

1 **Codes of Fair Competition: The National Recovery Act, 1933-1935, and the Women's Dress**
2 **Manufacturing Industry**

3
4 **Sara B. Marcketti¹**
5

6 Controversial issues prevalent in today's ready-to-wear apparel industry include the right
7 of workers to join unions, the proliferation of sweatshops and sweatshop conditions, and design
8 piracy (Ballinger, 2009; Tan, 2007; "Unions Seek Wal-Mart," 2008). To establish ethical
9 practices in the apparel industry, codes of conduct have been created by the U.S. Department of
10 Labor, the Fair Labor Association, and the Worldwide Responsible Apparel Production (Kunz &
11 Garner, 2007). While these codes, which span both domestic and international borders, have
12 improved the awareness of social responsibility, or the "practices for conducting business in
13 which [firms] make decisions based on how their actions affect others within the marketplace"
14 (Littrell & Dickson, 1999, p. 6), unethical business activities continue into the 21st century.

15 The idea of forming codes of conduct to establish criteria of ethical practices is not new
16 to the apparel industry. Indeed, the women's dress manufacturing industry discussed and debated
17 codes of fair practices and competition under the New Deal Policies of the National Recovery
18 Act (NRA) of 1933 to 1935. An understanding of the controversial issues debated during this
19 time and the ultimate failure of the NRA reveals the complexities of the ready-to-wear apparel
20 industry and the often conflicting aims of industry interests in creating standard practices. The
21 purpose of this study was to investigate the apparel industry's code making process and results
22 during the NRA. Because little research on this topic has been published in the textiles and

¹ Marcketti, S. B. (2010). Codes of fair competition: The National Recovery Act, 1933-1935, and the women's dress manufacturing industry. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 28(3), 189-204.

23 clothing literature, this study provides an important historical case study for better understanding
24 the more recent industry-wide codes of fair competition.

25 To study this topic, the researcher accessed the governmental hearings on the codes
26 discussed by apparel industry executives during the NRA. *The New York Times*, *Women's Wear*
27 *Daily* and the *Journal of the Patent Office Society* (which discussed the establishment of the
28 codes) were systematically searched for reference to the codes and the women's apparel industry.
29 The databases JSTOR and America History and Life facilitated the researcher's search for
30 relevant secondary information. Financial support was received from The Pasold Research Fund.

31 **The National Recovery Act and Industrial Codes of Conduct**

32 The National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) was passed by Congress and approved by
33 President Franklin D. Roosevelt on June 16, 1933. It was the centerpiece of Roosevelt's first 100
34 days in office and was a deliberate attempt to restore industrial prosperity by positive
35 governmental intervention. Title I of the NIRA, known as the National Recovery Act (NRA),
36 suspended antitrust laws and called for industries to create codes of industrial production in order
37 to guard against the dangers of competition. Title II of the NIRA called for the creation of a
38 Federal Emergency Agency for Public Works that would benefit Americans through direct
39 government expenditure on public works projects ("National Recovery," 1935; Romasco, 1983).

40 The purposes of Title I of the NIRA were plural and related to the immediate national
41 emergency of the Great Depression: reemployment and industrial recovery (Clark, Davis,
42 Harrison & Mead, 1937; Taylor, 2008). The Act was touted as "a new deal for demoralized
43 industry on a new philosophy of governmental cooperation" (Cates, 1934, p. 130). According to
44 the Brookings Institute study, which investigated the procedures of the NRA, Washington
45 became "the industrial as well as the political capital of the nation" (Dearing, Homan, Lorwin, &

46 Lyon, 1934, p. xi). The very heart of the program, as stated by NRA administrator General Hugh
47 Johnson, was “the concerted action in industry *under government supervision* looking to a
48 balanced economy as opposed to the murderous doctrine of savage and wolfish individualism,
49 looking to dog-eat-dog and devil take the hindmost” (Brand, 1988, p. 99-100).

50 The NRA called on industries to form trade associations and negotiate and submit for
51 government approval so-called “codes of fair practices and competition” (Galambos, 1966).
52 Forty-three industrial groups including, but not limited to, automobile manufacturing, the lumber
53 industry, the motion picture industry, the wholesale automotive trade, and the dress
54 manufacturing industry participated in forming codes of conduct under the auspices of the NRA
55 (“Codes to be Heard,” 1933; Fenning, 1934).² Industries as specialized as “pickle packers and
56 powder makers” and manufacturers of everything “from anti-hog cholera serum to wood cased
57 lead pencils” discussed and applied for the approval of their codes (Wilson, 1962, p. 96).

58 Industry members were instructed to work together to form consensus regarding
59 controversial practices in the best interests of industry, labor, and consumers. The codes were
60 expected to restrict harmful competition, raise wages and reduce hours, encourage the united
61 action of labor and management, and eliminate “piratical methods and practices which harassed
62 honest business and contributed to the ills of labor” (Dearing et al., 1934, p.1; Hapke, 2004).
63 Objectives for the codes related to the goals suggested by the International Ladies’ Garment
64 Workers’ Union (ILGWU) to help stabilize the industry (Tyler, 1995). The voluntary codes were
65 discussed openly by spokespeople in each industry and, once approved, would be administered
66 by the individual industries with minimal governmental control (*Hearing on the Code of Fair*
67 *Practices and Competition*, 1933). According to General Hugh Johnson, “[The] whole thing

² Other textiles related groups that considered codes included corset and brassieres, men’s wear, millinery, and retailers, among others. A single code for all of the apparel industry was proposed, but rejected. The cotton textile code was the first code approved by President Roosevelt on 9 July 1933.

68 simmered down to keeping the purchasing power of workers in step with the price and quantity
69 of the things they make. Wages, prices, and production, these are the three causes of good or bad
70 times” (“Johnson says Recovery,” 1933, p.1).

71 Government representatives stated that the initiative in preparing codes of fair conduct
72 would be undertaken by the trade associations of each industry. It was mandated that these
73 organizations would not create codes designed to promote monopolies or to eliminate or
74 “oppress” small enterprises, but the creation of the codes themselves were left to the discretion of
75 the industrial groups (“Dress Code Called,” 1933). Enforcement of the rules was assigned to
76 each individual industry’s code authorities, supported by the Federal Trade Commission and the
77 federal courts. Violations of provisions of the codes were to be treated as “unfair methods of
78 competition” and violators faced misdemeanor charges and a \$500 penalty for each offense each
79 day the violation occurred (Fenning, 1934; “Five hundred in City,” 1933). President Roosevelt
80 was granted an open ended authority to abolish the codes at any time (Connery, 1938).

