

Family Unity and “Noncitizen Citizenship”: The Advocacy of the International Institutes on Behalf of Separated Families

*Yuki ODA**

This paper studies the advocacy for family reunification rights in the late 1920s by the International Institutes, one of the largest immigrant aid organizations in the U.S. during this period. Prolonged family separation forced by immigration law and the legal concept of permanent residency were both products of the restrictive national origin quota acts enacted in the 1920s, especially the Immigration Act of 1924. The late 1920s marked both the end of mass migration to the U.S. and the transition to a new era of restricted immigration. The International Institutes considered family rights as central to noncitizens’ rights and to construction of ideal citizenship in this new era. This study examines individual casework of the Institutes as well as interorganizational and trans-Atlantic campaigns for the cause. It argues that the Institutes played a crucial role in the Progressive reformers’ efforts to ground family unification rights in the modern immigration regime.

“The great reduction in its numbers has caused immigration to be no longer regarded as a national problem.” So wrote Edith Terry Bremer, of the International Institutes, a national social service agency, in the 1933 *Social Work Yearbook*. A decade after the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, legislation that imposed strict quotas on immigration from Europe (and banned nearly all Asian immigration), the principle of quantitative immigration restriction was no longer contested. The controversial national origins quota system set annual quotas for all European nationals combined at approximately 150,000. The Great Depression curtailed annual immigration further to a record-low 35,576 in 1932. Nonetheless, Bremer

*Chuo University

contended that circumstances had “thrust the social problems of migration and its consequences forward as never before.” She highlighted problems such as families living across multiple countries, inflexible immigration regulations, intolerance of foreigners, and the economic depression. In particular, Bremer called attention to “the new questions of social principle in regard to the treatment of aliens or non-citizens.”¹

The issues Bremer raised concerned what legal scholar Linda Bosniak terms “noncitizen citizenship,” the rights and status (or informal “citizenship”) of immigrants who are not legal citizens of the country in which they live.² At the outset of the post-1924 era of restrictive immigration policy, noncitizen citizenship emerged as the key concern of immigrant advocates. As legal scholar Hiroshi Motomura argues, quantitative immigration restriction newly created “the legal concept of permanent residence.” Fundamental to the regime of numerical immigration restriction was the legal distinction between an “immigrant” and a “nonimmigrant”, in other words a clear delineation of foreigners with the right of permanent residency and a path to citizenship from all other foreigners without either.³ As “immigrant” became a numerically limited and strictly defined legal status, reserved for the selected few, it raised new questions about what specific rights permanent residency included. On one level, this paper contributes to the field of citizenship studies through a historical inquiry into the late 1920s, when the regime of immigration restriction took root. How did the new regime define the specific rights of those admitted to the U.S., and in turn how did the legal claims and personal appeals these immigrants made influence the regime itself?

Specifically, this paper looks into advocacy for family rights by the International Institutes, a social service agency headquartered in New York City at the Department of Immigration and Foreign Communities of the YWCA. With branches in over fifty cities, it was among the largest immigrant aid organizations in the U.S. during the 1920s. Following several reorganizations, the Institutes remain active today under the umbrella organization of U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants.⁴ Studies of the International Institutes by historians Raymond A. Mohl, Neil Betten, John F. McClyme, and Celeste DeRoche have focused on educational activities such as English and civics classes for immigrants or cultural festivals. They characterized the organization as cultural pluralists, an oppositional force against assimilationists.⁵ This paper will shed light on a less-studied aspect of the organization’s role in the immigration and naturalization reform movement in the late 1920s.

By studying the Institutes, this paper engages in another field of scholarship, that investigates what became of the Progressives after the Progressive Era.⁶ This study also builds on a body of recent literature that has reevaluated the 1924–1965 period, once a neglected era in immigration history, as a founding period of contemporary migration.⁷ Early studies of the Americanization movement suggested that both the pluralist liberal progressives and the assimilationist 100 percent Americanizers lost their interest in immigrants altogether after the mid 1920s, as immigration was sharply curtailed by both the quota act and the Great Depression.⁸ In fact, some of the immigrant advocacy groups survived from the pre-World War I (WWI) era to the post-World War II (WWII) era, emerging as key actors in the post-WWII immigration reform movement. Already in the late 1920s, the authority of eugenicists, which had peaked with the 1924 Act, was increasingly challenged by liberals who joined forces and bid for recognition as a new group of immigration experts. How did Progressive immigrant advocates reset their agendas and redefine their role in the new era of restricted immigration?

In the following sections, this paper first provides a brief history of the International Institutes in the pre-restriction years. The second section discusses how the organization placed family rights in the context of constructive citizenship building. The third section examines how the Institutes addressed family separation as a new social problem that resulted from the quota law. Lastly, this paper explores the formation of an inter-organizational and trans-Atlantic movement to alleviate the problem of family separation and to more firmly ground family unification rights in immigration law.

VOLUNTARY CITIZENSHIP AND CITIZENSHIP OUT OF FEAR

The blueprint for the International Institutes was drawn in 1909, when the YWCA's national board established a special committee to study the situation of foreign-born women in New York City. The YWCA had previously attempted to organize English classes for German and Scandinavian immigrants, but immigrants from southern and eastern Europe remained outside its reach. Based on the advice of Women's Home Mission Boards working on Ellis Island, the committee proposed to open a facility for English classes and an employment bureau, staffed with foreign language speakers.⁹ Assigned to the task was Edith Terry Bremer, a recent graduate of the University of Chicago. Bremer had worked at the University

of Chicago Settlement House and the Union Settlement in New York City before she was recruited by the YWCA, and the Institutes had strong ties to the rising field of professional social work within the settlement house movement.¹⁰

The first International Institute was established in 1911 in Greenwich Village, New York. The organization soon developed into one of the few immigrant aid organizations in the U.S. with multiple branches across the country.¹¹ As part of the YWCA, the organization initially focused on first and second-generation immigrant women. Based on the lists distributed by the immigration officials stationed at Ellis Island, the social workers at the Institutes often engaged in “home-visiting” to inform newly arrived immigrants of English classes and recreational and club activities, and to aid them with housing and employment.¹² To follow up with immigrants who headed from New York to their final destinations, Bremer extended the network to other cities. The existing YWCA branches facilitated the expansion of the International Institutes to over twenty cities by 1918.¹³

