

GUY ALCHON

---

## Mary Van Kleeck and Social-Economic Planning

“We are, most of us,” Mary Van Kleeck said in November 1957, “getting too old to talk.” Near the end of more than two hours of interrogation by officials of the State Department’s Passport Office, Van Kleeck tried to impress upon her questioners the commitment to social research and to social justice that underlay her career. The Passport Office, however, was more concerned about her Communist front and party affiliations, and she was in their offices that Thursday morning appealing their refusal to renew her passport. She was seventy-three years old and retired from public life. She wanted to travel, as had been her practice, to Holland, her ancestral home and the home of her closest friends. “I date way back of you young people,” she told her two interrogators. “I think the work of my generation and our attitudes in international affairs is one of sympathy . . . to developments in other countries.” But, she continued, “I don’t think you people who don’t know the period prior to the First World War can possibly see how deep our concern is.”<sup>1</sup>

From the time she entered Smith College in 1900 to her retirement from the Russell Sage Foundation in 1948, Mary Van Kleeck’s social concern had run deeply. Her visible passion was for public matters, for the international increase of living standards, and for human welfare. And underlying and informing these commitments was a youth and early career devoted to the cause of women in industry. “The archetypal social feminist,” in Nancy Cott’s phrase, Van Kleeck was part of the women’s reform network active early in the century in New York. There her pioneering studies of women workers introduced her to urban industrial misery and propelled her to early prominence. By 1916 this member of the National Society of Colonial Dames was already an accomplished indus-

---

JOURNAL OF POLICY HISTORY, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1991.

Copyright © 1990 The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, PA.

trial sociologist and the head of the Industrial Studies Department of the Russell Sage Foundation. Director during World War I of the Labor Department's Woman in Industry Service (the forerunner of the U.S. Women's Bureau), Van Kleeck would later defend, together with other organized women, sex-based protective legislation against those urging an Equal Rights Amendment.<sup>2</sup>

Such disputes, Van Kleeck suggested, indicated only that "feminism . . . is by no means a unit." And as if to emphasize feminism's variety, during the interwar years she constructed a public life simultaneously distanced yet still drawn from her feminist origins. While she would be active in women's reform, she would not be central to its progress. Instead, and virtually alone among the women of her time, Van Kleeck devoted her mature career to advancing the utopian vision of a scientifically managed society and economy. "Social-economic planning," as she eventually termed it, was to meld the social feminist drive for raised living standards with scientific management's potential for the organization of efficient production and abundance. To this end, she became during the 1920s a leading light and one of the first and only women members of the Taylor Society, the chief American organization for the advancement of scientific management. She also helped to lead, usually as the only woman involved, a wide range of social science initiatives, including the early social science work of the National Research Council, the elaboration of the Sage Foundation's industrial relations studies, and the President's Committee on the Business Cycle, the first peacetime American effort directed toward national economic planning. Always outspoken, Van Kleeck in the 1930s emerged as the preeminent leader of the left wing of American social work, a champion of the labor movement, and an advocate of socialized national planning. Together with her close friend, the Dutch labor reformer Mary (Mikie) Fledderus, she emphasized the global nature of social-economic disorder by leading the International Industrial Relations Institute (IRI) into the worldwide planning debates of that decade. Her admiration for the Soviet central planning experiment, and her engagement in the antifascist and pro-Soviet movements of the time, placed her on an international stage, but in the 1940s and 1950s brought her, like so many others, difficulties and isolation.<sup>3</sup>

Van Kleeck's social-economic planning arose within those larger streams of twentieth-century development that have interested modern women's and organizational historians: the expanding range and consequences of women's public activity and efforts to equip managerial society with a planning capacity. These themes, however, usually are treated

separately, and such treatment may account partly for scholars' inattention to the work of a woman whose career so intertwined elements of each. A more comprehensive study of her efforts, then, will further our understanding both of women's political history and the search for national managerial capabilities, might reveal points of intersection and grounds for synthesis between these thematic concerns, and perhaps will suggest the sources of Van Kleeck's obscurity.<sup>4</sup>

Mary Abby Van Kleeck was born in Glenham, New York, on 26 June 1883, a child of two well-established families. Her father, Robert Boyd Van Kleeck, was heir to a legacy that included distinguished service to the cause of Dutch New Amsterdam and, later, to the American Revolution. Her mother, Eliza Mayer, belonged to an extended Baltimore family that was prominent in legal and commercial affairs. It was her money that supported the family, enabling her husband to take up the Episcopalian ministry, and together they raised four children, of whom Mary was the youngest, in comfortable if modest circumstances.<sup>5</sup>

Upon her father's death in 1892, Mary and her family moved to Flushing, New York, where Mary made her debut and graduated from Flushing High School in the spring of 1900. Sensitive, religious, and filled with anticipation, the young Van Kleeck enrolled that year in Smith College's class of 1904. "College," she wrote in her college memorabilia book's first entry, "Its happenings—Its joys and sorrows—Its gaiety and soberness—Its faculty and students. . . . Its perfection."<sup>6</sup>

Mary prospered at Smith, earning high marks in all subjects, becoming a member of several honorary societies, and thriving in the hothouse intensity typical of women's colleges at the time. Sophia Smith's determination to empower young women through Christian devotion and secular education had created a women's college especially alive to the problems and opportunities of American life. And in Northampton Mary found a community of women determined to link their faith and education more forcefully to the wider world.<sup>7</sup>

Probably the most important vehicle for promoting such connections was the Smith College Association for Christian Work, the peak student organization at Smith and the one most likely responsible for introducing Van Kleeck to the YWCA's early efforts on behalf of women workers. The SCACW exposed Smith women to the array of woman-led religious and social concerns through its campus Consumers' League, Missionary, and College Settlement subcommittees. Under Van Kleeck's presidency during the 1903–4 school year, the association, among other things, brought Jane Addams to Northampton to address Smith's students.<sup>8</sup>

The year 1904 also brought imminent graduation, and with it an apparently intense period of self-examination. Like Addams and others before her, Van Kleeck was acutely aware of the simultaneous luxury and a distress of her own condition. Safely tucked amidst the sheltering gentility of family, religion, and college, she had become an accomplished young woman. But she had also and suddenly, it seemed, become a woman not only aware of a larger world, but one driven by her faith to sympathize with that world's outcasts, and led by her education to value if not the outcast's at least the intellectual's allegedly disinterested point of view. Increasingly estranged from her origins and her class, she was in fact their purest product. She knew this, at least subconsciously; she knew, too, that she soon had to determine her own answer to Addams's question, "After college, what?"<sup>9</sup>

Briefly, Van Kleeck considered teaching school, but upon graduation was awarded the joint Smith College Alumnae and College Settlements Association fellowship for postgraduate work at New York's College Settlement House on Rivington Street on the Lower East Side. The College Settlement was an important training ground for activist women, who included Mary Simkhovitch, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Frances Kellor, and Van Kleeck eagerly anticipated following in the steps of Kellor, who had held the fellowship before her. "I read her book on employment exchanges," she would later write, "and sought to follow in my subject her methods of getting first-hand information in such a study." Taking up residence there in the fall of 1905, the twenty-one-year-old Van Kleeck soon was immersed in the city's tumultuous social-reform activities. She began graduate studies with Edward T. Devine, Henry Seager, and Franklin Giddings at Columbia University, and began a working association with Florence Kelley, Josephine and Pauline Goldmark, Mary Dreier, Lilian Brandt, Rose Schneiderman, and the New York Women's Trade Union League. Brandt and Kelley were especially influential in the life of the young social worker, with Brandt continuing for several years as Van Kleeck's adviser and Kelley responsible for encouraging the research that would launch Van Kleeck's career.<sup>10</sup>