81 Beyond the elaborate code-making procedures within each industry, the NRA authorized
82 the president to formulate a Re-Employment Agreement or “blanket code” with individual
83 businesses. This simplified procedure avoided the time-consuming process of negotiation
84 required for the codes for an entire industry. Individual employers pledged to abide by certain
85 specified conditions, namely maximum hour and minimum wage provisions (a minimum wage
86 of \$12 to \$13 a week for forty hours of work), a guarantee of the workers’ rights to organize and
87 to join unions of their own choice, and the elimination of child labor (“Reemployment Drive,”
88 1933; “Roosevelt gets Cloak,” 1933). Further, the president implored the nation’s managers to
89 raise wages without increasing prices, “even at the expense of full initial profits” (Jacobs, 1999,
90 p. 35). Employees who signed the blanket agreement were entitled to display the Blue Eagle

91 insignia of the NRA with the words, “Member N.R.A., We Do Our Part” (Figure 1). Consumers
92 were urged by the government and by industry to patronize retailers that displayed the
93 government-issued label, symbolizing goods produced in humane working conditions (McKellar,
94 2002; “Miss Perkins Sews,” 1934).

95 “Insert Figure 1 About Here”

96 Theoretical underpinnings of the NRA were that increased employment and hourly wages
97 would expand the purchasing power of wage earners. Larger payrolls in turn would circulate
98 through the entire economic system, benefiting retailers, wholesalers, manufacturers, and
99 producers, inducing each to take on more workers. Secondly, the positive economic effects of
100 restricting unfair trade practices would lessen risk and encourage expanded business operations.
101 Business reform would encourage national economic recovery (Dearing et al., 1934).

102 In reality, many industries raised prices in anticipation of the increased operating costs of
103 conducting business under the NRA (Johnson, 1935). The Brookings Institute found that the
104 positive incentives for business cooperation were relief from anti-trust laws, authoritative
105 enforcement of price control measures, and release from competitive practices. In essence, the
106 central motivating force for businesses’ willingness to cooperate with the codes was the hope of
107 raising prices by collective action among competitors through control of the market (Lyon,
108 Howman, Lorwin, Terborgh, Dearing, & Marshall, 1935).

109 **Administration of a Code**

110 The first steps in the negotiation of a code were under-taken at pre-hearing conferences
111 between a committee and the deputy NRA administrator recruited from the industries which
112 were to be regulated. These pre-hearing conferences provided the first opportunity of the
113 negotiators to flesh out the different conflicts of interest. The pre-hearing conferences were

114 informal and not recorded. The public hearings were formally conducted, usually by the Deputy
115 Administrator and were publicized through the press, trade and industrial journals, and the
116 posting of bulletins in post offices throughout the country. Nearly all of the hearings were held in
117 Washington and complete stenographic records were available to the public (Clark et al., 1937).

118 During the first six months of the NRA, negotiated and approved codes of fair
119 competition encompassed the major portions of American industry and trade. By the end of three
120 years, 578 code authorities were developed, 567 codes were approved and 201 supplementary
121 codes covering some 22 million workers in 3 million businesses were established (“Questions
122 and Answers,” 1935). In addition there were 2.3 million blanket codes involving another 16
123 million workers. From beginning to end, the code making process and the resulting code
124 authorities which were to administer and enforce the codes were dominated by trade
125 associations, aided by the government’s deputy administrators.

126 Code making was not a simple process, and most of the conflicts which punctuated the
127 method occurred among competing businesses within the same industries. These disputes were
128 resolved through a bargaining procedure that put a premium on competitor size and strength.
129 Other problems resulting from institution of the codes were the nearly 5000 petitions for
130 exemptions which companies requested from the NRA and challenges with interpretation of the
131 code provisions. Further, violations of the codes granted some firms advantages over rivals who
132 continued to bear the financial burdens associated with adherence to the provisions. Efforts to
133 enforce the codes were inherently self-defeating as these altered the program from one of
134 voluntary cooperation to one of forced adherence (Clark et al., 1937).

135 **The Dress Manufacturing Industry during the Great Depression**

136 The Great Depression had tremendous impact upon consumption practices and the
137 operations of the dress manufacturing industry. Although as much as 25% of the American
138 workforce was unemployed during periods of the Depression, people continued to consume
139 goods (Farrell-Beck & Parsons, 2007). Shopping habits changed as women of all income levels
140 needed to maximize their clothing purchases. They achieved this through comparative shopping,
141 evaluating similar clothing styles sold by different stores and purchasing based on price in order
142 to get the most for their money (Barber & Lobel, 1952).

143 The increased specialization of garments available from the lowest dollar amounts to
144 several thousand dollars meant women could shop in departments that fit their economic means
145 and social status (Leach, 1993). Generally speaking, consumers chose to buy less-expensive
146 clothing rather than cease buying altogether. As stated by Richards (1951), “Women accustomed
147 to paying \$16.95 for their dresses shopped around for one at \$10.95, while the \$10.95 customer
148 settled for a \$6.95 number” (p. 25). While the number of dresses produced by the manufacturing
149 industry remained the same, the cost and quality of these dresses decreased significantly
150 (Kolchin, 1933). According to published records of the U.S. Census of Manufacturers, the
151 average wholesale value per dress decreased from \$5.39 in 1927 to \$5.11 in 1929 to \$3.74 in
152 1931 to \$2.60 in 1933 to \$2.95 in 1935 and to \$2.62 in 1937 (Drake & Glaser, 1942).

153 The 50% reduction in ten years from dresses wholesaling at \$5.39 to \$2.62 caused a
154 fundamental shift in the competitive relationship of the industry. The demand for inexpensive
155 dresses was strong, stimulating manufacturers to produce increasingly lower-cost creations.
156 According to a report of the ILGWU, this had a demoralizing influence upon the entirety of the
157 garment business, “The crisis...has practically revolutionized the main lines of dress merchandise

158 to meet a growing demand for cheaper garments...The production slogan in the New York dress
159 industry has now become not quality but cheapness" ("Dress Trade's Growth," 1932).

