

NJS Presents**Invited Talks****In this Issue:*****Economic Justice for All: Some Jersey Roots¹*****By Dorothy Sue Cobble****DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14713/njs.v2i2.45>**

New Jersey has often stood at the forefront of movements for social and economic justice. This talk analyzes twentieth-century legislative campaigns for wage and hour fairness and foregrounds the leadership of social justice feminists, including New Jersey Congresswoman Mary T. Norton. The laws secured by reformers fell short of their lofty aims of economic justice for all. Nevertheless, the reforms they enacted – fair labor standards and mothers’ pension laws in the majority of states before World War I and the federal Social Security Act and first nationwide Fair Labor Standards Act in the 1930s -- offered considerable benefits to millions of low-income breadwinners and caregivers. The talk concludes by bringing the story into the present and highlighting three vibrant New Jersey campaigns for just wages and fair time policies. In 2008, New Jersey became the third state in the nation to pass paid family leave legislation; in 2013, New Jersey voters overwhelmingly approved a higher state minimum wage; and as of 2016 New Jersey leads the nation in the number of cities and municipalities signing paid sick leave ordinances.

I want to thank the New Jersey Historical Commission and the Clement A. Price Institute for inviting me to speak and for bringing us together for today’s conference, “Fighting for Justice: 20th Century Protest in New Jersey.” I am honored to be here and I look forward to our conversation this morning and throughout the conference.

¹ Keynote Address, New Jersey Historical Commission Conference, “Fighting for Justice: 20th Century Protest in New Jersey,” Rutgers, State University of New Jersey, Newark, New Jersey, 21 November 2015.

I like the bold assertion of the conference planners that New Jersey has often stood at the forefront of movements for social justice. In preparing this keynote, I discovered just how true that statement was in characterizing New Jersey's past and present.

My talk this morning focuses on one stream of social justice activism: legislative campaigns for wage and hour justice and the leadership of women within those campaigns, including the contributions of Jersey City reformer Mary T. Norton, among the first women elected to the U.S. Congress from the Democratic Party. Women, of course, helped lead many economic justice struggles in New Jersey and across the nation: campaigns for good jobs and full employment; for promotional and educational opportunities; for welfare rights, housing, and basic income guarantees; for trade union and collective bargaining rights. This morning I offer but a small slice of that rich history.

Many of the women I'll talk about today are not often foregrounded in histories of American feminism. Nor are they always considered "feminists." Part of what was exciting about writing my 2014 book, *Feminism Unfinished: A Short, Surprising History of American Women's Movements*, with Linda Gordon and Astrid Henry, was that we broadened the conventional historical narrative of American feminism and included a diverse group of women activists. We included women who organized in coed groups with multiple reform agendas as well as those who joined all-female groups with a single focus on women's equality with men. The women who populate our history all cared deeply about women's rights; many also fought to end income inequality as well as discrimination based on race, religion, sexual orientation, and nationality. In my chapter of *Feminism Unfinished*, "More than Sex Equality: Feminism After Suffrage," I traced the vibrant intertwined movements for women's rights and economic justice in the half century

between 1920 and 1970. The women I included, some of whom I will talk about this morning, sought women's rights and a fairer, more prosperous society for all.

Women's campaigns for wage and hour justice, I believe, are a rich, over-looked aspect of the long history of American egalitarian reform and a robust New Jersey political tradition worth reclaiming. In what follows, I concentrate on economic justice campaigns for wage and hour legislation in three moments of reform upsurge: the Progressive Era, the New Deal, and the present day. The reformers whose campaigns I analyze conceived of the workplace broadly to encompass the private sphere of the home as well as the public sphere of the market. They sought economic justice for women as breadwinners and caregivers and wanted women to have more choice in how they balanced family work and market work. In this talk I include their efforts to pass labor standard laws covering wages and hours on the job as well as social welfare laws providing for income and respect for those working at home. What these activists won fell short of their ambitious goals. Nonetheless, their reform initiatives had consequential, positive, and long lasting effects.