World War I was crucial to the growth of the International Institutes in several ways. First, during the war, the YWCA’s War Work Council provided the Institutes with additional funds, which allowed the organization to employ more social workers and expand their facilities. By the mid 1920s, their network had extended to over fifty cities in eighteen states.¹⁴ Additionally, disdain for the fervent wartime movement for “100 percent Americanism,” which proposed such things as compulsory English classes, registration of noncitizens, and banning of foreign language presses, induced the Institutes to reorganize their programs by reflecting on the failures of the nationwide Americanization movement.¹⁵ The term “Americanization” was “often used to exploit that popular psychology of fear,” Bremer wrote in 1919, opining “for the most part the term stood for a nationalistic and political effort to make Americanization a compulsory thing.”¹⁶

Bremer questioned the assumption that native-born Americans knew what was best for the immigrants. Since its founding, unlike most settlement houses, the Institutes were staffed with “nationality workers” or college-educated social workers who were first-generation immigrants. Although there certainly was a class difference between the nationality workers and their clientele, nationality workers were expected to “understand the thought-language as well as tongue-language” of the immigrants better than native-born social workers.¹⁷ Bremer saw mutual benefit societies, churches, immigrant organizations, and foreign language

newspapers as the source of "the powerful consciousness of nationality [ethnicity] in common" that held immigrants people together in a new environment, and encouraged each Institute to form advisory panels consisting of local ethnic community leaders.¹⁸ By the 1920s, in addition to casework helping immigrants find employment, housing, or English classes, the Institutes placed increasing emphasis on ethnic cultural programs to develop "the self-expression of the community" and on encouraging "the formation and progress of nationality organizations" by opening its facilities to existing immigrant organizations and mutual aid societies.¹⁹

Combined with their cultural pluralist approach, the International Institutes established a principle that "a man's or woman's right to choose citizenship should not be molested."²⁰ It rejected the dominant idea in the Americanization movement that immigrants should naturalize as soon as possible. For one, the organization acknowledged that many immigrants initially considered the U.S. only as a place of temporary sojourn. At a more fundamental level, the Institutes reasoned that immigrants should secure citizenship only after careful study and preparation. Importantly, in their view, the five-year minimum residency requirement for naturalization was less a period for the United States to test an immigrant's fitness for citizenship than for immigrant themselves to examine the U.S. "Down in our hearts," Bremer commented, "we really respect a person more who does want to get acquainted, does want to think things over, and does not quite so easily 'renounce and abjure' the country and the state in which he was born." Thus, the Institutes regarded the pre-naturalization years as a critical period for immigrants to weigh all the factors involved in changing nationality, free from any pressure.²¹

The quota acts, however, drove immigrants to apply for citizenship out of "fear," which ran counter to the Institutes' principles. When the number of naturalization applications increased after the first quota act in 1921, the organization did not necessarily view this trend favorably. Bremmer wrote:

In so far as an increased demand for citizenship is the result of a purely voluntary choice ... we consider it a very encouraging development. Unfortunately, there are other factors which enter into the situation.... We have no way of knowing the number of petitions traceable to dire fear.²²

The gap between rights of citizens and those of noncitizens widened further after 1924, and the question of noncitizen citizenship bore a renewed significance for the Institutes.

FAMILY UNITY AND “COERCIVE CITIZENSHIP”

As the effects of the 1924 Act gradually unfolded, the International Institutes observed that the new law “decreased the number of immigrants but has increased the number of immigration problems and hardships.” It not only made “admission into this country ... a golden apple” but imposed various difficulties on immigrants already in the U.S., particularly noncitizens.²³ Their offices were flooded with legal casework on immigrants captured in a complex web of immigration and naturalization regulations. For instance, a six-month absence from the U.S. without a reentry permit stripped noncitizens of their immigration status. Reentry to the U.S. required an entirely new immigrant visa, which was very difficult to obtain for those from countries with small quotas. Therefore, the Institutes had to “explain to them very carefully the danger of expatriation if they stay abroad for an extended period of time.” Citizenship was becoming “the only sure means of return to” or to remain in the U.S.²⁴

As casework increased, legal obstacles to family unification came particularly to the attention of the Institutes. The most vulnerable people were recent immigrants who were yet to obtain citizenship or were unable to acquire citizenship for various reasons. Some were undecided about making the irreversible choice of changing nationalities. Others had not met the legal conditions such as the five-year minimum residency requirement. Others had been living in the U.S. for more than five years but without declaring their intention to naturalize (first paper), which had to be filed at least three years before applying for citizenship. Still others lacked or were unable to present evidence of formal admission to the U.S. Ethel Bird, a national board member of the YWCA commented: “The family of the declarant and the alien resident presents the most hopeless and by far the gravest social problems of separation.”²⁵ Albeit very narrowly, the Immigration Act of 1924 did take into account nuclear families of citizens by classifying wives and unmarried children under eighteen of citizens as non-quota immigrants, and allocating half of the quotas to husbands, unmarried children between eighteen and twenty-one, and parents of citizens.²⁶

However, by recognizing only nuclear families of U.S. citizens, the 1924 Act in effect made naturalization a legal precondition to sending for one’s family members, thereby tying citizenship to family migration in an unprecedented manner. The International Institutes were confronted with numerous cases of immigrants desperate to acquire citizenship in order to

be joined by their families. For example, Stanislawa Volkazaz had made various attempts to bring her son to the U.S. before she sought help from the Yonkers International Institute. When Volkazaz first arrived from Poland in 1912, she had left her son Joseph in the care of her mother. When the grandmother became elderly, Joseph was put into the custody of his uncle and aunt. With the quota law in effect, the only way for mother and son to be reunited in the U.S. was for Volkazak to become a U.S. citizen and secure a non-quota visa for her son. Volkazak successfully filed her "first papers" (or declaration of intent to become a U.S. citizen). However, she faced obstacles to completing the naturalization process because she lacked her arrival record as a result of her not being able to identify the exact name of the ship upon which she traveled to the U.S. or remember the exact date of her arrival. Volkazaz was trapped in legal limbo between declarant status and citizen status, while time was running out as her son approached adulthood.²⁷