160 One of the ways in which manufacturers achieved lower prices was through the
161 contracting system. This method of production proliferated during the 1930s due to the
162 efficiencies of smaller economies of scale. Contractors were more able than large companies to
163 respond quickly to fashion and price changes. As opposed to inside shops in which dresses were
164 manufactured from fabric to sewn-garments in one factory location, contractors or sub-
165 manufacturers created clothing out of materials consigned to them by the manufacturer. The
166 manufacturers often supplied designs, piece goods, materials, and credit. The contractors rented
167 factory space and machinery, found and hired a labor force, and directed the production process.
168 The garments were then distributed by jobbers to the retailers (Meiklejohn, 1938). Because
169 fluctuations in fashion were so great and occurred so quickly, many manufacturers and retailers
170 were reluctant to assume the risk of purchasing materials and stock long in advance of actual
171 production or the start of a season. Due to this, on average, the manufacturing workshops, as
172 distinct from the designing rooms, were busy only 30 to 32 full weeks of the year (Larson, 1963).

173 To achieve the lowest costs possible and receive agreements for work, contractors bid
174 minimal amounts, competing solely on the basis of labor costs. Manufacturers paid contractors
175 by the piece. Contractors deducted dollar amounts for employees' use of sewing machines,
176 needles, and threads from workers' pay. In the period 1929 to 1933, the average per capita
177 weekly earnings in all of the manufacturing industry ranged from \$17 to \$27 (Wolman, 1935). In
178 the apparel industry, many unskilled employees worked 60 to 70 hours a week for \$1 to \$3
179 (Richards, 1951). In addition to long hours and low wages, workers often contended with unsafe
180 and unsanitary conditions (Richards, 1951). David Dabinsky, labor leader and ILGWU

181 President, stated the contracting system was “a chain of exploitation” in which contractors
182 “hack[ed] away at the wages and conditions of the workers” (Dubinsky & Raskin, 1977, p. 123).
183 Dubinsky described the shift from inside shops to outside shops “from just being miserable to
184 being in hell” (Dubinsky & Raskin, 1977, p. 122). Labor supporters maintained the system was
185 “sick” and “parasitic” and that “employees paid the bill for the chaos of the industry” (*Hearing*
186 *on the Code*, 1933, p. 83).

187 Due to the nature of the apparel industry, manufacturers often used multiple sub-
188 manufacturers to create one style of dress. Some of the larger manufacturers required the
189 services of 25 to 30 contractors to maintain production levels (Richards, 1951). Manufacturers
190 often used multiple contractors to eliminate the possibility of total, sudden work stoppages.
191 Strikes within the industry were commonplace even during the Depression (“Seventy Strikers,”
192 1933; “Sixty Thousand Quit,” 1933; “Garment Workers,” 1933; “General Johnson Ends,” 1934).

193 Explaining the necessity of the strikes, Grover Whalen, chairman of the New York City
194 NRA and “honorary member” of the apparel profession, stated, “...the periods of recovery from
195 depressions have always brought with them struggles between capital and labor, with labor
196 seeking by strikes to regain ground in wages, hours, and working conditions lost during the
197 period of depression” (“Whalen Reports,” 1933, p. 26). Strikes were used during the 1930s by
198 labor supporters to “uplift the unbelievably low sweatshop standards” in the industry (“Strikes
199 are Voted,” 1933, p. 8). According to Dubinsky, the strikes helped in “civilizing our industry”
200 and ensured greater respect for labor (Barbash, 1968, p.102; Parmet, 2005).

201 In the 1930s, the dress industry was highly concentrated in and around New York City,
202 with about 73% of the dress manufacturing establishments in New York employing over 50% of
203 workers and producing 76% of the total value of goods produced (Drake & Glaser, 1942). The

204 predominance of New York as a leading style center was largely due to the adequate supply of
205 skilled and unskilled labor, transportation facilities, and the proximity to fabric markets.
206 According to some reports, contractors produced 80 to 85% of all dresses manufactured in the
207 New York area (“Howard,” 1933; Trowbridge, 1936).

208 Partly due to the contracting system, coupled with the cutthroat nature and seasonality of
209 the business, the apparel industry was besieged with bankruptcies. Studies undertaken by the
210 New York Dress Joint Board of the Dress and Waist Makers Union revealed that 83% of
211 businesses formed in 1925 were discontinued by 1933. Further, while customarily about 20% of
212 apparel firms went out of business annually, this percentage doubled in 1932 (Richards, 1951;
213 Tepere, 1937). Workers themselves had little security, as employer bankruptcies disrupted
214 employment (Dubinsky & Raskin, 1977). In describing the dress industry in 1933, C. Robbins, a
215 dress manufacturer stated, “The dress industry is troubled by an utter absence of security or ease
216 of mind. Every man in it has had a justifiable fear...as to what dire developments the next
217 month or week or day might bring forth” (“Plan Organization,” 1933, p. 35).

218 **Formulation of the Dress Manufacturing Industry Code of Conduct**

219 It was within these conditions that the women’s dress manufacturing industry discussed
220 and debated codes of fair practice and competition, negotiating specific terms acceptable to the
221 diverse business groups. The initial code hearings focused on the overall structure of the
222 industry, namely the relationship between manufacturers and contractors. Specific problems such
223 as design piracy were discussed at the hearings, but industry members failed to reach consensus
224 to include these provisions into the code submitted to the president (*Hearing on the Code*, 1933).

225 As defined in the NRA dress manufacturing code, the dress industry included the sale of
226 women’s, misses’, and junior’s dresses and dressmaker ensembles, with the exclusion of cotton

227 house dresses (Gill, 1935).³ The concentration of the major branches of the apparel industry in
228 the New York metropolitan area gave this region preponderant majority on the code.
229 Negotiations on the provisions to be contained in the dress code were commenced immediately
230 following the passage of the NIRA. The first public hearing was held August 23, 1933 with
231 subsequent amendment hearings in March, October, November and December 1934 and
232 February 1935 (Trowbridge, 1936).