"Mrs. Kelly [sic]," Van Kleeck noted in one of the first entries of her College Settlement journal, "wants facts collected as to hours of labor in factories and mercantile trades . . . to be used in introducing a more explicit labor law." And in pursuit of these facts, Van Kleeck began shoe-leather investigations that introduced her to the world of urban labor, trade unions, and government. She concentrated from 1905 through 1907 on child labor and overtime in women's work and soon discovered that these problems "could not be controlled by prosecuting one em-

ployer, but required a concerted effort to stimulate public opinion on the basis of facts secured from the workers themselves." Her early work here reflected the hard-nosed optimism of her mentors and drew continued sponsorship from other social welfare agencies. Published in the leading social work journal, her work soon came to the attention of an important new force in urban social reform, the Russell Sage Foundation.<sup>11</sup>

Founded early in 1907, the Sage Foundation was the only major philanthropy begun by a woman, staffed in its early years by several women, and dedicated expressly to the reform of working and living conditions. Envisioned by its founder, Margaret Olivia Sage, and her close adviser, Robert W. deForest, as a vehicle for research and improvement, it sponsored the pioneering Pittsburgh Survey, the first social survey of a major U.S. city. The foundation went on to become an important force in the development of modern social work and functioned for the next forty years as the chief institutional base for Van Kleeck's initiatives.<sup>12</sup>

Initially the new foundation sponsored the continuation of Van Kleeck's early researches, operating now under the auspices of the independent Committee on Women's Work; in 1910 the committee was formally brought into the foundation. Between 1910 and 1917 Van Kleeck's department launched an investigation of the poor conditions, night work, and irregular employment suffered by New York City's women workers in the artificial flowers, millinery, and bookbinding industries, among several others. Her work here suggested the need for employment exchanges and minimum-wage guarantees, and in 1910 and again in 1915 it would lead directly to the establishment of state prohibitions against night work for women workers, to the broadening of the department's mandate with the creation in 1916 of a new Division of Industrial Studies under her leadership, and would help to establish her national reputation as an industrial sociologist. Reflecting later upon the value of these early studies, Van Kleeck remarked that for "a view of the industrial system which comprehends . . . the effects of industrialism upon civilization, the best subject of study is the status of women in industry."<sup>13</sup>

Van Kleeck's women-in-industry work also indicated that inefficient business management lay behind much of the unemployment and distress of urban workers. This emphasis soon propelled her into a wider orbit of labor leaders, businessmen, and management engineers similarly concerned with the social costs of mismanagement and convinced that solutions lay in the new field of scientific management.

Several engineers had influenced scientific management, but Frederick W. Taylor gave the movement its name and became its most important

theorist. Taylorism involved engineering studies of workplace inefficiencies, the development of plans for their elimination, and the administration of these plans through cadres of scientific managers. Just before World War I, Taylorism began to undergo a broadening and redefinition, a reorientation largely sponsored by the Taylor Society, a forum for the promotion of scientific management as a social science. This Taylorite revisionism would be founded upon a larger conception of industrial inefficiency, one that would now include unemployment and worker dissatisfaction among the ills to be remedied through better management.<sup>14</sup>

This emphasis, together with the logic of her own work, attracted Van Kleeck to scientific management. "My own experience," she would later tell the Taylor Society in 1924, "began with what is called the human element in industry, and I saw it first outside the shop in the community." There, as she would later relate to Mary Beard, her search for solutions to the long hours and repetitive unemployment characteristic of women's work "led back into the causes of these conditions in the shop itself, and nowhere did I find so many questions in process of being answered as in the Taylor Society." The "constructive imagination which can spend seventeen years studying the art of cutting metals," she noted in a pointed reference to Taylor, "is the imagination which can make industry and all its results in human lives harmonize with our ideals for the community." Such a scientific management, she continued, ultimately would create "a shop whose influence in the community will be social in the best sense, because the shop and all its human relations" would be built on "sound principles." Thus for Van Kleeck the application of Taylorism to business management promised a powerful strategy for the attainment of steady employment and higher living standards, one that could complement the approaches of reformers and social workers.<sup>15</sup>

Much of Van Kleeck's work during the 1920s was devoted to developing just such a wider appreciation of the complementarity of social welfare and scientific management. The professionalization of both management engineering and social work became a favorite theme. "The analogy is close between social work and engineering," she wrote to her friend, the management engineer Morris Cooke. "Social workers," she noted, "starting with an interest in the individual, enlarge the field of their activities to give attention to institutions and organization as a social problem." Engineers, she continued, "starting with an interest in administration and structural organization are coming to see that the welfare of the individual is the test of management." The two groups, she argued, were moving toward each other, and their continued success depended now upon an explicit recognition of their mutual dependence.<sup>16</sup>

“Industry,” Van Kleeck exulted in 1922, “was being invaded by social work.” And she, from her desk at the Sage Foundation, was leading the assault. With the support of the foundation’s director, John Glenn, she tried to reorient the Department of Industrial Studies toward a larger technocratic mission, one focused on the development of such new fields as personnel research, employment statistics, and the study of employee-management schemes in coal and other industries. But more profoundly, the momentum of her efforts to merge social work and scientific management led her now into the developing arenas of national and international planning.<sup>17</sup>

In the most immediate sense, these were the product of World War I’s various national planning experiments and the postwar persistence of industrial and class conflict. The first suggested the possibility of national management; the second, in the eyes of some, demanded it. For the United States these issues were thrown into sharp relief, as the immediate postwar years saw an intensification of industrial conflict, nationwide strikes, antiradical hysteria, and a steep depression. Against this backdrop, some of those who had played the largest roles in the wartime mobilization of the economy—management engineers, social scientists, a few businessmen and labor leaders—struggled to build new national managerial capabilities. The chief figure in this story was Herbert Hoover, millionaire mining engineer, organizer of the vast war and postwar relief operations that saved millions of Western Europeans and Russians from starvation, and now the new Republican Secretary of Commerce. Around him, from 1921 through the early 1930s, would gather an array of planners, and among them was Mary Van Kleeck.<sup>18</sup>

Van Kleeck saw Hooverian planning, at least at its outset, as an opportunity to further the merger of scientific management and social work, and to do so now on a national scale. Its key organization would be the Committee on Business Cycles and Unemployment, a continuing committee of the President’s Unemployment Conference of 1921 and the supervisory body for an unprecedented investigation into the nature of business cycles and the utility of scientific management in their prevention. The Unemployment Conference had been Hoover’s creation, and it reflected, as did the Business Cycles Committee, his desire to construct a better-ordered and balanced society through the application of technical expertise to complex economic problems. It reflected, too, Hoover’s antistatism and his determination to achieve these goals through private bodies energized by his Commerce Department to assume larger public responsibilities. To that end, Hooverian planning would be funded by the major foundations and built upon the investigations of social scientists

affiliated with them, as well as universities and new public-policy research organizations like the National Bureau of Economic Research. The idea was that the new knowledge developed about the business cycle and of the countercyclical benefits of scientific management would be broadcast to the nation's businessmen by a Commerce Department eager to see them stabilize their operations and tailor their investment decisions to the cycle's swings. To the extent that they did so, the argument ran, the sum of their individual actions would add up to a national economy of greater stability and less unemployment.<sup>19</sup>

Together with economist Wesley C. Mitchell, the chairman of General Electric, Owen D. Young, and others, Van Kleeck was a prominent and enthusiastic member of the Business Cycles Committee. The main result of their work, *Business Cycles and Unemployment*, was published amidst wide publicity in 1923 and seemed at the time to have helped to moderate both the upward swing and subsequent decline in business activity at mid-decade, thus vindicating, apparently, Hoover's approach to the economy. But the story of Hooverian planning, or techno-corporatism, would not end happily, and it turned out to be more a story of tentative and creative efforts soon to be overwhelmed by the economy's deeper structural dilemmas and the coming of the Great Depression.<sup>20</sup>