Such problems were compounded by the 1924 Act's narrow definition of family, even for citizens. The International Institutes maintained that at the very least an "immediate family" should include one's spouse, children, parents, and minor dependent unmarried siblings.²⁸ In the decade before the quota acts were enforced, approximately half of immigrants answered at their ports of entry that they were joining their "relatives" in the U.S., which included much wider relations than the nuclear family. The 1924 Act cut into family ties that extended beyond "fireside relatives" to the "compound family" (a family consisting of three or more spouses and their children) which had been a source of "extraordinary power of successful adjustment to alien environment."²⁹

Observers on both sides of the political spectrum knew that a significant number of post-1924 naturalization applications were motivated by the desire to receive family reunification privileges. Hence, ardent immigration restrictionists insisted on minimizing the privileges of citizens to bring their families into the U.S. Others sought to prevent naturalization altogether to prevent recent immigrants from exercising family reunification privileges. For example, Raymond Christ, the U.S. Commissioner General of Naturalization, notoriously ordered naturalization examiners to reject applications from immigrants whose family were still in Europe, thereby putting them in an untenable catch-22.³⁰

For the International Institutes, the problem extended beyond various obstacles to naturalization. It was not just a matter of whether an immigrant could eventually become a U.S. citizen or not. The organization saw

naturalization as too high a price to pay for family reunification, imposing upon immigrants the risk of making the irreversible decision of changing one's nationality, even before their family had ever lived in the U.S. Moreover, the International Institutes voiced fundamental opposition to tying family unification rights to citizenship status, as it would amount to indirect coercion of naturalization. According to Bremer, how the U.S. treated immigrants in the pre-naturalization years determined their depth of attachment to their new country and whether newcomers would become "thoughtful, responsible and fervent citizens" in the long run.³¹ In other words, the rights endowed in pre-citizen years, or noncitizen citizenship, would strongly influence how immigrants exercised their citizenship after they became formal citizens. The Institutes' approach represented what legal scholar Hiroshi Motomura conceptualizes as an "immigration as transition" model of citizenship, which views a newcomer as being in transition to becoming a citizen, or as a future citizen, and offers a quasi-citizen treatment during their initial years in the U.S.³²

For instance, while the International Institutes found it reasonable to reserve certain rights such as suffrage to formal citizens, in other domains it opposed creating wide disparities between the rights and benefits of citizens and those of noncitizens. Above all, to make escape from alienage "the only way for the securing of certain ordinary human protection" was what the Institutes called "coercive citizenship."³³ In this context, the organization denounced coupling citizenship status and family rights as the worst form of coercive citizenship. Deprivation of family life from noncitizens destroyed "the positive forces on which good citizenship can be built."³⁴ The Institutes envisioned citizenship based on a feeling of attachment to the U.S., and not by the desire to overcome the tangible divide between formal citizen status and noncitizen status.

APPROACHING A "NEW SOCIAL PROBLEM"

The Institutes understood the legal obstruction to family reunification created by the quota acts as a "new social problem ... very serious and very far-reaching in its social and economic consequences."³⁵ The problem was social in two aspects. First, it was created by the American society through the Immigration Act of 1924. "The situation created by the immigration law," the Institutes argued, should be "set right by amending the law." Obstructions to family migration that came out of the quota law were thus both social and legal. Second, it not only destroyed the "life of the

immigrant" but "the most sacred institution of society," namely the family. Hence, the American society was both the cause of and imperiled by family separation.³⁶

The organization worried about the dire consequences that prolonged separation could have on family relationships. Even before the enforcement of the 1924 Act, social service agencies had been concerned about desertion and nonsupport by husbands who preceded their families to the U.S. The Institutes had assisted numerous women who learned upon arriving in the U.S. that their husbands no longer wished to continue marital relations.³⁷ The problem of desertion became more pressing after the 1924 Act took effect because the new law did not allow prospective immigrants to apply for a family visa, unless their citizen relative who preceded them first filed a petition on their behalf. The family members' ability to immigrate depended entirely on the actions of the preceding relative.³⁸

Sometimes even citizens who filed petitions on behalf of their family members to immigrate were denied the ability to sponsor their relatives. For instance, the International Institute of New York City reported how an Italian man had revealed to them "with tears in his eyes" that although he had been supporting his wife in Italy and trying to bring her to the U.S., he was giving up his efforts altogether. He came to believe that both the Italian government and the U.S. government were hindering his efforts, with Italy profiting from his remittances and the "United States ... in league with the European Countries."³⁹ Forced separation by immigration law or immigration authorities, the Institutes observed, could eventually destroy the very will to strive to live together.

Legal obstructions to family migration were also socially detrimental, the Institutes feared, because they hindered integration of immigrants into American society. For instance, the organization found little merit in a system that essentially obliged children to remain in Europe until the preceding parent became a naturalized U.S. citizen. The organization pointed out that younger children adjusted to new environments and acquired English proficiency faster than those who came to the U.S. at an older age. If the children were eventually to immigrate to the U.S., why make them wait for a minimum of five years instead of taking a more constructive approach of welcoming them as early as possible?

The time factor could be crucial in cases involving children, as "child" was defined by age as well as by relations. In the worst-case scenario, children who reached majority before their parents became a U.S. citizen were no longer eligible for immigration as a non-quota family member

and consequently lost the chance to join their family. A case from the Milwaukee International Institute illustrates such problems. After World War I, M. Metridis, a Greek American war veteran, arranged to bring his wife and three daughters to the U.S. However, before the family was able to join him, the 1924 Act took effect. Although his wife and his two minor daughters were eligible for a non-quota visa, his 19-year-old daughter Anastacia was disqualified because she was older than 18. The quota for Greece was a mere one hundred, and in such countries with years-long waiting lists for quota visas, the 1924 Act's age restrictions resulted in separation of older siblings from their younger siblings.⁴⁰