233 Earl Dean Howard, Professor of Economics at Northwestern University was selected by
234 NRA Administrator General Johnson to bring together the diverse groups of the wearing apparel
235 industry to discuss the codes under the NRA ("Johnson Aide Asks," 1933). In an address to the
236 Association of Dress Manufacturers, Professor Howard stressed the necessity of creating
237 straightforward codes "to quickly beat this depression" ("To Seek Clothing," 1933, p. 37).
238 Members of the steering committee to frame the code for the women's wear group included
239 Howard, General Johnson, David Dubinsky - the Labor Advisory Board representative, a
240 representative of the Industrial Advisory Board, and representatives from the Consumer
241 Advisory Board and Legal Division of the NRA (*Hearing on the Code*, 1933).⁴ Presenters at the
242 hearings included presidents, chairmen, and representatives from small, medium, and large firms
243 from around the nation, most notably, representatives from the National Dress Manufacturers'
244 Association (NDMA), Industrial Council of Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers, and Fashion
245 Originators' Guild of America (FOGA) (Call, 1933; "Garment Leaders Draft," 1933).

246 Because the codes were to be instituted by trade groups of each industry, the NDMA was
247 created to form a single, representative organization "to foster the stability of the industry and to

³ Cotton house dress manufacturers successfully fought to have their own code. This was largely because of the cotton house dress manufacturers' reliance on less fashion-forward garments ("Fight Dress Code," 1935).

⁴ The apparel industry was unique in having members of both labor and consumer groups-less than 10% of code authorities included labor members and less than 2% incorporated consumer representatives (Hawley, 1966).

248 give to this trade an authoritative voice in the formulation and operation of economic
249 reconstruction” (“For Organization,” 1933, p. 26). The group was comprised of 650
250 manufacturers and wholesalers, responsible for more than 80 percent of the dress output of the
251 New York market (“The National,” 1935). The NDMA emerged as the chief proponent of the
252 trade practice provisions (Call, 1933). Despite the large number of companies represented by the
253 national group, members of the Popular Price Dress Manufacturers Association argued that they,
254 the lower-end manufacturers, were not adequately represented (“Popular Price,” 1935).

255 Some within the apparel industry stressed the importance of the codes, stating that the
256 partnership with government “would act as ladders on which crippled business could climb out
257 of the bag which it is holding” (“Says NRA Realized,” 1934, p. 8). Sylvan Gotshal, counsel to
258 the NDMA, stated the NRA was a revolution and “a power of peace, which is going to mean
259 prosperity for this industry for many years to come” (*Hearing on the Code*, 1933, p. 20). Percy
260 Straus, President of R. H. Macy & Co., Inc stressed the momentous importance of the NRA in an
261 address to the National Retail Dry Goods Association (NRDGA).

262 [On the] uncharted sea in which we are now sailing, we must steer between the rocks of
263 inflation, the shoals of higher prices, and the breakers of unsettled foreign exchange. All
264 must quickly realize the implications of the NRA and its possibilities for overcoming
265 most of the difficulties that stand in the way of the return of prosperity... There is urgent
266 need for whole-hearted cooperation by large and small businesses if industrial recovery is
267 to be achieved. We are at war against depression. There is no place for slacker industry
268 (“Text of Percy,” 1933, p. 8).

269 In discussing the necessity of the New Deal policies’ attempts to “make capitalism work in terms
270 of industrial democracy,” Dubinsky stated, “nobody but a lunatic could believe in a system-or

271 rather a lack of system-that produces violent business cycles, mass unemployment and misery for
272 millions of people” (Stolberg, 1944, p. 198).

273

274

275 **Results of the Code Making Process**

276 The agreed-upon code, variously called a “treaty of peace” and a “document of fair play,”
277 was based on a previous agreement between the NDMA, the ILGWU, and the Joint Board of
278 Dress and Waist Makers Unions of Greater New York (“Dress Code Put Forward,” 1933). It was
279 to provide an opportunity to “control” and eliminate “some of the most destructive aspects of
280 competition” in the apparel industry (Dubinsky & Raskin, 1977, p. 125). By putting into place
281 rules and restrictions, enforceable by the federal government, the playing field would be leveled
282 for manufacturers. It was argued that with trade practices standardized, competition could be
283 predicated upon knowledge, skill, and experiences, rather than cheapness of production (Lasher,
284 1933). This standardization would reinvigorate employment and strengthen the impaired
285 purchasing power of the public (Barbash, 1968).

286 While agreements between employers and union organizations were formulated before
287 the NRA, the dress industry code became the force of law when it was authorized and made
288 effective by President Roosevelt on November 13, 1933 (Dubinsky, 1933). In an industry with a
289 myriad of differences, ambitions, and personalities, the code was a compromise resulting in one
290 basic and generic law (Lasher, 1933).

291 The code provided provisions for the length of the work week and wage scale for
292 employees, the registration of contractors by manufacturers, and other labor and trade practices.
293 It divided the major production centers into the five boroughs of New York City; the Eastern

294 Metropolitan area encompassing Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore; the Eastern area including
295 the New England States, New York State, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland;
296 and the Western area including all regions not previously mentioned. The regions maintained
297 specified wage scales; all outside of the New York City area were paid not less than 85 to 90%
298 of the minimum wages established in the City.⁵ Employees were to receive the minimum
299 compensation regardless of time or piece rate (“Text of Code,” 1933). Those employees
300 manufacturing garments could not work more than 35 hours in any five-day work week. Other
301 employees, including salesman and designers, could not work more than 40-hour weeks; an
302 exception of six weeks in any one season was granted, provided that the employer paid an
303 overtime rate of one and a half times the normal wage (“Text of Code,” 1933).

304 Manufacturers were ordered to pay contractors such a rate so that they could pay their
305 employees the wages and earnings provided in the code’s wage scale and cover their own
306 overhead expenses. Contractors were no longer able to undersell fellow sub-manufacturers by
307 lowering labor costs. Manufacturers were also to designate and register with the NRA the
308 number of contractors that they would use to meet their business requirements (“Text of Code,”
309 1933). This was to avoid the cut-throat competition stimulated by manufacturers forcing
310 contractors into bidding wars at the expense of labor (Zahn, 1933).

311 The code provided for other labor and trade standards. No person under the age of 16
312 could be employed in the dress manufacturing industry. Employees had the right to organize and
313 bargain collectively, free from the interference or coercion of their employers. No work was to
314 be carried out in tenement homes, basements, or unsanitary or unsafe buildings. Trade practices
315 included provisions for the returning of merchandise and selling practices. Manufacturers were

⁵ The minimum wage scale for a full week’s work: cutters \$45, sample-makers \$30, drapers \$27, examiners \$21, and cleaners and pinkers \$15. Un-skilled workers were to be paid a minimum of \$14 a week (“Text of Code,” 1933).