By the late 1920s, in any case, Van Kleeck had become increasingly skeptical of the Hooverian approach. The evidence of rising unemployment amidst general prosperity was mounting, undercutting her faith in the possibilities of business planning. The time had come, she argued now, to ask whether the problems of stabilizing employment and raising living standards could any longer be left to business management, no matter how much it had been "invaded" by concern for the general welfare. Scientific management was as important as ever to addressing these problems, she maintained, but the onset of the Depression forced her to conclude that, without a strong and independent labor movement to drive it, scientific management would never fulfill its promise of a rational and abundant economy. The pursuit of social protections of ten and twenty years past, in and of itself, had not been enough. "In that period," she reminded her YWCA friends in 1932, "we believed that it would be possible to attain such ideals through an educated public opinion, even though we left untouched the forms of control which were developing in industry." Van Kleeck, like others at the time, was forsaking the 1920s' faith in the promise of a New Capitalism and turning increasingly toward linking her vision of social-economic planning with an emerging labor movement and the international search for a new economic order.<sup>21</sup>



By the early 1930s, Van Kleeck was well positioned for this next stage of her life. Her work in the 1920s had led, among other testaments to her stature, to her appointment as a fellow of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science, as the chair of the Committee on Governmental and Labor Statistics of the American Statistical Association, and to the board of directors for the first edition of *The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Lillian Gilbreth called her “the best research woman I know.” Alice Hamilton, according to one correspondent, referred to her “ideas, vision, and great executive ability,” and insisted that Van Kleeck was “one of the best-fitted women in the country for a Cabinet position.”<sup>22</sup>

An increasingly militant advocacy of socialized and labor-led central planning, however, made such an appointment impossible. In fact, Van Kleeck’s bitter criticism of capitalism and the New Deal drew hard on her stock of professional prestige and led her further into the expanding debate over international planning and the promise of socialism. But her entry into this debate came not alone from her disappointment with the domestic scene. It arose as well from a decade’s progress along another track: her efforts to “internationalize” the merger of social reform and scientific management through the work of the IRI.<sup>23</sup>

The IRI arose early in the 1920s as the result of international efforts by a group of mostly women personnel specialists to address an intensifying world debate over the nature of modern labor-management relations. Corporate welfare or personnel work had been developing both in Europe and the United States since early in the century. But the war’s demands for labor-force growth, stability, and more women workers also created openings in many firms for female social workers interested in managing the “human factor.” And in a chateau in Normandy in July 1922, a small group of such women, representing eleven countries, came together in the First International Welfare Conference.<sup>24</sup> The American representative to the conference was Louise Odenkrantz, the wartime personnel manager for the New York ribbon-making firm Smith & Kaufmann and a former investigator for Van Kleeck at the Rivington Street Settlement and the Sage Foundation. Mary Fledderus, the personnel manager of the Leerdam Glassworks, just outside Rotterdam, Holland, and soon to become, together with Van Kleeck, the motivating force behind the IRI, also attended.<sup>25</sup>

Appointed by the conference to organize a larger and more permanent organization, Fledderus was responsible in June 1925 for convening in Holland just such a body, now called the International Association for the Study and Improvement of Human Relations in Industry. More than fifty delegates, most of them women, representing twenty-one countries, at-

tended this new conference. Among them were sympathetic employers, such as Dorothy Cadbury, a managing director of England's Cadbury chocolate empire, and Cees van der Leeuw, a partner in Rotterdam's Van Nelle coffee operation and long-time friend of Fledderus. Sweden's chief inspector of factories, Kersten Hesselgren, was elected president, and three American members—Odenchantz, Lillian Gilbreth, and Van Kleeck—were elected to the organization's permanent council.<sup>26</sup>

The members of the new organization shared the intense self-consciousness of many at the time who felt that both the war and the simultaneous rise of scientific management had altered industrial relations forever. More than anything, it seemed, the future depended upon their recognition of the potential dangers and possibilities of this new era. "Though the principles of Scientific Management and Efficiency are in themselves to be hailed with enthusiasm," Fledderus wrote in the introduction to the conference's report, "unless they are applied with a corresponding study of their effect upon humanity serving in Industry, they hide within their depths [sic] the possibility of a great and subtle cruelty." Here again, in another form and place, was Van Kleeck's insistence on the need to link social welfare and scientific management. The new association envisioned its role as one of collaboration with such established bodies as the International Management Institute and the International Labor Organization (ILO). As such, it could be a forum for the frank discussion of contending schemes for the "promotion of satisfactory human relations and conditions in industry."<sup>27</sup>

The association met in summer sessions during 1926 and 1927 to prepare for its first triennial conference, one that was to test this self-appointed function. The "Fundamental Relationships Between All Sectors of the Industrial Community" was the theme in June 1928, when more than one hundred delegates from twenty countries met for a week at Girton, the women's college of Cambridge University. In attendance were Paul Devinat of the ILO, the British scientific management enthusiast Lyndall Urwick, former Principal Woman Inspector of Factories, Dame Adelaide Anderson, Paul Kellogg, editor of the *Survey* magazines, Professor Susan Kingsbury of Bryn Mawr College, and the former Chief Industrial Commissioner of England, Lord Askwith, to name only a few. Both Holland's and Britain's progressive employers were represented by Cees van der Leeuw and by the Rowntrees and the Cadburys, with Dorothy and George Cadbury accompanied by several of their workers, including "chocolate grinder" George Davies and "fancy boxmaker" Annie Freeman.<sup>28</sup>

Their discussions, Van Kleeck noted in her remarks to the congress's closing session, had ranged over the philosophies of individualism and

collectivism, differences in national experiences, workers' education, and the contributions of scientific management to improved human relations. "Now if anyone complains that there are not enough 'brass tacks' . . . in our discussions," she admonished, "I think we have to ask, is there anything more tangible or more concrete [than] bringing together the points of view of labour, of employers, of managers, and of those who are students of industry?"<sup>29</sup>

This seemed to be the view of many, both at the conference and among the attentive public, who in the late 1920s looked upon the IRI as an interesting, if modest, "factory of ideas." The organization was all the more remarkable, Van Kleeck was to note later, because it did not have a formal staff. Instead, it relied upon the triennial conferences that also had arisen out of previous summer meetings and reports. These materials and conference proceedings would be published, usually in book form, to bring the organization's work to a wider, international public.<sup>30</sup>

In truth, the IRI by the late 1920s relied almost exclusively upon Fledderus and Van Kleeck. As director and associate director, respectively, they ran the organization from its office in The Hague and from Van Kleeck's offices at the Sage Foundation, relying for funds on membership dues, a few benefactors, and the Sage Foundation. And they relied increasingly upon each other, choosing later in the 1920s to live together, half the year in the new co-op they purchased in Manhattan, the other half in Holland, a way of life they would maintain for forty years. Theirs was a powerful and sustaining partnership. And when early in the 1930s the coming of the Depression, the emergence of fascist parties in Europe, and the Soviet Union's turn toward central planning brought a new urgency to world affairs, they turned the IRI's next triennial conference into an opportunity to investigate the implications of these developments. The result was the Amsterdam World Social Economic Congress of 1931, the high watermark of the IRI's influence.<sup>31</sup>

Van Kleeck envisioned the Amsterdam Congress as an effort to build internationally upon the President's Unemployment Conference of 1921. Then "Mr. Hoover . . . was trying to lift the subject of unemployment to a higher plane of industrial statesmanship, getting leaders of business to use the results of economic research to enlarge the judgment of businessmen." With unemployment now worsening, she argued, "international economic co-operation . . . toward a planned development of productive capacity and standards of living," a "Social-Economic Planning," was required. With Van Kleeck setting its agenda, the Amsterdam Congress unremarkably reflected this long-held fusion of social feminist and technocratic faiths. Still, for her, the congress would be a remarkable event, a

personal and political watershed, marking either a further step within the logic of social-economic planning or a wrong turn, or both. For here in Amsterdam, in her middle age, she began her long career as staunch friend and fellow traveler of Stalin's Soviet Union.<sup>32</sup>