Concerns about immigrant families prompted the International Institutes to reorganize its activities in several ways. For one, their clientele expanded to include more men, since the majority of family reunification cases involved men with families in Europe. Second, it placed more emphasis on training staff to develop expertise in immigration and naturalization laws. In some cities, the Institutes had staff specializing in naturalization applications, who would accompany applicants to court to ensure their applications proceeded smoothly. Legal expertise, the Institutes maintained, was not only beneficial for clients; it was essential for the organization to gain recognition as specialists in immigration matters and in "shaping American attitudes toward new citizens and would-be citizens."⁴¹

Naturalization casework underscored the numerous difficulties of acquiring U.S. citizenship. Besides the minimum residency requirement, naturalization was by no means an easy process. Often, the citizenship test was an insurmountable barrier for immigrants with little education. Julio Gilano, an Italian immigrant with five children who came to the U.S. before the 1924 Act, sought help from the Baltimore International Institute. He came to the U.S. alone, and after several years, he first sent for his wife and the younger three of his children. Since he did not yet have enough savings to bring all the family at the same time, the two older sons, aged 12 and 13, remained in Italy in the care of their aunt. However, while the Gilano family was still saving travel funds for the older sons, Congress enacted the 1924 quota law. Since Congress only accorded a quota of 3,645 for Italy, it was virtually impossible for the two boys to join the family unless their father became a U.S. citizen. But Julio had received little education in Italy, much less could he read English, and there was little chance for him to pass the citizenship test.⁴²

As a result of working with separated families, the Institutes reinforced its network with overseas agencies, since the problem by definition

crossed national boundaries. Moreover, the new visa system enhanced the importance of reaching out to potential immigrants while they were still in Europe. After the 1924 Act went into effect, decisions regarding whom to admit into the U.S. were made for the most part by the consulates that issued visas, and immigration officials at the ports of entry receded to a secondary role.⁴³ Hence, in acquiring the names of arriving immigrants, the Institutes came to rely less on immigration officials on Ellis Island than on overseas agencies. In assisting separated families, the Institutes worked particularly closely with the Geneva-based International Migration Service ("IMS"), which was established by the World YWCA in 1920. Although the IMS became an independent agency in 1924, Bremer continued to serve on its board. The Institutes viewed the IMS network in eight countries to be particularly valuable in approaching families of U.S. residents.⁴⁴ Yet, the gravity and scale of the problem went far beyond the individual case-based efforts of private agencies. A more comprehensive solution required legislative reform.

BUILDING AN ALLIANCE FOR FAMILIES

It took courage for members of the International Institutes to begin the work of engaging and lobbying legislators and other policymakers, a field in which it had no previous experience. At their 1925 annual conference, various speakers voiced the need to move beyond casework for individual immigrants and cultural and educational programs in ethnic communities, and proposed to take collective action to influence legislators directly.⁴⁵

A speech at the conference made by Aghavnig Yeghenian, an Armenian American Institutes member who had fled from Turkey, illustrates how the organization had come to view the regime of immigration restriction and had redefined its role in the new era. Yeghenian first discussed redrawing the line between restrictionism and anti-restrictionism. Whereas the divide in the pre-World War I years concerned the desirability of numerical restriction itself, liberals after the 1920s came to terms with numerical restriction in principle, notwithstanding their opposition to the quotas system. Yeghenian argued: "The human mind is a very strangely flexible thing. When the country first began to talk about restriction ... the idea of restriction was somewhat ridiculous ... Many of us were anti-restrictionists at the time." She continued, when "the quota law of 1921 [a predecessor to the 1924 Act] came.... we adjusted our minds to it."⁴⁶ As historian Gary Gerstle put it, many liberals did not "specifically endorse a racist

restrictionist act” in the early 1920s, but nonetheless “tolerated” it.⁴⁷

At the same time, however, while the Institutes reconciled itself to the end of a normatively open immigration policy, it did not agree that the restriction of entry into the U.S. should translate into restriction of rights of immigrants already in the U.S. The Institutes argued that reuniting immigrants with their family members abroad who wanted to join them was essentially about rights of U.S. residents. “If we decide to take a stand, we will have to do it with the full realization that it is not going to be an easy position,” she encouraged the audience. “I know that there is fear of influencing legislation in this country among groups. And yet . . . what is the use of democracy if one is not going to influence legislation?”⁴⁸

Even more so than in individual casework, coordination with other social work agencies and immigrant advocacy groups was essential for legislative reform. Among the various meetings and conferences that members of the International Institutes attended, the National Conference of Social Work, with annual participation of some 2,000 social workers, was particularly important. The Institutes was one of the founding members of the conference’s Division of Immigrants, established in 1917. The Institutes saw the conference as their “kindred group,” where it could measure the quality of its activities and work against those of other prominent organizations engaged in similar fields, such as the Immigrants’ Protective League of Chicago and the National Council of Jewish Woman. At the 1925 National Conference of Social Work, various organizations echoed concerns about family separation of their clients. The conference also provided a platform for building political alliances.⁴⁹

The campaign for family unification was transatlantic. In 1926, forty-one organizations from ten countries, including the International Institutes, gathered in Geneva at the International Conference of Private Organisations for the Protection of Migrants. The International Conference classified separation of immigrant families into “personal causes” and “causes which do not depend on the migrants themselves.” The former included seasonal migration wherein immigrants sent remittances to their families, which was personal and “voluntary separation.” Family separation precipitated by illness and lack of sufficient travel funds constituted personal but “involuntary separation.” “External” causes of separation included war, political persecution of ethnic and religious minorities, and importantly “the application of legislative measure.” The International Conference reported that “it is the American Law of 1924 which, by its characteristics, has most struck the Associations and public opinion in this matter.”⁵⁰ To support U.S.

organizations in their efforts to shape American public opinion in response to the 1924 law, the International Conference undertook a transatlantic study on family separation, gathering reports from sixteen countries including Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Hungary, and Italy.⁵¹

By late 1925, separation of immigrant families caught the attention of policy makers including President Calvin Coolidge. Senator James W. Wadsworth and Representative Nathan D. Perlman of New York introduced a family reunification bill to Congress. For the first time since its founding, the International Institutes sent a delegate to a Congressional hearing. A social worker stationed at Ellis Island testified before the Senate immigration committee about various cases that the Institutes handled.⁵² The Wadsworth-Perlman bill had been expected to run up against a host of obstacles, and the Institutes were willing to support any measures that would facilitate family reunification. But the bill failed to pass despite numerous amendments.⁵³