Moment One: The Progressive Era

Women's reform groups like the National Consumers' League and the Women's Trade Union League were the primary advocates for wage and hour laws in the early twentieth century. In the decade before World War I, they won state laws across the country that raised wages, reduced long hours, and improved dangerous and unhealthy working conditions.

Late nineteenth-century reform movements had agitated for living wages and shorter hours for all. But in 1905 the Supreme Court in *Lochner v. New York* overturned a New York state law setting maximum hours for adult male bakers, dashing the hopes of reformers for labor standard laws covering both sexes. Yet three years later, the Supreme Court in *Muller v. Oregon* affirmed

the constitutionality of woman-only maximum hour laws. Women's "freedom of contract," the Court reasoned, could be restricted by law because of overriding public interest in protecting women's health and "maternal functions."

After *Muller v. Oregon*, social justice feminists renewed their efforts to secure labor standard legislation. This time, however, they proposed woman-only laws. Given the conservatism of the Supreme Court, reformers assumed that only laws limiting coverage to women would withstand court scrutiny. In the long run, however, they hoped the judicial and political climate might transform, making possible the passage of wage and hour laws for all.

Over the next decade, social feminists sought and won a remarkable number of woman-only wage and hour laws. After Massachusetts passed the first minimum wage law in 1912, fourteen other states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico followed suit. Woman-only hour laws proved even more popular. By the early 1920s, all but four states had enacted maximum hour laws for women.

Minimum-wage laws for women met stronger opposition than did laws limiting women's hours. Raising women's wages, social conservatives feared, might take women out of the home. Businesses whose profits rested on sweatshop wages and exploitation of female labor strenuously resisted as well. Reformers advocating women's right to a *living* wage, not just to a *minimum* wage, met especially stiff opposition.

What a *living wage* meant varied. Many living wage proponents, men and women, defined it as a wage sufficient for individual and family support, and high enough to allow a wage-earner time for leisure, family life, and participation in civic affairs. Although some reformers believed a *living* wage sufficient for family support should be reserved for male heads-of-household, social feminists like Women's Trade Union League leaders Leonora O'Reilly, Rose Schneiderman, and

Mary Anderson disagreed. Women, like men, they insisted, were primary breadwinners and heads-of-household, and women too required a wage sufficient for care of dependents and time for relaxation and citizenship.

But were women entitled to income when they were primarily caregivers, not breadwinners, and when their workplace was the home not the market? Early twentieth-century campaigns for mothers' pensions offered one response to this question. After 1911, mothers' pension laws spread across the country even more rapidly than did wage and hour legislation. By the early 1920s, forty states had laws requiring cash payments to single-headed families with dependent children. Social workers and social feminists in women's clubs and other all-female civic associations led the charge. Reformers gained political traction by pointing out the cost savings in paying mothers to care for their children at home rather than spending public monies on state-funded orphanages and foster care. Mothers' pension laws lowered taxes, advocates proclaimed, and united children with their biological mothers. Such arguments led to multiple legislative victories.

Still, as social welfare scholarship of the past quarter century makes clear, single mothers rarely received state aid sufficient for self and family support, and not all single mothers qualified, with many nonwhite and immigrant mothers deemed ineligible. Mothers' pension laws, however, varied considerably from state to state in their determination of who was "deserving" or eligible for state benefits. In 1926, according to an analysis of mothers' pension laws published in 1930 in the *American Journal of Sociology*, widowed mothers were entitled to caregiver income in *all* of the forty-two existing state laws. But surprisingly, in a *majority* of the laws, divorced mothers also were eligible, as were still-married mothers whose husbands had "deserted" them or were "incapacitated" and unable to work. Further, in nine states, *never-married* mothers qualified, as

did mothers with husbands in prison. And most surprising: in Colorado and California, *fathers* received state support as well as mothers.

