illinois: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1959.

Wandersee, Winifred D. "'I'd rather pass a law than organize a union': France Perkins and the Reformist Approach to Organized Labor." *Labor History* 34, no. 1 (Winter 1993): 5-32.

Winslow, Anne, ed. *Women, Politics, and the United Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.