"Today," Van Kleeck later wrote, "the word 'planning' will soon be another commonplace expression," meaning everything and nothing. "But rarely is the expression 'economic planning' used in combination with the word 'social' as denoting the common welfare—the one word from which it should never be severed." Social-economic planning, she asserted in Amsterdam, "is the name for a definite procedure." It had yet to be fairly tested, "but its underlying principles have been developed in the scientific management movement," and its central task is to utilize the world's productive capacities "to raise the standards of living."<sup>33</sup>

This theme appealed to the diverse group of Taylorites, scholars, and trade unionists who assembled in Amsterdam's Koloniaal Institute in late August of that year. Newcomers from the United States included Edward A. Filene of the Boston department store and Twentieth Century Fund, and Lewis Lorwin of the Brookings Institution, but the main feature of the conference was the participation of two guests, a delegation of the State Planning Commission of the Soviet Union (Gosplan) and the Viennese philosopher and socialist Otto Neurath.

Neurath, a Vienna Circle philosopher and polymath, is best remembered today within the field of graphic design for his invention of Isotype, or international picture language. Isotype grew out of Neurath's effort as director of the Vienna Social and Economic Museum during the 1920s. There he developed pictorial statistics to portray the story of urban sanitation, housing reform, and political economy within socialist Vienna. Soon his museum was drawing visitors, Van Kleeck and Fledderus among them, intent on learning more about "visual education."<sup>34</sup>

In Amsterdam, Neurath regaled his audience with lantern-slide shows of his Isotype charts of economic and social data. These illustrated the variety of the world's natural and industrial resources and the growing gap between rising productive capacity and stagnant living standards. The Depression, both he and Van Kleeck agreed, was "a problem of economic organization," and it could be remedied through a world plan. Such planning, however, Neurath argued, depended upon further statistical knowledge of the world's physical and human resources and an agreed-upon method for their calculation. This point captivated a congress searching for a concrete indication of where the movement for social-economic planning should turn next. And it fitted Van Kleeck's thinking on the matter, thus turning the search for better data into "the most

important point for primary consideration” by the IRI following the congress. It also confirmed for Van Kleeck that the “Neurath Method” was an ideal tool for the propagation of social-economic planning.<sup>35</sup>

The members of the Soviet delegation brought no lantern slides, but their presence alone was news, as they were among the first Soviet officials to travel to the West to discuss the Five-Year Plans. In addition, they were representatives of the world’s first group to attempt comprehensive and socialized planning, and thus “their coming did not merely add one nation to the list,” Van Kleeck insisted, “but brought to the discussion the record of experience with social economic planning under communism, as it is actually in effect.” Led by the Gosplan economist Valery V. Obolensky-Ossinsky, the delegation even presented its chief discussion of Russia under the Plans as “The Nature and Forms of Social Economic Planning.” The presentations were eagerly attended by a congress and international press corps curious to learn more about the details of central administration, goal-setting, the role of scientific management in labor relations, and the allegedly democratic and collaborative ethos underlying the Soviet administration of industry, agriculture, and trade. But the Soviets really had little new to say, preferring instead to emphasize, sometimes angrily, the contrast between a Soviet Union enjoying planned and democratic full employment and a prostrate Western capitalism. This was an apparently credible point, and one irresistible early in the 1930s even to hardheaded industrial sociologists.<sup>36</sup>

Following the Amsterdam Congress, Van Kleeck worked to establish the World Commission for the Study of Social Economic Planning, which would be capable of developing statistics and other data necessary for the construction of world plans. But the IRI never attained substantial influence in the planning debates of the 1930s. At best, it functioned to catalyze thought and to suggest ultimate and instrumental goals. Unable to generate additional funds for their ambitious plans amidst the Depression, Van Kleeck, Fledderus, and a few associates continued their work, coming together in IRI conferences every year, until war in Europe brought their enterprise to an end.<sup>37</sup>

Before that, however, Van Kleeck visited the Soviet Union in 1932 to study its efforts toward social-economic planning. Already a defender of the Soviet state, she now became a reliable advocate for all its works, including its persecution of Trotsky, its purge trials, its invasion of Finland, and its short-lived pact with Hitler. She became, in other words, a fellow traveler, apparently never joining the Communist party but lending the Soviet Union and American Communists her energies and the support of her intellectual authority. Aghast at the poverty, fascism, and war bred by the

imbalances of capitalism, she, like many of her generation, looked upon the Soviet Union as the single, courageous alternative, trying to build the planned society to which she had devoted her life, but beset on all sides by enemies, and requiring her help and defense. "I started to criticize their ruthless methods," wrote William Spofford, managing editor of the Episcopal Church weekly, *The Witness*, in an interview with Van Kleeck, but "she matched each one with a deed even more ruthless here in America—massacres in Colorado, . . . in North Carolina, lynchings, the denial of all our liberties in times of stress." After all, he recalls her saying about the Soviets, "we must admire their self-sacrifice and their devotion to social ideals." For these reasons, she joined or worked with various pro-Soviet organizations during the 1930s and 1940s, which led to her surveillance by the FBI and to appearances before Senator Joseph McCarthy's committee in 1953, and, on that November day in 1957, at the State Department to defend her right to her passport.<sup>38</sup>

Dignified, reserved, and "without warmth of personality," in Margaret Grierson's memorable phrase, Mary Van Kleeck and her work have been only partly visible to contemporaries and scholars. Eleanor Flexner remembers the seventy-three-year-old Van Kleeck as a politically prickly personality, who on one occasion in 1957 or 1958 "reacted very strongly" to passing criticism of Red China. Sidney Hook remembered a younger Van Kleeck, who in the early 1930s presented "the very picture of a grand New England or Midwestern lady with firm American roots," but one who was, nonetheless, probably "a secret member of the Communist Party." And one informant, who prefers to remain anonymous, remembers the Van Kleeck of 1917 as a "technician" and a "know it all." Corliss Lamont, Edith Tiger, and Leonard Boudin, among Van Kleeck's colleagues on the left, recall a principled, combative, and self-assured woman. Along with Mary Dublin Keyserling, Philip Foner, Herbert Aptheker, and Jan Tinbergen, they profess admiration and respect for her. Indeed, words such as "extraordinary," "excellent," and "admirable" dot these and other people's descriptions of Van Kleeck. But few, if any, it seems, ever knew her well.<sup>39</sup>

Historians' grasp of Van Kleeck, her social-economic planning, and her significance has been equally tenuous. And this may result partly from the prevailing perspectives within organizational and women's history. Women's history, particularly in its approach to twentieth-century politics and public affairs, has tended to emphasize participation in government activity and those periods such as the Progressive Era and New Deal years in which the state and women's public influence expanded

together. Such an emphasis probably is appropriate to much of twentieth-century United States history, particularly to the two world wars, the 1930s, and the 1960s, periods of significant statist activity and expansion. But this emphasis also distorts recent history, both by diminishing developments during periods of retrenchment and antistatism and by implicitly suggesting that the state has been the exclusive arena of public activity. In areas vital to Mary Van Kleeck's story, these distortions are especially telling.<sup>40</sup>

Van Kleeck devoted most of her career to the national and international public activities of nominally private institutions such as the Sage Foundation and the IRI, and at a time and in areas where often they were more vigorous public actors than the government. Some of her most important and interesting work, for example, took place during the antistatist 1920s, a period still occasionally diminished as an interlude between more important eras. For some time, to be sure, scholars have recognized progressive survivals and women reformers' continuing role during the 1920s. But even the most recent scholarship has yet to explain Van Kleeck's role in the institutional and ideological innovations of that decade. It tends to miss, in other words, the managerial component that her work brought to interwar women's history.<sup>41</sup>