Debate on the Wadsworth-Perlman bill revealed wide divides between reformers and their opponents. The most fundamental difference lay in their ideas about racial hierarchy. The Institutes discredited the notion of racial difference among European immigrants and embraced cultural and environmental explanations of differences, explaining that "whole race theories may be built ... without the slightest biological foundation for them."⁵⁴ Deep antagonism towards the family reunification bill derived from the fact that the primary beneficiaries were eastern and southern European immigrants, the very targets of the quota system. Family-specific provisions mattered little for immigrants from northern European countries with large quotas, because visas were readily available without any special consideration.⁵⁵ Therefore, Anglo-Saxon supremacists such as the Allied Patriotic Societies conceived the issue as a "struggle between the Anglo-Saxon stock and the new immigration for control of our country."⁵⁶ Hence, a major concern of the restrictionists was chain migration of family members from southern and eastern Europe. Based on visa application information from American consulates, Secretary of State Frank Kellogg estimated that the bill would allow some 570,000 immigrants to immediately enter the U.S. Surprised by the estimate, Representative Albert Johnson, one of the primary authors of the 1924 Act, raised an alarm that "the minute we begin to look with sympathy on the first line we are met with appeals for the next line, and it runs right along in an endless chain."⁵⁷

Another deep split occurred in the framing of family reunification, which

concerned both a right of newcomers already within the U.S. territory and simultaneously admission of new immigrants. Restrictionists such as Johnson stressed the latter aspect pertaining to new admissions and argued that family migration, especially outside the quotas, would undermine the very foundation of numerical restriction. By contrast, the Institutes framed family reunification primarily as a right of U.S. citizens and permanent residents and insisted that the issue was distinct from general admission of immigrants.

Narrower but still significant gaps existed among those who were sympathetic to the plight of separate families. For example, they disagreed about which types of family relationships mattered. There also remained a question of whether formal citizenship status or commencement of the naturalization process should be a prerequisite to obtaining the benefits of family reunification. Hurry E. Hull, the Commissioner General of Immigration, for instance, recommended amending the law to give more consideration to families of citizens, but not those of permanent resident aliens. Other policymakers who agreed about providing some relief at least to immigrants already residing in the U.S. were uncertain about the appropriate method of doing so.⁵⁸

As a product of the Progressive Era, the Institutes valued social-scientific research as a basis for social reform. While Congress discussed various bills on family reunification, the Institutes launched an extensive survey through their local branches. It published announcements in local foreign language newspapers and gathered some 520 cases from forty branches in fourteen states. Importantly, the published report called attention to much wider familial relations than those given consideration under the 1924 Act, including stepchildren, adopted children, parents, and siblings.⁵⁹ The study by the Institutes prompted the National Conference of Social Work's Division of Immigrants to conduct a more wide-reaching survey in 140 cities. From the European side, the Geneva-based International Association of Organizations for the Protection of Migrants prepared reports. Informed discussion based on social surveys would shape public opinion, the reformers believed.⁶⁰

Concurrent with individual casework and the nationwide survey, the Institutes developed a legislative strategy. At the 1927 Annual Conference of Social Work held in Des Moines, Iowa, the Division of Immigrants discussed family separation extensively. Cecilia Razovsky of the National Council of Jewish Women spoke about humanitarian effects of immigration law, and how the 1924 Act separated families striking "so

palpably at relationships growing out of fundamental human need."⁶¹ Adena Miller Rich of the Immigrants Protective League of Chicago introduced the agency's study on one hundred Italian American families in Chicago.⁶² After the official close of the conference, delegates from various organizations continued to discuss strategies for legal reform.⁶³ In the course of their campaigns for uniting families, the Institutes allied with other New York-based organizations such as the Foreign Language Information Service as well as with national organizations such as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, National Council of Catholic Men, National Council of Catholic Women, National Council of Jewish Women, and the National Women's Trade Union League.⁶⁴

The Institutes' New York connections proved helpful in obtaining legal counsel for their legislative work. Bremer brought the Des Moines proposal to a drafting committee at Columbia University. The bill was then introduced by Representative Clarence MacGregor of New York. In order to gain support of organizations that were more committed to restriction but still sympathetic to separated families, as was the case with the American Federation of Labor, the reformers sought to expedite family reunification without appearing to destroy "the principle of the restriction law." The best solution, they concluded, was to suspend admission of immigrants without family in the U.S. until family members of immigrants already in the U.S. were able to apply for admission. Specifically, the bill proposed to reserve half of the total quotas and distribute them on a need basis to overseas family members regardless of their countries of origins for a period of several years. Pressing for its passage, Bremer testified before the House Immigration Committee how the quota act disrupted the lives of thousands of families and emphasized the immediate need for remedial legislation. To give special priority to families was not a matter of debasing the principle of selective admission, but a matter of justice for immigrants already living in the U.S., she argued.⁶⁵

After numerous revisions to the bill, Congress amended the Immigration Act of 1924 on May 29, 1928. For the Institutes, the new law was far from a total victory but still a significant achievement. The 1928 amendments added citizens' children between eighteen and twenty-one to those eligible for admission, raising the age limit by three years. Additionally, the amendments added husbands of citizens married prior to 1928 to the non-quota category, narrowing the gender gap in that category. They also enabled permanent residents to send for their wives and their children under eighteen, albeit only by means of getting a preference within existing

national origin quotas.⁶⁶ Soon after the passage of the 1928 amendments, local offices of the International Institutes were filled with affidavits for family visas.⁶⁷

Regarding permanent residents' right to be joined by one's family, the International Institutes considered their achievements to be mixed. From a short-term perspective, the Institutes were disappointed that preference within the quotas for families of permanent residents would not immediately relieve eastern and southern European immigrant families, since their quotas were too small. But from a long-term perspective, the new law helped resident aliens in a lasting way by acknowledging that their families deserved special consideration and recognizing their family unity as part of their noncitizen citizenship.⁶⁸ Families of permanent residents would come to constitute a significant portion of future migration to the U.S.