Looking closely at the mothers' pension laws in all forty-two states reveals the complexity and diversity of the U.S. welfare state in the early twentieth century. States varied widely in *which caregivers* were deemed "deserving" of financial aid, with still-married mothers eligible in the majority of states and some states extending coverage to never-married mothers and fathers. Analyzing mothers' pension laws in the aggregate also points to a non-linear or uneven narrative of twentieth-century welfare provision, with some states before World War I offering caregiver provisions and social wages superior to what emerged in the New Deal and later.

Moment Two: The New Deal

Let me turn to a second moment of economic justice activism: the 1930s New Deal. With massive unemployment, plummeting wages, and soaring hours, problems of economic inequality and workplace reform took center stage. Supreme Court rulings in the 1920s repealing Progressive Era wage and hour laws added to the 1930s crisis. In 1923, for example, the Supreme Court had deemed Washington D.C.'s minimum wage law for women unconstitutional in *Adkins v. Children's Hospital*. With recently enfranchised women now men's political equals, the Court proclaimed, so too should women be men's economic equals. For the Supreme Court, however, making women and men equal economically meant making women subject to the same unregulated free market as men. National Consumers' League leaders such as Florence Kelley, Grace Abbott, Molly Dewson, and Frances Perkins condemned the Supreme Court ruling, as did Women's Trade Union League activists and other social justice feminists. In the view of social justice feminists, unregulated market work meant greater exploitation for the majority of women, not greater freedom. Woman-only minimum wage laws raised wages and furthered economic

independence for millions of women. Woman-only labor standard laws, they believed, should be extended to men, but in the meantime, these laws should be retained. Not all feminists agreed, however. The National Woman's Party judged the 1923 Supreme Court decision a victory for women's equality. After 1923, divisions among feminists remained stark and given the conservative political temper of the 1920s, campaigns for new wage and hour laws languished.

With the political ascendancy of Roosevelt's New Deal in the 1930s, the wage and hour movement burst forth again. In 1933, seven states, including New Jersey, passed new "fair wage" laws. And just as significantly, at the federal level, social justice feminists like Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, the first woman in the U.S. cabinet, took the lead in securing passage of the 1933 National Industrial Recovery Act, which encouraged "fair wage and hour codes" industry by industry.

The Supreme Court would have none of it. In 1935, in *Schechter Poultry v. U.S.*, the Supreme Court determined the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) had no authority to regulate the workplace, and a year later, it found New York's minimum wage law unconstitutional, a ruling that called into question all state wage and hour legislation. Yet within two years, President Roosevelt had signed the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), the first federal law setting wage floors and hour ceilings for both sexes as well as limits on child labor, and the courts let it stand.

How this remarkable turnaround happened and how reformers secured passage of the 1938 FLSA is a fascinating story. At the time, many New Dealers saw federal wage and hour legislation as doomed, and declared it a legal and political impossibility. Legitimate fear (and despair) existed about whether any labor standard legislation could withstand Supreme Court scrutiny, particularly

if it covered both sexes. And despite Roosevelt's 1936 landslide reelection victory, his political leverage in Congress had ebbed.

To make matters worse, organized labor expressed strong reservations about the wage and hour bill Frances Perkins proposed in 1937 with President Roosevelt's backing. The American Federation of Labor (AFL), for example, rejected the NIRA approach championed by Perkins in which government-appointed boards set workplace standards industry by industry, often after extensive public hearings. Instead, the AFL wanted "fixed" and "universal" wage and hour standards explicitly spelled out in the legislation itself. Moreover, both the AFL and its rival, the Congress of Industrial Organization (CIO), pushed for *national* wage and hour standards and staunchly opposed the sub-minimum regional wage rates sought by Southern employers. Finally, the labor movement lobbied for the highest labor standards possible, worrying that low standards would legitimize a move among high road employers to drop wages and lengthen hours to match government norms.

New Jersey Congresswoman Mary Norton ended up in the middle of the political wrangling over the FLSA, and she proved instrumental to its final passage. Norton may forever be associated with the corrupt Frank Hague political dynasty in Jersey City, but she should also be remembered for the many progressive laws she championed and actually got passed. In a political career spanning some forty years, Norton consistently defended the needs of children and of low-income men and women of all races and religions. Her social justice politics sprang from her adherence to progressive interpretations of Catholic teachings, her own experiences growing up in an Irish immigrant family of moderate means, and the tragic death of her infant son.