By contrast, organizational history has emphasized the public role of private institutions in the rise of the managed society. Modern social management, so it seems from this perspective, indeed has involved a large degree of state expansion, but it has also depended upon fluid and continuous public-private, or corporatist, linkages in which private bodies have acted in a public capacity. From this perspective, then, the 1920s and, conceivably, the activities of the Sage Foundation, the Business Cycle Committee, the IRI, and Van Kleeck would appear to be particularly important.<sup>42</sup>

Organizational history, however, has its own blind spots. It has tended, for example, to diminish human agency, to "depopulate" history. It has also ignored gender as an analytical category. And because of this, organizational history misses such things as the large part played by women, almost exclusively white and middle class, in the construction of the ideologies, institutions, and modern managerial society with which it is so concerned. Organizational historians, in other words, have missed for the most part the sources, nature, and consequences of women's role in the professionalization of the social sciences, the rise of the modern foundations, and in the elaboration of the social welfare, social protection, and planning impulses that underlie the modern "search for order." Ignoring gender also hampers their understanding of organizational society's influ-

ence on women. It frustrates their ability to understand the importance of new institutional arenas, such as those provided by the social sciences, philanthropy, and the new field of scientific management, within which professional women like Van Kleeck simultaneously gained public influence and heightened marginality.<sup>43</sup>

Despite their obvious strengths, neither of these historiographies is equipped to comprehend a woman like Van Kleeck. To organizational history she is almost invisible because it does not readily acknowledge the rise of the social sciences, scientific management, the foundations, and the search for national planning capabilities as the result, in some part, of the work of women like Van Kleeck. But women's political history, for its part, has missed Van Kleeck's significance largely because until recently it has emphasized the state and periods of government activism. It tends to ignore the persons, institutions, and supporting ideologies operating in that penumbra between the public and private so characteristic of a managerial world. Organizational and women's history thus could learn from one another. And because Mary Van Kleeck played important roles in areas critical to each, studying her work may help to encourage such a synthesis.

At the least, studying Van Kleeck's career in social-economic planning will help to illuminate further the political history of modern women, the planned society, and the nature of the ties between them. For Van Kleeck embodied and pushed to their limits important, if still little understood, lines of twentieth-century development. Perhaps more than anyone of her time, she worked to reconcile and to merge the social feminist demand for justice and the social minimum with modern technocratic authority's claims to efficiency and abundance. Her work makes plain, moreover, that the histories of women and managerial society are intertwined. Social feminist ideas, in other words, cannot be understood without recognizing their links with scientific management, philanthropy, and the rise of the modern experts and their quest for broad social management, whether socialist or capitalist. The history and appeal of scientific management and the modern planning impulse, in addition, cannot be understood apart from the drive for scientized social reform that impelled part of the social feminist project. Inquiry into Van Kleeck's contributions in these areas may yield more powerful generalizations about the larger political history of the managerial and technical orders, of the role of women and types of feminism in their construction, and of the resulting compromises, gains, and losses.

*University of Delaware*



## Notes

1. "In the Matter of Miss Mary Van Kleeck," transcript of hearing, Passport Office, U.S. Department of State, 21 November 1957, 74–75, Box 1, Folder 14, Mary Van Kleeck Papers, Sophia Smith Collection, Women's History Archive, Smith College (hereafter MVK Papers).

2. Overviews of Van Kleeck's life (1883–1972) include Eleanor M. Lewis, "Van Kleeck, Mary Abby," in Barbara Sicherman and Carol Hurd Green, eds., *Notable American Women* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), 707–9; and Jan L. Hagen, "Van Kleeck, Mary Abby," in Walter I. Trattner, ed., *Biographical Dictionary of Social Welfare in America* (Westport, Conn., 1986), 725–28. The quoted phrase is from Nancy F. Cott, "What's in a Name? The Limits of 'Social Feminism'; or, Expanding the Vocabulary of Women's History," *Journal of American History* 76:3 (December 1989): 823. Cott explores the limited utility of "social feminism" as an analytical category. Historians usually apply the term to the labor and social-reform activities of the first generations of college-educated women and their working-class allies during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Through the settlement-house movement and such organizations as the Women's Trade Union League (WTUL) and the Industrial Department of the YWCA, a network of women reformers, including Florence Kelley, Mary Dreier, Florence Simms, Mary Anderson, and a host of others, arose to shape public debate and policy. Their efforts apparently projected prevailing notions of women's "domestic responsibilities" onto a larger "public household" in which women workers, in particular, required protection from exploitation. Like Van Kleeck, whose early career was devoted to this cause, social feminists sought to advance women's opportunities by recognizing and defending women's "difference" from men. Van Kleeck's feminism, then, seems to embody what Cott, in another context, terms "feminism's characteristic doubleness, its simultaneous affirmation of women's human rights and women's unique needs and differences." See Nancy F. Cott, *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, 1987), 49. On social feminism, see, for example, William L. O'Neill, *Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America* (New York, 1969); J. Stanley Lemons, *The Woman Citizen: Social Feminism in the 1920s* (Urbana, 1973); Estelle Freedman, "Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution-Building and American Feminism, 1870–1930," *Feminist Studies* 5:3 (Fall 1979):512–29; Nancy Schrom Dye, *As Equals and As Sisters: Feminism, the Labor Movement, and the Women's Trade Union League of New York* (Columbia, Mo., 1980); Julie Matthaei, *An Economic History of Women in America: Women's Work, the Sexual Division of Labor, and the Development of Capitalism* (New York, 1982), pt. 2; and Naomi Black, *Social Feminism* (Ithaca, 1989).

3. Van Kleeck, "Women and Machines," *The Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 127, February 1921, 253. Van Kleeck would not be among the women's network surveyed in Susan Ware's *Beyond Suffrage: Women in the New Deal* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981). Lewis, "Van Kleeck, Mary Abby"; Hagen, "Van Kleeck, Mary Abby."

4. On women's and organizational history, see, for example, Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "The Feminist Reconstruction of History," *Academe* (September/October 1983): 26–37; and Louis Galambos, "Technology, Political Economy, and Professionalization: Central Themes of the Organizational Synthesis," *Business History Review* 57:4 (Winter 1983):471–93. Van Kleeck appears occasionally and briefly in histories of U.S. labor, social welfare, communism, planning, and women, but only a handful of scholars devote more than a few words to her. See, for example, Clarke Chambers, *Seedtime for Reform: American Social Service and Social Action, 1918–1933* (Minneapolis, 1963) and Paul U. Kellogg and the Survey: *Voices for Social Welfare and Social Justice* (Minneapolis, 1971); Maurine Weiner Greenwald, *Women, War, and Work: The Impact of World War I on Women Workers in the United States* (Westport, Conn., 1980); Cletus Daniel, *The ACLU and the Wagner Act: An Inquiry into the Depression-Era Crisis of American Liberalism* (Ithaca, 1980); Jacob Fisher, *The Response of Social Work to the Great Depression* (Boston, 1980); Harvey Klehr, *The Heyday of*

*American Communism: The Depression Decade* (New York, 1984); Guy Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning: Capitalism, Social Science, and the State in the 1920s* (Princeton, 1985); and two unpublished papers by Ruth Oldenziel, Department of History, Yale University: "Mary Van Kleeck: A Career of Idealism" (1983), and "The International Institute for Industrial Relations, 1922–1946" (1987).