The Institutes were encouraged by the fact that their campaign played a significant role in realizing legislative reform. The Institutes decided to devote more efforts to grassroots lobbying, such as letter writing campaigns to members of Congress, meeting the immigration committee members in Washington D.C., and training specialists who had "an understanding of Washington and of how Congress works."⁶⁹

The onset of the Great Depression exacerbated the vulnerability of noncitizens. Often, citizenship status or first papers were required for public assistance and welfare, and even for private employment. To make matters worse, Congress raised the bar to naturalization in 1929 by raising the fee from five dollars to twenty dollars. The Hoover administration ordered American consulates to reject many visa applications on the grounds that the applicant was "Liable to Become a Public Charge," leaving most of the quotas unfilled. Such administrative restrictions seemed to erase many of the achievements of the 1928 family reunification amendment.⁷⁰

During the Depression, the organizational character of the Institutes changed both at the local level and at the national level. Local Institutes diverted their limited resources from cultural programs such as folk festivals to concentrate on immigration and naturalization problems. As naturalization applications came to comprise majority of their casework, the organization gradually transformed into an agency offering technical and legal assistance to clients about immigration and naturalization matters.⁷¹ Transformation at the local level translated into reorganization at the national level. While their clientele was no longer limited to women, unlike in its founding years, the organization still observed that

a significant number of male immigrants expressed hesitation about joining the organization, saying they did not "want to belong to a women's organization." Local Institutes also suggested the possibility of reaching out to a broader community by becoming a non-sectarian agency. In 1933, the International Institutes resolved to become a stand-alone agency entirely independent of the YWCA.⁷² Concurrently, it strengthened interorganizational cooperation with other prominent immigrant aid organizations with different constituencies. The loose coalition that organized for family reunification in the late 1920s, developed into the Joint Committee of Immigration Legislation in 1930, and then into Joint Conference on Alien Legislation in 1939, taking a more "coordinated action of legislative questions affecting the foreign-born."⁷³

Throughout the 1930s, the International Institutes continued to campaign for family unification. While it claimed that their goal was not new admission of immigrants but equity for immigrants already in the U.S., in fact, it was at the forefront of the fight against further immigration restrictions. As administrative restriction by the State Department continued, consulates generally granted visas to applications with family in the U.S., but denied them to applicants without. The foremost criteria in differentiating family migration from general immigration was whether the relation was legally recognized as family under immigration law. Thus, legal developments in the late 1920s became the foundation for liberal advocates and immigrants to make claims on behalf of their family members, providing the last line in the defense of immigration.⁷⁴

EPILOGUE

The New Deal would lead to the International Institutes building a new relationship with the federal government. The Institutes welcomed the appointment of Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, the first female Cabinet Secretary and the first Labor Secretary trained in the field of social work.⁷⁵ In 1934, Perkins appointed a civilian advisory panel, including several leaders of the International Institutes, to advise her on immigration matters. The so-called Ellis Island Committee submitted a report proposing administrative reform first of the federal immigration and naturalization bureau and then of agencies within the Department of Labor, and also legislative reform of broader immigration policy. Specifically, with millions unemployed, the committee found "no reason for substantial amendment" to "the present policy of restriction." But it insisted that

rights of immigrants within the national territory belonged to a separate sphere from restriction of new immigration, and urged Congress to remedy family separation, an “evil ever since the first quota law was passed in 1921.” The underlying principles of the committee echoed the views of the International Institutes that the hard boundary of U.S. society should be drawn at the territorial border, and not within the U.S. based on legal citizenship: “In most discussion touching naturalization and the alien too much importance ... is attached to the alien’s naturalization as compared with his admission to the United States. When we admit an immigrant for permanent residence, we are accepting him, in effect as a member of our American Society.”⁷⁶ This emphasis on permanent residence, a new legal concept of membership in American society that came into being under the regime of immigration restriction, characterized the new overarching framework of noncitizen citizenship.

NOTE

¹ Edith Terry Bremer, “Immigrants and Foreign Communities,” in *Social Work Year Book 1933* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1933) edited by Fred S. Hall, 244.

² Linda Bosniak, *Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006), 3.

³ Hiroshi Motomura, *Americans in Waiting: The Lost Story of Immigration and Citizenship in the United States* (New York: Oxford UP, 2006), 6–7, 9–11.

⁴ The International Institutes broke away from the YWCA in 1933 to form the National Institute of Immigrant Welfare, which later became American Federation of International Institutes. In 1958, it merged with the Common Council for American Unity to create the American Council for Nationalities Service. American Council for Nationalities Service became Immigration and Refugee Service of America in 1994.

U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants. “History.” <https://refugees.org/history/> Accessed 1 March, 2023.

⁵ Raymond A. Mohl and Neil Betten, “Paternalism and Pluralism: Immigrants and Social Welfare in Gary Indiana, 1906–1940,” *American Studies* 15 (Spring 1974); 5–30. Raymond A. Mohl and Neil Betten, “Ethnic Adjustment in the Industrial City: The International Institute of Gary, 1919–1940,” *International Migration Review* 6 no. 4 (1972); 361–376; John F. McClymer, “Gender and the ‘American Way of Life’: Women in the Americanization Movement.” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 10, no. 3 (1991): 3–20; Celeste DeRoche, “Cultural Pluralism and American Identity 1910–1954,” (PhD Diss, University of Maine, 2000).

⁶ See for example, Alan Dawley, *Changing the World: American Progressives in War and Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003), chapter 9.

⁷ A landmark work in this literature is Mae Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2004); For a recent anthology, see Maddalena Marinari, Madeleine Hsu, and Maria Cristina Garcia eds., *A Nation of Immigrants Reconsidered: U.S. Society in an Age of Restriction, 1924–1965* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2019).

⁸ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925* (1955; repr., New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983) is a classic example. See also Rivka Shpak Lissak, *Pluralism and Progressives: Hull House and the Immigrants, 1890–1919* (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1989), 157; Noah Pickus, *True Faith and Allegiance: Immigration and American Civic Nationalism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005), 112–117.

⁹ "The Y.W.C.A. and the Foreign-born Women," *Woman's Press* 21 no. 11 (Nov 1927): 754–756.