316 called upon to sell under uniform terms including standard 8% end of month discounts. This
317 stipulation forbade secret rebates, refunds, and allowances to retailers. Further, only defective or
318 delayed merchandise could be returned to manufacturers, preventing retailers from returning
319 garments that were no longer saleable due to shifting consumer demands. To indicate to
320 consumers that garments were created according to the requirements of the code, garments were
321 to bear the NRA Blue Eagle insignia and label (“Text of Code,” 1933). Provisions such as the
322 abolition of all forms of discrimination and “jim-crowism” (or the systematic practice of
323 discrimination and segregation of African Americans) were discussed, but not included in the
324 final code presented to and approved by the president (*Hearing on the Code*, 1933, p. 367).

325 To administer and enforce the provisions of the code, the Dress Code Authority was
326 created. It was comprised of sixteen individuals with representatives from the NDMA, the
327 United Association of Dress Manufacturers, Inc., the ILGWU, and members from the eastern
328 metropolitan area and the western region. Financing for the operation of the code was
329 apportioned to the apparel industry and paid for by NRA label fees purchased by companies. The
330 price of the labels ranged from \$8.00 per thousand for the city of New York to \$10.00 per
331 thousand beyond city boundaries; the higher price outside of the city defrayed additional
332 administrative costs (*Hearing on the dress manufacturing industry: Amendment Proposal*, 1934).

333 As published in *Women’s Wear Daily*, many individuals stated pleasure with the passage
334 of the NRA code. It was believed that with unfair competition curbed, manufacturers would have
335 more time to concentrate on the development of the aesthetic elements and the promotion of their
336 products, rather than cost-cutting measures (Rentner, 1933; “Zahn Predicts,” 1933). Companies
337 that had been paying living wages to workers and maintaining high conditions in their factories
338 would no longer be penalized by cut-throat competition (“Leveling,” 1933). According to

339 Dubinsky, the minimum wage, “would not only check the merciless competition” of the
340 sweatshop employer but also “protect the better paid, organized worker from the demoralization
341 of wage-scales emanating from the sub-standard shop” (Parmet, 2005, p. 85). The restriction of
342 total work week hours was said to give designers, in particular, more leisure time to think; before
343 the adoption of the code, the apparel industry was so concerned with “speed, speed, speed” and
344 “chasing money” that it was believed that the forced “downtime” would encourage creative
345 talent (“Urges Aid,” 1933, p. 2). The NDMA viewed the code as a “declaration of independence
346 from unfair competition” (Lasher, 1933, p.1).

347 After approval, ideas to expand the original code were suggested. While the more
348 pressing problems of wages and the limitations of hours were decided in the code, other
349 problems such as design piracy were noticeably absent. In the article, “Big Bad Wolf ‘Style
350 Piracy’ Has Little to Fear in Apparel Codes,” Crawford, prominent *Women’s Wear Daily* writer
351 and editor, wondered, “If the apparel industry wants design protection or just wants to talk about
352 it...unless regulation, supervision, and penalties are provided, the recovery act will have passed
353 into history without the slightest benefit to the fundamental development of the apparel
354 industries” (1933).⁶ Additional ideas submitted by the Dress Code Authority to the NRA
355 included the barring of false advertising (*Hearing: Modification*, 1934).

356 Not everyone in the dress industry was pleased with the code. In amendment hearings,
357 modification proposals, and the popular press, industry members suggested changes to
358 everything approved in the original code, from the smallest details of end of month discounting
359 to the larger matter of the geographical divisions of the industry (*Hearing: Amendment*, 1934).
360 Maurice Rentner, chairman of the FOGA and a frequent speaker at the hearings, argued that

⁶ See Marcketti and Parsons (2006) for analysis of the arguments for regulating design piracy during the NRA.

361 work-week restrictions were unfair to fashion “creators” as they could not be bound by hard and
362 fixed hours of labor. Rentner continued that the restricted work week and limit on overtime
363 “throttled creative activity and resulted in a disastrous impairment of the orderly functioning of a
364 quality apparel manufacturing business” (Rentner Urges,” 1933, p.11).

365 Some argued that it was incredibly difficult to enforce the work week standards in an
366 industry that included a large piece work system, in which workers were paid by the garment that
367 they sewed, rather than their weekly schedules. The wage scale also forced some manufacturers
368 to increase their prices, therefore providing advantage to larger companies that were able to
369 absorb higher production costs (“Leveling,” 1933). Strikes based on misunderstandings and
370 misuses of the recovery act were commonplace and caused great antagonism between employers,
371 workers, and labor unions (“Four Thousand,” 1935; “Garment Industry,” 1935; “Peace Parleys,”
372 1934). Ultimately, the only changes to the original code approved by President Roosevelt were
373 the allowance of the Code Authority to incorporate in any state of the United States and the
374 prohibition of bribery to gain trade secrets (*Amendment to code of fair competition*, 1934).

375 Besides specific problems with code rules, the simple act of enforcement was nearly
376 impossible in an industry as large and diverse as the women’s ready-to-wear manufacturing
377 business. The codes were intended to be regulated by the industries in which they were
378 developed, yet enforcement was lax and violations flagrant (“Industry Must Regulate Self,”
379 1933). Byres Gitchell, chairman of the Dress Code Authority, cited the lack of adequate
380 recordkeeping by individual dress manufacturers as a handicap in the enforcement of the
381 standards (“Says Lack of Records,” 1935). The lack of uniformity among codes in all textiles
382 and apparel organizations caused further damage to success in the women’s dress industry. For
383 instance, the cotton garment trade codes, among others, overlapped but did not uniformly

384 conform to the dress code. This negatively impacted on the number and volume of dresses
385 created and the possible number of workers employed (“Greater Code Flexibility,” 1935).