5. We know little about Van Kleeck's youth and family, and my characterizations rely especially upon the remembrances of J. Dyck Fledderus, the nephew of Mary Fledderus, and the closest friend of these two women from the late 1940s until their deaths in the early 1970s; interviews with Fledderus, 24 February and 16 October 1989 (hereafter Fledderus interviews). On the Mayer family, Brantz Mayer, *Memoir and Genealogy of the Maryland and Pennsylvania Family of Mayer* (Baltimore, 1878), in the possession of J. Dyck Fledderus, is helpful. Other genealogical material and short biographical sketches are contained in several collections of Van Kleeck papers, including the two central deposits at the Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College and the Reuther Library, Wayne State University. See, for example, Frank Van Kleeck, "The Van Kleeck Family," Box 2, Folder 23, MVK Papers; see also an untitled two-page piece in Box 2, Folder 18, Russell Sage Foundation Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RSF Papers).

6. Fledderus interviews; On Van Kleeck's college years, her memorabilia book, personally inscribed "Ye book of ye 1904 girl," is a rich and only recently discovered source of college pamphlets, letters from friends and family, poetry, and self-commentary. Van Kleeck, "Memorabilia," in the author's possession (hereafter MVK Memorabilia). See also *Smith College Class Book, 1904* (Northampton, Mass., 1904), Colledge Archives, Smith College.

7. Van Kleeck's transcript, Smith College Office of the Registrar, Box 4, Folder 14, MVK Papers. Van Kleeck's memorabilia book is filled with notes and letters from classmates, friends, and family congratulating her on her several achievements and inductions; see MVK Memorabilia. On Sophia Smith, the origins and early nature of Smith College, and the emerging world of women's higher education in the late nineteenth century, see, for example, "Last Will and Testament of Miss Sophia Smith," Smith College Archives; Elizabeth Deering Hanscom and Helen French Greene, *Sophia Smith and the Beginnings of Smith College* (Northampton, Mass., 1925); Gladys Wookey Davis, *Miss Sophia's Legacy* (Oxford, 1950); Barbara M. Solomon, *In The Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America* (New Haven, 1985), chaps. 4–6; and Helen L. Horowitz, *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in Women's Colleges from Their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s* (New York, 1984).

8. *Annual Report, 1903–1904*, Smith College Association for Christian Work, Van Kleeck's copy, in MVK Memorabilia. See also *SCACW Minutes*, April 1902–April 1905, 9, 13; and *SCACW Reports*, 1902–3, 1903–4, 82–83, 104, Colledge Archives, Smith College. On the early industrial work of the YWCA, see Lucy Carner, "The Background of the Industrial Work of the Y.W.C.A.," Box 1, Folder 18; and *The Y.W.C.A. and Industry* (New York, 1928), Box 16, Folder 4, both in the National Board of the YWCA Records, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College; and Mary Frederickson, "Citizens for Democracy: The Industrial Programs of the YWCA," in Mary Frederickson and Joyce L. Kornbluh, eds., *Sisterhood and Solidarity: Workers' Education for Women, 1914–1984* (Philadelphia, 1984), 75–106.

9. Several of Van Kleeck's college poems indicate her ambivalence toward graduation and adult life. In one, "Voices," she refers to voices calling to her. "But I knew I dared not follow," she writes, "for my heart was full of fear." Still, as the poem refrains, "Far away from toiling cities, . . . they called me, gently called me, chanting softly—"Will you go?" MVK Memorabilia. This dilemma, now a staple of the history of the New Woman, was examined by Jane Addams in her "The Subjective Necessity of Social Settlements," first delivered as a lecture in 1892. But it could also describe the more general personal predicament of the increasingly self-conscious intellectual then emerging

in distinctly modern form. See, for example, Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House* (New York, 1910); Joyce Antler, "After College, What?: New Graduates and the Family Claim," *American Quarterly* 32 (1980): 409–34; and Christopher Lasch's earliest essays on these matters in *The New Radicalism in America, 1889–1963: The Intellectual as a Social Type* (New York, 1965).

10. Van Kleeck, "Memorandum No. 1," 2 November 1956, and "Memorandum No. 2," 14 November 1956, both addressed to the Smith College Library, in Box 1, Folder 18, MVK Papers. Van Kleeck refers to Kellor in a letter to Mary Dreier, 3 March 1952, Box 9, Folder 152, Mary E. Dreier Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College. See also Frances Kellor, *Out of Work* (New York, 1904). On Kellor, see Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade: Women Social Scientists and Progressive Reform* (New York, 1990). On Kelley urban reform, and the women's world of the social settlements, see Kathryn Kish Sklar, "Hull House in the 1890s: A Community of Women Reformers," *Signs* 10:4 (Summer 1985): 658–77.

11. Van Kleeck, "Daily Record," The College Settlement, entry of 27 September 1905, Box 77, Folder 1202, MVK Papers. The second quotation is from Van Kleeck to Mary Beard, November 18, 1935, Box 1, Folder 3, MVK Papers. Van Kleeck, "Working Hours of Women in Factories," *Charities and the Commons*, 16 October 1906, 13–21; "Child Labor in New York City Tenements," *Charities and the Commons*, 18 January 1908, 1405–20.

12. On the origins and history of the Sage Foundation, see David Hammack, "Russell Sage Foundation," in Harold Keele and Joseph Kriger, eds., *Foundations* (Westport, Conn., 1984), 373–80; and the two-volume history of the foundation by John M. Glenn, Lilian Brandt, and F. Emerson Andrews, *Russell Sage Foundation, 1907–1946* (New York, 1947). See also Sheila Slaughter and Edward T. Silva, "Looking Backwards: How Foundations Formulated Ideology in the Progressive Period," in Robert Arno, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Boston, 1980), 55–86. On the history of the public role of private foundations, see, for example, Barry D. Karl and Stanley N. Katz, "The American Private Philanthropic Foundation and the Public Sphere, 1890–1930," *Minerva* 19:2 (Summer 1981): 236–70. On similar, but earlier, urban social survey work, see Sklar, "Hull House in the 1890s."

13. See, for example, Van Kleeck, "The Artificial Flower Trade in New York City," 30 November 1909, Box 13, Folder 3; Van Kleeck to John M. Glenn, Russell Sage Foundation, 31 March 1910, Box 13, Folder 4; and Van Kleeck, "A Program for a Committee on Women's Work," 25 April 1910, Box 13, Folder 6, all in Mary Van Kleeck Papers, Reuther Library, Wayne State University (hereafter MVK/R Papers). See also Van Kleeck, "Memorandum Regarding Investigations for the Winter of 1910–11," and the several letters from Van Kleeck to John Glenn, all in Box 15, Folder 132, RSF Papers. Several of these studies were published under Van Kleeck's name as *Artificial Flower Makers* (New York, 1913), *Women in the Bookbinding Trade* (New York, 1913), and *A Seasonal Industry* (New York, 1917). See the discussion of these matters in Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning*, chap. 1, and Peter Seixas, "Unemployment as a 'Problem of Industry' in Early-Twentieth Century New York," *Social Research* 54:2 (Summer 1987): 403–30. The quotation is from Van Kleeck to Beard, 18 November 1935.

14. Daniel Nelson, *Frederick W. Taylor and the Rise of Scientific Management* (Madison, 1980); Milton Nadworny, *Scientific Management and the Unions, 1900–1932* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955); Samuel Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890–1920* (Chicago, 1964); David F. Noble, *America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism* (New York, 1977), 264–65, 275–77; Morris L. Cooke, "Scientific Management as a Solution of the Unemployment Problem," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (hereafter *Annals*), vol. 61 (September 1915), 146–64; Richard A. Feiss, "Scientific Management Applied to the Steadying of Employment and Its Effect in an Industrial Establishment," *Annals*, vol. 61 (September 1915), 103–11; Van Kleeck, "The Effect of Unemployment on the Wage Scale," *Annals*, vol. 61 (September 1915), 90–102.

15. "Remarks of Mary Van Kleeck at Annual Business Meeting of the Taylor Society, 4 December 1924," Box 24, Folder 488; Van Kleeck to Mary Beard, 18 November 1935, Box 1, Folder 2, both in MVK Papers.