¹⁰ Bremer served as the national leader of the Institutes until 1954. Raymond A. Mohl, "The International Institutes and Immigrant Education, 1910–1940," in *American Education and the European Immigrant*, ed. Bernard J. Weiss (Urbana: U of Illinois Press, 1982), 118–119; Elizabeth W. Clark, "Including the Foreign-Born," *Association Monthly* 14 no. 7 (July 1920): 344; Robert H. Bremner, *American Philanthropy* (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1960), 106–107, 112–113; For professionalization of social work, see Kathleen McCarthy, *Noblesse Oblige: Charity and Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago, 1849–1929* (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1982), 106.

¹¹ Marian Schibbsy, "Private Agencies Aiding the Foreign-Born," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 223 (1942): 189.

¹² Edith Terry Bremer, *The International Institutes in Foreign Community Work: Their Program and Philosophy*, (New York: Woman's Press, 1923), 4; Elizabeth Clark, "Those in the International Institute," *Woman's Press* 17 (Sep. 1923): 564; Mohl and Betten, "Paternalism and Pluralism," 5–30.

¹³ N. E. Niewiadomsky, "Social Care of Newly Arrived Immigrants," (paper, annual conference of International Institutes, 1928), reel 100:6, YWCA USA Records, Sophia Smith Collection, Northampton, Massachusetts (Hereafter, YWCA Records).

¹⁴ Edith Terry Bremer, "Development of Private Social Work with the Foreign Born," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 262 (March 1949): 145; Mohl, "The International Institutes and Immigrant Education," 118–122; YWCA Department of Immigration and Foreign Communities, *National Office Newsletter* (Jan 1928): 8.

¹⁵ Bremer, *The International Institutes in Foreign Community Work*, 11.

¹⁶ Edith Terry Bremer, "Americanization," *Association Monthly* 13 no. 6 (June 1919): 259–260.

¹⁷ Edith Terry Bremer, "The Field of International Institute and Its Place in Social Work," (paper, annual conference of International Institutes, 1925), 13, reel 100:6, YWCA Records; Elizabeth Russell Hendee, "Leadership in Twenty-Seven Languages," *Woman's Press* 21 (February 1927): 112–113; Deroche, "Cultural Pluralism and American Identity," 35.

¹⁸ Mohl and Betten, "Paternalism and Pluralism," 26; Edith Terry Bremer, "The Field of International Institute and Its Place in Social Work," 11 (paper, annual conference of International Institutes, 1925), reel 100:6, YWCA Records.

¹⁹ Mohl and Betten, "Ethnic Adjustment in the Industrial City," 370.

²⁰ Bremer, *The International Institutes in Foreign Community Work*, 11.

²¹ Edith Terry Bremer, "How is it with the Non-Citizens?" *Women's Press* 24 no. 12 (Dec 1930): 847.

²² Bremer, *The International Institutes in Foreign Community Work*, 11.

²³ Ludmila K. Foxlee, "At the Gateway," *Woman's Press* 19 no. 9 (September 1925): 622.

²⁴ Florence C. Cassidy, "The Increasing Importance of Naturalization: Its Legal and Educational Significance," (paper, annual conference of International Institutes, 1925), 11–12, reel 100:6, YWCA Records.

²⁵ "Declarant" refers to immigrants who had filed their "declaration of intention to naturalization." Ethel Bird, *Separated Families and the Immigration Law* (New York: YWCA, 1927), 3–4, reel 100, YWCA Records; For family provisions in the 1921 Act

and the 1924 Act, Oda, “Family Unity in U.S. Immigration Policy,” (PhD Diss, Columbia University, 2014), chapter 1.

²⁶ Section 4a, Immigration Act of 1924, 43 Stat. 154.

²⁷ Case no. 43, in International Institutes, “The Family of the Foreign-Born under Restrictive Immigration: A Study of One Hundred Separated Families from the Records of International Institutes,” (1927), 28, Box 288, folder 5, reel 195, *Immigration and Refugee Services of America, 1918–1985* (Woodbridge, CT: Primary Source Microfilm).

²⁸ International Institutes, “The Family of the Foreign-Born under Restrictive Immigration,” (1927), 3.

²⁹ Bird, *Separated Families*, 3.

³⁰ “Citizenship Discouraged,” *Interpreter Release* 3 no. 6 (June 1924): 3–6.

³¹ Bremer, *The International Institutes in Foreign Community Work*, 11.

³² Motomura identifies three models of immigration: immigration as contract, immigration as affiliation, and immigration as transition. The “immigration as contract” model places emphasis on the initial conditions of admission and permits an immigrant to live in the U.S. only in so far as one observes the initial terms. By contrast, the concept of “immigration as affiliation” values the length of period an immigrant has lived in the U.S. The longer a noncitizen lives in the U.S., the stronger his relationship with the country and his right to live in the U.S. become. Motomura, *Americans in Waiting*, 6–7, 9–11.

³³ Bremer, *The International Institutes in Foreign Community Work*, 11.

³⁴ International Institutes, “The Family of the Foreign-Born under Restrictive Immigration,” 2.

³⁵ Yeghenian, “Present Immigration Legislation,” 42.

³⁶ International Institutes, “The Family of the Foreign-Born under Restrictive Immigration,” 1–2.

³⁷ Niewiadomsky, “Social Care of Newly Arrived Immigrants,” V-11, V-12.

³⁸ Bird, *Separated Families*, 6.

³⁹ Case No. 93, in “The Family of the Foreign-Born under Restrictive Immigration,” 52.

⁴⁰ Case no. 1 in “The Family of the Foreign-Born under Restrictive Immigration,” 7; For age factor in immigration, Yuki Oda, “A Day Too Late”: Age, Immigration Quotas, and Racial Exclusion” in 166–186 Corrine T. Field and Nicholas L. Syrett eds., *Age in America: The Colonial Era to the Present* (New York: New York University Press, 2015).

⁴¹ Cassidy, “The Increasing Importance of Naturalization,” 16; Bremer, *The International Institutes in Foreign Community Work*, 4.

⁴² Case no. 52 in “The Family of the Foreign-Born under Restrictive Immigration,” 32.

⁴³ Aristide R. Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2006), 264–265.