386

387

388 **The End of the N.I.R.A. and the Codes**

389 On May 26, 1935, the Supreme Court unanimously ruled in *Schechter Poultry V. U.S.* that
390 the NIRA was unconstitutional; Congress had overstepped its constitutional authority by
391 improperly delegating power to the President to approve codes of conduct and give them the
392 force of law. Further, the Federal Government had no power to regulate hours and wages in
393 transactions affecting interstate commerce (“Code-making Authority,” 1935; “Justices Cardozo,”
394 1935; “NRA Remnants,” 1935). The experiment in fostering economic recovery through
395 industrial self-government was decisively ended. Roosevelt claimed the NRA was economically
396 and socially successful in that it employed four million workers, added about \$3,000,000,000 to
397 the annual purchasing power of working people, eliminated child labor and sweatshops, and
398 inaugurated a “pattern of a new order of industrial regulations” (*The New York Times*, 1935, p.
399 2). The Brookings Institute took issue with Roosevelt’s claims and estimated that only 500,000
400 were added to the employed work force (Dearing, et al., 1934). They argued that increased
401 employment was achieved primarily because employed workers reduced their hours and received
402 less pay in order to provide work for the unemployed.

403 Immediately following the court’s decision, those within the apparel industry discussed
404 finding a way to make the codes constitutional or to continue self-regulation in the spirit of the
405 codes but without government supervision (“First of Bills,” 1935; Fraser, 1991; “NRA begins,”
406 1935; “Richberg would extend,” 1935; “Voluntary NRA,” 1935). The NRDGA, the NDMA, the

407 ILGWU, and various medium to large size individual companies stated in *Women's Wear Daily*
408 and *The New York Times* that they would continue to conduct business under the fair trade
409 provisions of the code (figure 2) (“Business to Fight,” 1935; Call, 1935a; “Dress Association
410 Move,” 1935; “Industry Moves,” 1935; “Industries Speed NRA,” 1935). Echoing sentiments of
411 dress trade leaders, Emil Rieve, President of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers,
412 issued a blanket order stating, “We will close down the entire industry if need be in order to
413 maintain wages, hours, and conditions of work” (“Garment Industry,” 1935, p. 17). Mortimer
414 Lanzit, Executive Director of the NDMA, even suggested replacing the former NRA insignia
415 that signified humane production standards with a nationwide “Buy-by-label” campaign, with
416 garments carrying a “consumer protection label” (“Labor Label Drive,” 1935).

417 “Insert Figure 2 About Here”

418 Despite these enthusiastic endorsements, some industry members were not angry or upset
419 about the discontinuation of the NRA. Some manufacturers felt that the codes were too stringent
420 and impossible to enforce (Zelomek, 1935). The high wages and production costs resulting from
421 the regulations of the NRA meant that few firms experienced profits (Call, 1935b). Many
422 believed that the NRA supported big business at the expense of small companies, which suffered
423 under the strict rules of the codes. The elimination of the codes allowed for greater latitude in
424 wage schedules and hours, and manufacturers and contractors could once again compete on price
425 (“Darrow Denounces,” 1935). Some retailers even argued that the code restrictions took “all of
426 the sport out of the industry” because buyers could not “haggle with manufacturers” over
427 discounts (“Codes a Bulwart, 1935, p. 2).

428 Even before the *Schechter* decision, the large number of amendments and protestations
429 against the women’s apparel industry codes indicated how unwieldy and ultimately

430 unenforceable the codes of conduct were. No longer backed by the power of government, the
431 apparel industry continued to endure the economic and business practices which gave rise to the
432 NRA. The apparel industry slipped back to the methods of production which favored lower labor
433 costs, rather than quality of production (“Garment Industry,” 1935; Richards, 1951).

434 **Conclusions**

435 While the NRA may be viewed as a failure, the codes ultimately ushered in great changes
436 in the apparel industry. Legislation succeeding the Blue Eagle supported many of the NRA’s
437 more tangible ideas. The 1935 National Labor Relations Act declared employees had the right to
438 organize and bargain collectively, and the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act standardized a
439 minimum wage (Fitzpatrick, 2009). Further, the NRA contributed to the revival of the union.
440 According to Dubinsky, in 1932 the ILGWU was an organization of “inactivity, pessimism, and
441 apathy, bankrupt in every respect, financially, morally, [and] organizationally” (Parmet, 2005, p.
442 82). During Roosevelt’s presidency and under Dubinsky’s dynamic leadership, the ILGWU more
443 than quadrupled in membership and gained unprecedented importance and power (Eisner, 1969).
444 As stated by Dubinsky, “because of the NRA we are not hated any more. The word ‘union’ is not
445 a curse. The government said that labor has a right to organize” (Parmet, 2005, p. 101).

446 Some other ideas supported by the dress manufacturing industry during the NRA, such as
447 a label to promote humane working conditions, were adapted by the ILGWU label campaign of
448 1959 to 1975 (Ulrich, 1995). Led by Dubinsky until 1966, the ILGWU used advertisements in
449 newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, films, and other media to ask retailers and consumers to
450 purchase union-made American apparel (Ulrich, 1995). The ILGWU also participated in the
451 1984 creation of the Crafted with Pride in U.S.A. Council, a group that marketed textiles and
452 apparel made in the United States through television ads, newsletters, and clothing labels and

453 hangtags (Burns & Bryant, 2002). Although these later campaigns were focused on promoting
454 American union-made clothing in an increasingly global environment, the underlying concepts
455 of encouraging fair labor and business practices were similar to the ideas of the dress
456 manufacturing codes created under the NRA.

457 In the 1990s, organizations such as the American Apparel and Footwear Association and
458 the American Apparel Manufacturers Association implemented industry-wide, global codes of
459 conduct (Wolfe & Dickson, 2002). By this time, the American apparel industry faced increased
460 and intense global competition from overseas imports. Facing diminished membership, the
461 ILGWU merged with the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' Union to form the Union
462 of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE!). In the 2000s, UNITE! launched
463 Global Justice for Garment Workers and Behind the Label - campaigns that continue the
464 traditions and ideals of the ILGWU to provide support for the worker (Vance & Paik, 2006).

465 Despite these and other attempts to form codes of fair business practices, abuses
466 including child labor, specifically in developing countries, violation of wage and safety laws,
467 design piracy, and sweatshop conditions remain unresolved even into the 21st century (Kunz &
468 Garner, 2007). The history of the NRA codes implemented in the United States women's ready-
469 to-wear apparel industry provides an important early case study highlighting the difficulties and
470 complexities of creating and achieving industry-wide standard practices through self-regulation.
471 The failure of the NRA demonstrates that even with the joint cooperation of industry, labor, and
472 consumer groups and the backing of the force of law, codes of fair competition proved difficult
473 to enforce. To broaden our understanding of apparel manufacturing, future researchers may
474 explore the similarities and differences in the various codes of fair competition created by the
475 diverse branches of the garment industry.