16. Van Kleeck to Cooke, 9 June, 11 June 1921, Box 16, Morris L. Cooke Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (hereafter Cooke Papers); see also Van Kleeck, "What Industry Can Do to Raise Standards of Work for Women," 8 December 1925, Box 24, Folder 488, MVK Papers.

17. Mary Van Kleeck and Graham R. Taylor, "The Professional Organization of Social Work," *Annals*, vol. 101 (May 1922), 158–68. Van Kleeck's plans for her department's expansion are set forth in an unsigned memorandum to John M. Glenn from the Division of Industrial Studies, 25 October 1919, Box 23, Folder 456, MVK Papers; See also Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning*, Chap. 3, and Glenn et al., *Russell Sage Foundation*, chaps 27, 37.

18. The best treatments of these themes and this period include Ellis W. Hawley, *The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order: A History of the American People and Their Institutions, 1917–1933* (New York, 1979), and Charles Maier, *Recasting Bourgeois Europe: Stabilization in France, Germany, and Italy in the Decades After World War I* (Princeton, 1975). On Hoover, his thought and significance, see Hawley, "Herbert Hoover, The Commerce Secretariat, and the Vision of an 'Associative State,' 1921–1928," *Journal of American History* 61:1 (June 1974): 116–40; William A. Williams, *The Contours of American History* (Cleveland, 1961); and Joan Hoff-Wilson, *Herbert Hoover: Forgotten Progressive* (Boston, 1975).

19. This story is the subject of Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning*. See also Carolyn Grin, "The Unemployment Conference of 1921," *Mid-America* 54 (April 1973): 83–107; Evan Metcalf, "Secretary Hoover and the Emergence of Macroeconomic Management," *Business History Review* 49 (Spring 1975): 60–80; and Patrick D. Reagan, "From Depression to Depression: Hooverian National Planning, 1921–1933," *Mid-America* 70:1 (January 1988): 35–60.

20. Committee on Business Cycles and Unemployment of the President's Conference on Unemployment, *Business Cycles and Unemployment* (New York, 1923); Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning*, chap. 5–8.

21. Van Kleeck, "Unemployment in Passaic," *American Federationist* 35:5 (May 1928): 597–602; *ibid.*, "Changes Toward Social Control," *Report of the Twelfth Biennial Convention*, YWCA, 5–11 May 1932, 59, YWCA Papers, YWCA of the USA., New York; Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning*, chap. 8.

22. Lillian Gilbreth to L. W. Wallace, 3 February 1926, Container 124, File 0816–160, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth Papers, Purdue University (hereafter Gilbreth Papers); Hamilton is quoted in Perriton Maxwell to Van Kleeck, 5 January 1933, Box 1, Folder 3, MVK Papers.

23. Van Kleeck, "Employment or Unemployment? That Is the Question," *American Labor Legislation Review* 20:1 (March 1930): 13–19; Van Kleeck to *New York Times*, 18 October 1930, p. 16, Col. 7. Van Kleeck's criticisms of the New Deal were widely reported, especially when in August 1933 she accepted, then abruptly resigned from, an appointment to the Federal Advisory Council of the U.S. Employment Service, citing the government's insufficient support for collective bargaining and the labor movement. See, for example, "Mary Van Kleeck Scores NRA Policy," *New York Times*, 7 August 1933, p. 5, col. 7; and "NRA Is Criticized as Failing Labor," *New York Times*, 26 May 1934, p. 14, col. 1.

24. Sanford Jacoby, *Employing Bureaucracy: Managers, Unions, and the Transformation of Work in American Industry, 1900–1945* (New York, 1985), chap. 2, 5, and Mary Drake McFeely, *Lady Inspectors: The Campaign for a Better Workplace, 1893–1921* (New York, 1988), treat American and British developments in personnel management during these years.

25. Few records of the conference survive, except for a few pieces in the Odencrantz

Papers, including a copy of the Program, the paper she presented ("Personnel Work in America"), and a report of her impressions. See, especially, Folder 1, Louise Odencrantz Papers, Schlesinger Library (hereafter Odencrantz Papers).

26. "Report of the Interim Committee Appointed at the First International Conference on Industrial Welfare," Folder 8, Odencrantz Papers; and "Officers and Members of Council," in *Report of the Proceedings of the International Industrial Welfare (Personnel) Congress* (Zurich, 1925), 486. Organized initially as an association, the IRI would reorganize and rename itself the International Industrial Relations Institute in March 1932, but even from its earliest days was known as IRI.

27. For this and other aspects of postwar "self-consciousness," see, for example, Maier, *Recasting Bourgeois Europe*; Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning*, chaps. 2, 3; and Judith Merkle, *Management and Ideology: The Legacy of the International Scientific Management Movement* (Berkeley, 1980). See, especially, Van Kleeck, "Women Workers During Reconstruction," *American Labor Legislation Review* 9:1 (March 1919): 62–68; and "The Task of Working Women in the International Congress," 28 October 1919, Box 24, Folder 487, MVK Papers. This address was given before the First International Congress of Working Women (ICWW), called by the National Women's Trade Union League to protest the ILO's refusal to admit women or their concerns to its first conference in October–November 1919 in Washington, D.C. The ICWW pointedly held their meetings in Washington also in October–November 1919. Throughout the early 1920s, the ICWW and later the IRI struggled to establish a place for themselves and for women workers within the deliberations of the ILO, a creation of the League of Nations, and the major international labor agency of the period. See the relevant documents in Box 19, the ICWW Papers, Smith College. The quotation is from the "Introduction to the Report of the Proceedings of the International Industrial Welfare (Personnel) Congress, Flushing, 1925," Folder 8, Odencrantz Papers. It is attributed to Fledderus by Van Kleeck, "Comments on Work of Mary L. Fledderus," 17 February 1945, Box 1, Folder 19, MVK Papers.

28. See "Ten Years IRI," a short history of the organization written, apparently, by Fledderus and Van Kleeck in 1935 and found in Box 15, Folder 142, of the Paul U. Kellogg Papers, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota; "IRI Summer School: Preliminary Suggestions," Container 131, File 0830–9, Gilbreth Papers; Mary Fledderus, ed., *Report of Summer School: The Elimination of Unnecessary Fatigue in Industry*, Raveno, Italy, June 1927 (The Hague, 1930); and "List of Persons Present," IRI Cambridge Congress, Box 84, Folder 1318, MVK Papers.

29. Van Kleeck, "Summary of the Conference . . .," Box 84, Folder 1319, MVK Papers.

30. The quoted phrase appears in Van Kleeck's remarks in the "Report of the IRI Summer Meeting, Schloss-Elmau, June–July, 1929," Box 83, Folder 1311, p. 7; on the IRI's methodology, see Van Kleeck, "Comments on Work of Mary L. Fledderus: Addendum," 17 February 1945, Box 1, Folder 19, both in MVK Papers. See also "Informal Notes of a meeting . . .," 27 October 1928, Folder 8, Odencrantz Papers. The IRI, from its inception, was able to function as a truly international organization due to the linguistic abilities of Mary Fledderus, who was capable of simultaneous translations in Dutch, French, English, and German. These skills carried over into the IRI's major publications during the 1920s and 1930s, with English, French, and German versions appearing within each volume.

31. The IRI material in the two main Van Kleeck collections and the IRI papers at the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam are revealing of most of these points. Whenever separated during the years from the late 1920s through the late 1930s, for example, Van Kleeck and Fledderus corresponded daily, on IRI stationery, about the organization's affairs. They often mentioned, too, a parallel and personal correspondence, but no such letters and little else touching on their lives together survive. Thus, the remembrances of Dyck Fledderus are most important. He, for example, is able to provide

some details on their living arrangements and the mutually supportive nature of their relationship; Fledderus interviews.