Before being elected to Congress in 1924, Norton raised funds for day nurseries for the children of working mothers in Jersey City and better hospital care for mothers and infants. The

United States had one of the highest infant and maternal death rates of any industrial country in the world in the 1920s and Mary Norton wanted that to change. In the 1940s, she was the leading Congressional proponent of government funding for childcare and succeeded in passing and then extending the Lanham Act, setting up day care centers during World War II. She was also a prominent spokeswoman for fair employment legislation outlawing workplace discrimination on the basis of race, and starting in 1944, she introduced equal pay legislation into the House and year after year pushed hard for its enactment. After serving thirteen terms in Congress, Norton stepped down in 1951.

The battle over the federal wage and hour law proved to be one of the most difficult of her legislative career. When the chair of the House Labor Committee died in June 1937, Norton took over. She inherited a mess. It took her months to get the bill out of committee and months more to produce the necessary petition signed by 218 House members overriding the Rules Committee decision to table the bill. Then, much to her dismay, the House voted to send the bill back to committee. It was the first time the House had turned down a major piece of legislation supported by the President. But Norton carried on. She persuaded her Republican and Democratic allies to outvote the South and establish a single national minimum wage, she stood firm against multiple proposals for wage differentials based on race and sex, and she won over the labor movement. It took another six months of political maneuvering and a second petition drive, but the bill finally passed the House in May 1938. FDR signed it into law in June. When the Supreme Court upheld the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1941, federal wage and hour standards took force across the nation for the first time. Some twenty-two new state minimum wage laws were now in place as well, marking a formidable shift in government economic justice policy in just a few years.

Still, as New Deal reformers knew, the legislation they fought so hard to pass in the 1930s did not secure economic justice for all. Historian Landon Storrs called it an “ambiguous victory,” replete with substantial gains *as well as* losses. Let me note four of the more significant positive effects of the Act. Then I’ll discuss the Act’s equally significant inadequacies.

On the positive side of the ledger: first, wages went *up*, not down, for millions of workers, not an insignificant matter. Indeed, by raising wages for earners at the bottom, the FLSA diminished economic inequality and helped create a forty-year era of shared prosperity. Studies of income inequality, historical and comparative, leave little doubt that minimum wage legislation has a striking effect on lessening poverty and closing the income gap.

Second, by covering men as well as women, the FLSA inaugurated a new and less gendered era of labor policy. Having labor standard laws for men legitimized the idea of men needing protection and expanded conceptions of masculinity. It also undercut the still prevalent cultural notion that women required “special” state protections because of presumed weakness or inadequacies due to their biological sex.

Third, the FLSA set a *national* federal wage floor and hour ceiling for the first time. The United States moved away from its earlier patchwork system of wage and hour labor standards varying industry-by-industry and state-by-state – a system which at times had provoked unhealthy competition and a race to the bottom.

Fourth, the FLSA, at least in principle, stood for uniform labor standards for all workers, regardless of sex or race or other distinctions. In the House debates over the FLSA, Perkins adamantly defended the “equal pay” principle: lower standards based on sex or race would not be tolerated. And she prevailed: uniform wage and hour standards became the norm, marking a

decided departure from the early 1930s when NIRA codes allowed wage deviation based on sex and race.

But there were negatives. The law only covered a minority of the work force: those employed in interstate commerce. Many assumed such a limitation necessary to ensure the law's constitutionality. The state's power to regulate wages and hours, it was thought, rested in its constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce. Yet determining which industries engaged in interstate commerce and which did not was hardly self-evident. Judgments about which groups to cover in the Act often sprang as much from gender and race bias and from political compromise as from objective evaluation of the scope of "interstate commerce" or concern over ensuring the law's constitutionality.