476

References

477 *Amendment to code of fair competition for the dress manufacturing industry.* (1934, October 31).

478 Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

479 Ballinger, J. (2009). Finding an anti-sweatshop strategy that works. *Dissent*, 56(3), 5-8.

480 Barbash, J. (1968). The ILGWU as an organization in the age of Dubinsky. *Labor History*, 9(2),

481 98-115.

482 Barber, B., & Lobel, L. (1952). Fashion in women's clothes and the American social system.

483 *Social Forces*, 31, 124-131.

484 Brand, D. R. (1988). *Corporatism and the rule of the law: A study of the National Recovery*

485 *Administration*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

486 Burns, L. D. & Bryant, N. O. (2002). *The business of fashion*. New York: Fairchild.

487 Business to fight for continued NRA. (1935, May 16). *The New York Times*, p. 42.

488 Call, C.W. (1933, November 13). All factors cooperated in writing of dress code. *Women's*

489 *Wear Daily*, p. 2.

490 Call, C. W. (1935a, May 31). Industry moves to erect trade practice fortifications. *Women's*

491 *Wear Daily*, p. 9.

492 Call, C. W. (1935b, June 7). Speaking well of the dead applies to dress code rules. *Women's*

493 *Wear Daily*, p. 9.

494 Cates, D. (1934). A current appraisal of the National Recovery Administration. *Annals of the*

495 *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 130-138.

496 Clark, J. M., Davis, W. H., Harrison, G. M., & Mead, G. H. (1937). *The National Recovery*

497 *Administration*. Washington, D.C.: Committee of Industrial Analysis.

498 Codes a bulwark against chiseling. (1935, May 17). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 2.

- 499 Code-making authority in NIRA void. (1935, May 27). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 1, 19.
- 500 Codes to be heard affect 5,000,000. (1933, August 18). *The New York Times*, p. 2.
- 501 Connery, R. H. (1938). *The administration of an N.R.A. code*. Chicago, IL: Public
502 Administration Service.
- 503 Crawford, M. D. C. (1933, October 19). "Big dad wolf "style piracy" has little to fear in apparel
504 codes." *Women's Wear Daily*, 1, 16.
- 505 Darrow denounces extension of NRA. (1935, March 21). *The New York Times*, p. 9.
- 506 Dearing, C. L., Homan, P. T., Lorwin, L., & Lyon, L. S. (1934). *The abc of the NRA*.
507 Washington: Brookings Institute.
- 508 Drake L. & Glaser C. (1942). *Trends in the New York clothing industry*. New York: Institute of
509 Public Administration.
- 510 Dress association move to regulate fair trade rules. (1935, June 6). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 2.
- 511 Dress code called bar to monopoly. (1933, July 21). *The New York Times*, p. 21.
- 512 Dress code put forward as a "peace treaty." (1933, August 23). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 9.
- 513 Dress makers act to enforce rules. (1935, June 12). *The New York Times*, p. 39.
- 514 Dress trade's growth brings union problem. (1932, May 2). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 13.
- 515 Dubinsky, D. & Raskin, A. H. (1977). *David Dubinsky: A life with labor*. New York: Simon and
516 Schuster.
- 517 Dubinsky, D. (1933). Dubinsky says code will aid enforcement. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 2.
- 518 Eisner, M. (1969). Politics, legislation, and the ILGWU. *American Journal of Economics and*
519 *Sociology*, 28(3), 301-314.
- 520 Farrell-Beck, J., & Parsons, J. (2007). *Twentieth century dress in the U.S.* New York: Fairchild.
- 521 Fenning, K. (1934). N.R.A. codes. *Journal of the Patent Office Society*, 16(3).

- 522 Fight dress code rule. (1935, May 15). *The New York Times*, p. 39.
- 523 First of bills to rehabilitate NRA is ready. (1935, May 31). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 13.
- 524 Fitzpatrick, L. (2009, July 24). A brief history of the minimum wage. *Time*. Retrieved September
525 13, 2009 from <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1912435,00.html>.
- 526 Five hundred in city facing penalties of NRA. (1933, October 19). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- 527 For organization of dress industry. (1933, May 27). *The New York Times*, p. 26.
- 528 Four thousand dressmakers sign. (1935, April 13). *The New York Times*, p. 28.
- 529 Fraser, S. (1991). *Labor will rule*. New York: The Free Press.
- 530 Galambos, L. (1966). *Competition and cooperation: The emergence of a national trade*
531 *association*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- 532 Garment industry warned of strikes. (1935, May 28). *The New York Times*, p. 17.
- 533 Garment leaders draft code today. (1933, July 5). *The New York Times*, p. 10.
- 534 Garment workers vote for a strike. (1933, July 14). *The New York Times*, p. 10.
- 535 General Johnson ends garment lockout. (1934, April 22). *The New York Times*, p. 28.
- 536 Gill, W. A. (1935, July). *Evidence study no. 9 of the dress manufacturing industry*.
537 Washington, D. C.: Office of National Recovery Administration.
- 538 Greater code flexibility advocated. (1935, January 30). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 5.
- 539 Hapke, L. (2004). *Sweatshop: The history of an American idea*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutger
540 University Press.
- 541 Hawley, E. (1966). *The new deal*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 542 *Hearing on the code of fair practices and competition by the women's dress manufacturing*
543 *industry*. (1933, August 23, November 25). Washington, D.C.: National Industrial
544 Recovery Administration.

- 545 *Hearing on the dress manufacturing industry: Amendment proposal.* (1934, December 13).
546 Washington, D.C.: National Industrial Recovery Administration.
- 547 *Hearing on the dress manufacturing industry: Modification proposal.* (1934, March 26).
548 Washington, D.C.: National Industrial Recovery Administration.
- 549 Howard explains. (1933, November 1). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 12.
- 550 Industry moves to erect trade practice fortifications. (1935, May 31). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 9.
- 551 Industry must regulate self under the NRA. (1933, December 7). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 2.
- 552 Industries speed NRA substitutes. (1935, June 1). *The New York Times*, p. 8.
- 553 Jacobs, M. (1999). Democracy's third estate: New deal politics and the construction of a
554 consuming public. *International Labor and Working Class History*, 55, 27-51.
- 555 Johnson aide asks speeding of codes. (1933, June 29). *The New York Times*, p. 8.
- 556 Johnson, H. (1935). *The blue eagle from egg to earth*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- 557 Johnson says recovery rests with the industry. (1933, June 25). *Women's Wear Daily*, p.1.
- 558 Justices Cardozo and Stone stress codes assume too wide a scope. (1935, May 28). *Women's*
559 *Wear Daily*, p. 10, 26.
- 560 Kolchin, M. (1933, November 13). Says trading down justifies code. *Women's Wear Daily*, p.12.
- 561 Kunz, G. I. & Garner, M. B. (2007). *Going global*. New York: Fairchild.
- 562 Labor label drive for nation opened. (1935, November 19). *The New York Times*, p. 41.
- 563 Larson, S. (1963). Union impact on price in the dress industry. Unpublished master's thesis, City
564 College, New York.
- 565 Lasher, A. W. (1933, November 13). National Dress Manufacturers' Association views code as
566 declaration of independence from unfair competition. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 1.