32. Van Kleeck, "Memorandum," 17 April 1930, Box 23, Folder 467, MVK Papers; "Call For the Congress," February 1931, IRI Papers, 1925–39, Folder: IRI Social-Economic Congress, Amsterdam, 1931, International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam (hereafter, IRI Papers/1).

33. "Ten Years IRI," 3; "Statement at Final Session By Mary Van Kleeck . . .," 23–28 August 1931, IRI Papers/1.

34. Otto Neurath, *International Picture Language* (London, 1936) and *Modern Man in the Making* (New York, 1939). On Neurath, see Marie Neurath and Robert S. Cohen, eds., *Otto Neurath: Empiricism and Sociology* (Dordrecht, 1973); Michael Twyman, "The Significance of Isotype," in *Graphic Communication Through Isotype* (University of Reading, 1975); Robin Kinross, "Otto Neurath's Contribution to Visual Communication," M.A. thesis, University of Reading, 1979; Andreas Faludi, "What's Positivism Anyway? Otto Neurath and the Planners," *Working Paper, No. 102*, September 1988, Planologisch en Demografisch Instituut, University of Amsterdam, and "Planning According to the 'Scientific Conception of the World': the Work of Otto Neurath," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 7 (1989): 397–418.

35. Brenda Voysey, "The Vienna Method of Pictorial Statistics," *Labour Magazine* (May 1933). A summary of Neurath's Amsterdam presentation is in ms 1091, Folder 3.1/63, Otto and Marie Neurath Isotype Collection, Department of Typography and Graphic Design, University of Reading (hereafter, Isotype Collection). The quoted phrase appears in "Statement at Final Session by Mary Van Kleeck . . ." See also her "Analysis and Overview of the Congress," in M. L. Fledderus, ed., *World Social Economic Planning*, 2 vols. (The Hague, 1932). Van Kleeck had Neurath illustrate two of her books with Isotype. See *Miners and Management* (New York, 1934) and *Creative America: Its Resources for Social Security* (New York, 1936).

36. Van Kleeck, "Analysis and Review of the Congress," 3; V. V. Obolensky-Ossinsky, "The Nature and Forms of Social Economic Planning," reprinted in Fledderus, ed., *World Social Economic Planning*, 291–340. Press coverage included such articles as "Geneva and Soviet in Clash at Parley: Russians at Amsterdam Congress Assail Labor Organization Delegate as Pro-Capitalist," *New York Times*, 29 August 1931, 4, column 4; and a live radio address by Van Kleeck, broadcast from Amsterdam to the United States. See "Radio Address of M. Van Kleeck, Delivered August 26, 1931," in MS 1091, Folder 3.1/63, Isotype Collection. See also George Soule's review of the congress and its published proceedings, "A World Symposium," *Saturday Review of Literature*, 5 November 1932, 228–29.

37. On the IRI's plans and work, post-Amsterdam, see "Minutes of the Meeting of the Interim Committee . . .," Paris, September 20, 1931," File 353, Folder: International Industrial Relations Institute, 1931–52, F. M. Wibaut Papers, International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam; Van Kleeck, "Report on Present Outlook . . .," 19 January 1932, Box 9, Folder 7, MVK/R Papers. Among the IRI's later publications are Van Kleeck and Fledderus, *On Economic Planning* (New York, 1935); Fledderus and Van Kleeck, *Technology and Livelihood: An Inquiry into the Changing Technological Basis for Production as Affecting Employment and Living Standards* (New York, 1944); idem, *The Technological Basis for National Development* (New York, 1948).

38. Van Kleeck's relations with the Soviet Union during the 1930s are extensively documented in correspondence, speeches, and articles in both major collections of her papers. See, for example, her manuscript, "Notes on Six Weeks in the Soviet Union, July 25 to September 4, 1932," Box 29, Folder 541, MVK Papers. Some of her activities on behalf of the Soviet Union are further documented in Eugene Lyons, *The Red Decade* (New York, 1941), and Harvey Klehr, *The Heyday of American Communism*. On the nature and history of fellow traveling, see David Caute, *The Fellow Travelers: Intellectual Friends of Communism*, rev. ed. (New Haven, 1988); Paul Hollander, *Political Pilgrims: Travels of*

*Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba, 1928–1978* (New York, 1981); and William L. O'Neill, *A Better World—The Great Schism: Stalinism and the American Intellectuals* (New York, 1982). W. B. Spofford to Van Kleeck, 16 April 1931, Box 1, Folder 3, MVK Papers. Some of Van Kleeck's State Department and FBI files have been released to the author and to the Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College. Leonard Boudin represented Van Kleeck before an executive session of McCarthy's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1953, "where she astounded McCarthy and Roy Cohn with the statement that she had never been a member of the Communist Party." Boudin to author, 27 February 1989.

39. Margaret Storrs Grierson, Archivist Emeritus, Smith College, to author, 10 April 1989; interview with Eleanor Flexner, 19 April and 1 June 1989; interview with Sidney Hook, 3 May 1989; anonymous interview, 8 June 1989; interview with Corliss Lamont, 7 April 1989; interview with Edith Tiger, 12 May 1989; interview with Leonard Boudin, 7 April 1989; Mary Dublin Keyserling to author, 29 April 1989; Philip Foner to author, 27 February 1989; Jan Tinbergen to author, 11 December 1988; Herbert Aptheker to author, 20 November 1989.

40. See, for example, Susan Ware, *Beyond Suffrage*, and Dorothy Brown, *Setting a Course: American Women in the 1920s* (Boston, 1987); Interpretations, however, are changing. See Nancy Cott, *The Grounding of Modern Feminism*, and Susan Ware, *Partner and I: Molly Dewson, Feminism, and New Deal Politics* (New Haven, 1987).

41. Among the better studies of social feminism's continuous history are Black, *Social Feminism*; Judith Sealander, *As Minority Becomes Majority: Federal Reaction to the Phenomenon of Women in the Work Force, 1920–1963* (Westport, Conn., 1983); Lemons, *The Woman Citizen*; Chambers, *Seedtime of Reform*; and the several essays in Joan Hoff-Wilson and Marjorie Lightman, eds., *Without Precedent: The Life and Career of Eleanor Roosevelt* (Bloomington, 1984).

42. On organizational history's discoveries, see Galambos, "Technology, Political Economy, and Professionalization," and Samuel P. Hays, "The New Organizational Society," in *American Political History as Social Analysis* (Knoxville, 1980). The history of twentieth-century U.S. corporatist planning, the role of social science and expert elites in such planning, and the central importance here of the 1920s are the subject of a diverse and recent literature within organizational history, much of it proceeding, in turn, within New left and modernization frameworks. See, for example, Hawley, *The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order*, and "The Discovery and Study of a 'Corporate Liberalism,'" *Business History Review* 52:3 (Autumn 1978): 309–20; Noble, *America by Design*; Robert M. Collins, *The Business Response to Keynes, 1929–1964* (New York, 1981); Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning*; Patrick D. Reagan, "Architects of Modern American National Planning" (Ph.D. diss., The Ohio State University, 1982); and Jerold E. Brown and Patrick D. Reagan, eds., *Voluntarism, Planning, and the State: The American Planning Experience, 1914–1946* (New York, 1988).

43. On the impersonality of organizational history, see, especially, Judith Sealander, *Grand Plans: Business Progressivism and Social Change in Ohio's Miami Valley, 1890–1929* (Lexington, Ky., 1988), chap. 1. The meanings and utility of the idea of gender are discussed, for example, in Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91:5 (December 1986): 1053–75. On the history of the modern professional woman's marginality, see Penina Migdal Glazer and Miriam Slater, *Unequal Colleagues: The Entrance of Women into the Professions, 1890–1940* (New Brunswick, 1987).