The sectors of the economy in which blue-collar men predominated – manufacturing, transportation, construction, and mining -- enjoyed full protection under the Act. Organized labor lobbied for their inclusion and few in Washington legislative circles disputed the classification of these sectors as "interstate commerce." Service and small retail businesses, however, both areas employing large numbers of women and largely unorganized, fell outside the parameters of the Act. Unionization was minimal in these sectors and many enterprises operated in local markets. Thus ironically, despite the law's supposed "gender-blindness," a smaller percent of women – some 14 percent – than men ended up being covered under the Act. The majority of women, including almost all women service and retail workers, continued to depend *solely* on state laws to guarantee wage minimums and hour maximums. These woman-only state laws typically covered a wider swath of employed women than did the FLSA, and many remained in force into the 1970s.

The Act also left out all but a small proportion of African American and other minority workers. The Act specifically excluded agricultural and domestic workers, for example, two

sectors where the majority of African Americans were employed. Civil rights organizations objected, as did Women's Trade Union League feminists and the few labor organizations representing agricultural and domestic workers. But it was a losing battle. Southern elites and their political representatives adamantly opposed minimum labor standards for agricultural and domestic workers. They made common cause with government officials and lawyers who worried labor regulations would be impossible to enforce in such industries and saw widening FLSA coverage as a threat to the Act's constitutionality.

But those weren't the only exclusions. Professional, managerial, and self-employed workers lacked wage and hour protections as well. In the 1930s, their exclusion didn't seem so problematic, given their small numbers. But today it is a recognized and troubling problem, largely because of "title inflation," or employer misclassification of workers. Perhaps you remember the old *Seinfeld* TV episode where the waitress tells Elaine that she, too, has been promoted to "associate." Well, she was not the only one. Since the 1980s, employers have designated large numbers of low-income workers, including waitresses, as "managers" and "independent contractors" to avoid government wage and hour regulations and prevent union organizing (private sector managers and independent contractors are not eligible for collective bargaining rights under American labor law). Unlike white-collar professionals and "real" managers, however, low-income workers have very little individual bargaining power. They end up working 60-hour weeks, making less than minimum wage, and losing overtime pay. And although classified as "independent contractors," their "independence" from employer control of work schedule and work organization is illusory.

Lastly, the law set quite low labor standards. Wage floors were as low as 25 cents an hour in 1938 and protections against long hours were minimal. The minimum wage, of course, inched

upward after 1938, but today's federal minimum of \$7.25 still means millions of individuals, the so-called "working poor," hold full-time jobs and earn below the federal poverty line. Moreover, the FLSA's reliance on overtime pay penalties to rein in long hours was a weak substitute for the stricter maximum-hour provisions common in laws in other industrialized nations and in Progressive Era woman-only state legislation. As the cost of hiring new workers and providing them with health and pension benefits rose after World War II, overtime penalties had little effect on lessening overwork or on distributing jobs and work time more fairly. It was simply cheaper for employers to pay overtime than to hire additional workers.

New Deal reformers recognized many of these limitations, and they set out to amend and improve the FLSA. I do not have time to explore their post-1930s reform efforts, often led, as in the past, by women. Suffice it to say, progress was slow: domestic workers, for example, were not covered under the FLSA until 1974. But before I move to the present and to my third and final moment of upsurge, let me raise (although not resolve) the question of how New Deal feminists addressed social reproduction and the work of the home.

As Linda Gordon admonishes, it is important to remember that the 1935 Social Security Act provisions for poor mothers were not what U.S. Children's Bureau Director Grace Abbott and other prominent social feminist reformers wanted. They sought "reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health," available to all poor mothers, and delivered without stigma. They did not win that battle. Title IV of the Social Security Act, the Aid to Dependent Children provision, ended up providing only meager appropriations to the states to maintain their mothers' aid laws, and it failed to promise equal treatment regardless of race or marital status.