- 567 Leach, W. (1993). *Land of desire: Merchants, power, and the rise of a new American*
568 *culture*. New York: Vintage Books.
- 569 Leveling of inequalities is predicted. (1933, November 13). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 10.
- 570 Littrell, M.A. & Dickson, M.A. (1999). *Social responsibility in the global market: Fair trade of*
571 *cultural products*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- 572 Lyon, L. S., Homan, P. T., Lorwin, L. L., Terborgh, G., Dearing, C., & Marshall, L. C. (1935).
573 *The National Recovery Administration*. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute.
- 574 Marcketti, S. B., & Parsons, J. L. (2006). Design piracy and self regulation: The Fashion
575 Originators' Guild of America: 1932-1941. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*,
576 24(3), 214-228.
- 577 McKellar, S. (2002). Seals of approval: Consumer representation in 1930s' America. *Journal of*
578 *Design History* 15(1), 1-14.
- 579 Meiklejohn, H. E. (1938). *Dresses*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- 580 Miss Perkins sews first NRA label. (1934, January 23). *The New York Times*, p. 20.
- 581 National recovery code assessments. (1935). *The Yale Law Journal* 44(5), 849-868.
- 582 NRA begins to get voluntary trade codes. (1935, June 18). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 2.
- 583 NRA remnants in commerce, labor depts. (1935, December 24). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 2.
- 584 Parmet, D. P. (2005). *The master of Seventh Avenue: David Dubinsky and the American labor*
585 *movement*. New York: New York University Press.
- 586 Peace parleys on in dress lockout. (1934, April 21). *The New York Times*, p. 11.
- 587 Plan organization of dress industry. (1933, June 20). *The New York Times*, p. 35.
- 588 Popular price group to gird against curbs. (1935, March 15). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 1.
- 589 Questions and answers on present NRA status. (1935, May 28). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 5.

- 590 Reemployment drive insignia made known. (1933, July 25). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 1.
- 591 Rentner urges exemption of designers. (1933, December 15). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 11.
- 592 Rentner, M. (1933). Curb on unfair practices will aid artistry. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 6.
- 593 Richards F. S. (1951). *The ready-to-wear industry 1900-1950*. New York: Fairchild.
- 594 Richberg would extend NRA 2 years. (1935, March 7). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 1, 2,
- 595 Romasco, A. U. (1983). *The politics of recovery*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 596 Roosevelt gets cloak code in 10 days. (1933, July 21). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 1.
- 597 Says lack of records makes big dress code handicap. (1935, February 1). *Women's Wear Daily*,
- 598 p.15.
- 599 Says NRA realized ideals. (1934, September 22). *The New York Times*, p. 16.
- 600 Seventy strikers seized at a 5th Av. Hotel. (1933, October 8). *The New York Times*, p. 26.
- 601 Sixty thousand quit today in garment shops. (1933, August 16). *The New York Times*, p. 3.
- 602 Stolberg, B. (1944). *Tailor's progress: The story of a famous union and the men who made it*.
- 603 Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- 604 Strikes are voted in garment trades. (1933, July 12). *The New York Times*, p. 8.
- 605 Tan, C. L. (2007, October 27). Copy protection for fall fashion. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. W1.
- 606 Taylor, N. (2008). *American-made, the enduring legacy of the WPA: When FDR put the nation*
- 607 *to work*. New York: Bantam Books.
- 608 Tepere, L. (1937). *The woman's garment industry, an economic analysis*. New York:
- 609 Educational Department of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.
- 610 Text of code. (1933, November 1). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 12.
- 611 Text of Percy S. Straus's warning on codes. (1933, July 21). *The New York Times*, p. 8.
- 612 The National Dress Manufacturers' Association. (1935, May 29). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 15.

- 613 *The New York Times*. (1935 February 21). p. 2.
- 614 To seek clothing code (1933, June 8). *The New York Times*, p. 37.
- 615 Trowbridge S. (1936, March). *Some aspects of the women's apparel industry*. Washington,
616 D. C.: Office of National Recovery Administration.
- 617 Tyler, G. (1995). *Look for the Union Label*. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- 618 Ulrich, P. V. (1995). "Look for the label"- The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union
619 label campaign, 1959-1975. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 13(1), 49-56.
- 620 Unions seek Wal-Mart probe over election law. (2008, April 14). *The Washington Post*, p. A3.
- 621 Urges aid to young designer. (1933, October 12). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 2.
- 622 Vance, C. M. & Paik, Y. (2006). *Managing a global workforce*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- 623 Voluntary NRA or change considered. (1935, May 29). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 1, 26.
- 624 Whalen reports strikes abating (1933, October 6). *The New York Times*, p. 26.
- 625 Wilson, W. (1962). How the chamber of commerce viewed the NRA: A re-examination. *Mid*
626 *America* 42, 95-108.
- 627 Wolfe, J. H. & Dickson, M. (2002). Apparel manufacturer and retailer efforts to reduce child
628 labor: An ethics of virtue perspective on codes of conduct. *Clothing and Textiles*
629 *Research Journal*, 20(4), 183-195.
- 630 Wolman, L. (1935). Wages and hour under the codes of fair competition. *National Bureau of*
631 *Economic Research*, 54, 1-9.
- 632 Zahn predicts more efforts on promotion. (1933 November 13). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 12.
- 633 Zahn, P. (1933, November 13). Code held dawn of new era. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 6.
- 634 Zelomek, A. W. (1935, June 7). Apprehension over NRA. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 11.