Four years later, the 1939 amendments to the Social Security Act provided additional income support for another group of caregivers and children. Widows and dependents of deceased

workers were now eligible for benefits as were the spouses of retired workers. The 1939 amendments, as policy scholars rightly point out, perpetuated a dual-track welfare system with poor mothers who received Aid to Dependent Children assistance stigmatized as undeserving charity recipients while the widows and wives who received social security benefits were judged as deserving and entitled. At the same time, the 1939 social security amendments are notable for recognizing the unpaid household labor of spouses and providing them with state benefits; these amendments also made social wages for caregiving and household labor available to widows of all ages and income groups.

Yet the vision of adequate, universal income and respect for caregivers and mothers was far from being realized. After 1939, reformers continued to lobby for what they called “full social security,” or social and economic security for all, not just for the elderly. In addition, they organized to win government support for childcare and paid maternity leave. During World War II, social feminists like Congresswoman Mary Norton, as I mentioned, pressed for childcare funds in the Lanham Act and succeeded. After the war, in response to pressure from community, labor, and women’s groups, some states continued to make low-cost child care facilities available. A coalition of reform groups, coordinated by the U.S. Women’s Bureau, also pushed for paid maternity leave in both federal and state legislation. They failed to add paid maternity leave to the Social Security Act, but they did convince four states to include paid pregnancy leave in their postwar disability income programs. New Jersey was one of those states.

Moment Three: The Present Day Upsurge

Let me conclude by discussing what I see as a third moment of economic justice upsurge: the flourishing wage and hour movements of today. New Jersey is “in the forefront” of these efforts, as our conference organizers pointed out. I offer three brief examples.

The living wage movement is perhaps the best known contemporary wage justice struggle. Since the passage of the Baltimore living wage ordinance in 1995, some 140 U.S. cities and municipalities have enacted living wage ordinances. More recently, in the last few years, twenty states upped their minimums as well, setting wage floors above the FLSA standard. In New Jersey, in a 2013 state referendum, we voted yes by a wide margin of 60 to 39 percent to raise the minimum wage from \$7.25 an hour to \$8.25 an hour. The New Jersey law is notable too for including an automatic cost-of-living increase each year.

Yet living wage legislative initiatives are only one face of the wage justice movement. After 2012, when strikes among fast-food workers erupted in multiple cities, the Fight for Fifteen (or the fight for a 15-dollar minimum wage) gathered force, involving childcare, retail, hospitality, and health care workers. Women, especially minority women, predominate in low-wage sectors of the economy and they lead the movement for higher wages. Feeling pressure after thousands of low-income workers demonstrated in cities across the country, McDonalds and other fast food outlets upped their wages in 2015. At the same time, Walmart announced wage hikes for its million-plus hourly store workers, meeting at least some of the demands of OUR Walmart, a worker-led effort to upgrade conditions at a company where full-time hourly wage earners routinely turn to food stamps and other government aid to supplement their income.

The campaign for paid family leave is a second example of today's flourishing economic justice initiatives. This effort is not always considered an economic justice campaign, but it should be. Without paid family leave, caregivers are economically disadvantaged, suffering income losses and career curtailments. Low-income caregivers suffer even more since without social wages from the state, few can afford any leave time at all.

The United States is one of the very few nations in the world without legislatively-mandated paid leave for pregnant women and mothers: only the United States, Swaziland, Lesotho, and Papua New Guinea lack such legislation. In 2002, California became the first state to enact paid family and medical leave; women and labor groups led the charge. Other successful state campaigns followed: Washington state in 2007 and New Jersey in 2008. As in California, the New Jersey victory rested on earlier legislative breakthroughs won by social reformers: New Jersey was one of the four states that included paid pregnancy leave in its disability legislation after World War II. The New Jersey victory also happened because of big-tent coalitions like the New Jersey Time to Care Coalition with its 82 affiliated organizations, the majority community, labor, and women's groups.

The rapidly growing movement for paid sick leave is a third and last example. Thirty-nine percent of working Americans lack paid sick leave; campaigns to change that situation have proliferated in the last few years. Most campaigns seek laws requiring employers to provide employee access to paid sick leave for an employee's own illness or the illness of a family member. California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Vermont have now enacted such laws. In September 2015, President Obama signed an executive order requiring federal contractors to allow employees to earn a minimum of seven days of paid sick leave, giving an additional 300,000 working Americans access to such leave.

New Jersey does not yet have a state paid sick leave law, but it leads the nation in the number of cities and municipalities which have signed paid sick leave **local** ordinances. Jersey City passed New Jersey's first paid sick leave ordinance in January 2014; Mary Norton would have been proud! Nine other municipalities soon followed suit, and other victories are anticipated. In Elizabeth, New Jersey, the voters decided the issue in November 2015. After a grassroots

campaign led by community, labor, and women's groups, paid sick leave won handily, 3037 to 563. With 83 percent of New Jersey residents favoring paid sick leave and making their voices heard at town council meetings and local referendums, it is not surprising that close to a hundred thousand New Jersey workers gained the right to paid leave in the last two years.

Of course, we are a long way from having just wage and fair time policies for breadwinners and caregivers. But there are glimmers of hope: broad coalitions of groups are uniting around shared concerns for underpay and overwork and for recognition of the value of family work and caregiving. As history shows, movements may start small but they can rise rapidly. And as this conference helps underscore, creative policies and innovative social reforms often begin at the state and local level before they go national.

Thank you for your attention this morning. I am pleased to participate in such an exciting conference where we can learn from the past and honor social justice movements that often go unsung.

A distinguished professor of history and labor studies at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, Dorothy Sue Cobble specializes in the historical and contemporary study of work, social movements, and social policy. Her award-winning books include, among others, The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America (Princeton University Press, 2004) and, with Linda Gordon and Astrid Henry, Feminism Unfinished: A Short, Surprising History of American Women's Movements (W.W. Norton, 2014). She is the recipient of fellowships from Harvard University, the Russell Sage Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Woodrow Wilson Center, and, most recently, the Swedish Research Council.

Selected Sources:

Dorothy Sue Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Dorothy Sue Cobble, "Shorter Hours, Higher Pay," *Pacific Standard Magazine* (<http://www.psmag.com>) on-line: August 19, 2015. Print: November 2015.

Dorothy Sue Cobble, Linda Gordon, and Astrid Henry, *Feminism Unfinished: A Short, Surprising History of American Feminism*. New York: Norton, 2014.

Ada J. Davis, "The Evolution of the Institution of Mothers' Pensions in the United States," *American Journal of Sociology* 35, no. 4 (January 1930): 573-587.

Linda Gordon, *Pitied But Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare*. New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Linda Kerber, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Kathryn Kish Sklar (eds), *U.S. History as Women's History: New Feminist Essays*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Stephanie Luce, "\$15 per hour or Bust: An Appraisal of the Higher Wages Movement," *New Labor Forum* 24, no. 3 (September 2015): 72-29.

Mary T. Norton Papers, Special Collections, Rutgers University Library, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Annelise Orleck, *Rethinking American Women's Activism*. London: Routledge, 2014.

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

Thomas Piketty and Emmanuel Saez, "Income Inequality in the US, 1913-2002," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118, no. 1 (2003): 1-41.

Mary Poole, *Segregated Origins of Social Security: African Americans and the Welfare State*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

David L. Porter. *Mary Norton of New Jersey: Congressional Trailblazer*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2013.

National Partnership for Women and Families. www.nationalpartnership.org/issues

New Jersey Time to Care Coalition. www.njtimetocare.com

David Rolf, *Fight for Fifteen: The Right Wage for a Working America*. New York: The New Press, 2016.

Landon R. Y. Storrs, *Civilizing Capitalism: The National Consumers' League, Women's Activism, and Labor Standards in the New Deal Era*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Theda Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Karen White, Linda Houser, and Danielle Lindemann, "It's Catching: Public Opinion Toward Sick Days in New Jersey," Issue Brief, Rutgers University Center for Women and Work, New Brunswick, NJ, October 2013.

Nancy Woloch, *A Class By Herself: Protective Laws for Women Workers, 1890s-1990s*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015.