⁴⁴ The plan of an international agency specializing in assistance of migrants was originally proposed in 1914 at a World YWCA conference in Stockholm attended by delegates from YWCAs in seventeen countries. In 1920, the World’s Committee of the YWCA conducted a survey on overseas migration in ten countries and established the new agency’s headquarters in London, which later moved to Geneva. IMS separated from the YWCA, partly because in a number of European countries, YWCAs were small sectarian organizations not equipped for technical programs and also because affiliation with a Protestant organization added difficulties in gathering support from the government and the public in Catholic countries.

World’s YWCA, *International Migration Service: June 1920 to June 1922* (London: World’s YWCA, 1922); International Migration Service, *Migrants* (Geneva: International Migration Service, 1927); International Migration Service, *Migrants: New Standards of International Practice* (Geneva: International Migration Service, 1930).

⁴⁵ Elizabeth Russell Hendee, “Niagara Falls Conference of International Institutes,”

Woman's Press 19 no. 8 (Aug 1925): 573.

⁴⁶ Aghavnie Yeghenian, "Present Immigration Legislation and What Attitude the Institute Should Take," (paper, annual conference of International Institutes, 1925), 41; reel 100:6, YWCA Records.

⁴⁷ Gary Gerstle, "The Protean Character of American Liberalism," *American Historical Review* 99 no. 4 (1994): 1059.

⁴⁸ Yeghenian, "Present Immigration Legislation," 41, 45.

⁴⁹ Elizabeth W. Clark, "Conference on International Institute Work," *Woman's Press* 17 no. 8 (Aug. 1923): 186; Edith Terry Bremer, "The National Conference of Social Work: An Interpretation," *Woman's Press* 23 no. 10 (Oct. 1929): 682; Cecilia Razovsky, "The Visa and Quota Laws as They Affect the Clients of Social Agencies," in National Conference of Social Work, *Proceedings 1925* (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1925), 599–607.

⁵⁰ International Conference of Private Organisations for the Protection of Migrants, *Separation of Families of Migrants: Reports and Resolutions* (Geneva, 1926), 6–7, 10; Ruth Larned, *International Social Service: A History, 1924–1955* (Geneva: International Social Service, 1956), 38.

⁵¹ *Separation of Families of Migrants*, 33.

⁵² Senate Committee of Immigration, *Admission of Certain Relatives*. 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1926, 34–36.

⁵³ *Minutes of the National Board of the YWCA*, Jan 12, 1927, reel 3, YWCA Records.

⁵⁴ "And Who Is My Neighbor?" *Woman's Press* 18 no. 11 (Nov. 1924): 503–504.

⁵⁵ Oda, "Family Unity in U.S. Immigration Policy," 51–54.

⁵⁶ "Oppose Any Change in Immigration Law," *New York Times*, April 8, 1926.

⁵⁷ "Proposed Alien Bill Would Admit 577450," *New York Times*, Feb 25, 1926; House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, *Admission of Certain Relatives*. 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1926, 7, 62.

⁵⁸ U.S. Department of Labor, *Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration 1925* (Washington DC: GPO, 1925), 28; U.S. Department of Labor, *Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration 1926* (Washington DC: GPO, 1926), 23; Neuringer, *American Jewry*, 190–198.

⁵⁹ "The Family of the Foreign-Born under Restrictive Immigration: A Study of One Hundred Separated Families from the Records of International Institutes," (1927).

⁶⁰ Cecilia Razovsky, "Humanitarian Effects of the Immigration Law," in National Conference of Social Work, *Proceedings 1927* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927), 520.

⁶¹ Razovsky, "Humanitarian Effects of the Immigration Law," 520.

⁶² Adena Miller Rich, "Separated Families," in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1927*, 530–547.

⁶³ "Legislative Bulletin no. 4," *Interpreter Releases*, May 3, 1928.

⁶⁴ Bird, *Separated Families*, 6; Elizabeth R. Hendee, "Informal Report on Legislative Work for Reuniting Families," (paper, annual conference of International Institutes, 1928), reel 100: 6, YWCA Records; *Minutes of the National Board of the YWCA*, Jan 18, 1928, reel 3, YWCA Records; Marian Schibsby, "Pending Immigration Legislation," in National Conference of Social Work, *Proceedings 1928* (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1928), 498; "Is the Quota More Sacred than the Family?" *Interpreter* 6 no. 8 (Oct. 1927): 4–7; YWCA Department of Immigration and Foreign Communities, *National Office Newsletter* (Jan 1928); 1.

⁶⁵ House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, *Amendments to Immigration Act of 1924: Nonquota and Preference Provisions*, 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, 4–5.

⁶⁶ Act of May 28, 1928, 45 stat 654.

⁶⁷ Hazel G. Omsbee, "Jenkins Says Reunite," *Women's Press* 23 no. 7 (July 1929): 473–474.

⁶⁸ Elizabeth Eastman, "The Capital Letter," *Woman's Press* 24 no. 5 (May 1930): 343; Mary McDowell, "The Quota Law and the Family," in *National Conference of Social Work, Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1930* (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1930), 478.

⁶⁹ Edith Terry Bremer, "How the Congress Made up Its Mind," *Women's Press* 22 no. 8 (Aug. 1928): 527–529.

⁷⁰ In the first five months after the order, consulates denied 96,883 visas on this ground. Zolberg, *A Nation by Design*, 268–269.

⁷¹ Mohl, "Cultural Pluralism in Immigrant Education," 46, 52; Mohl and Betten, "Ethnic Adjustment in Industrial City," 374–375.

⁷² General Discussion "A New Era in Foreign Community Work," (paper, annual conference of International Institutes, 1933), reel 100:6, YWCA Records.

⁷³ Other members included American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Federal Council of Churches, Foreign Language Information Service, Immigrant's Protective League, League for American Citizenship, National Association of Travelers Aid Societies, National Catholic Welfare Council, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship, Protestant Episcopal Church. Daniel Erwin Weinberg, "The Foreign Language Information Service and the Foreign Born: A Case Study of Cultural Assimilation Viewed as a Problem in Social Technology" (PhD diss., U of Minnesota, 1973): 233–234.

⁷⁴ Senate Committee of Immigration, *Suspension for Two Years of General Immigration into the U.S.* 71st Cong., 3rd sess., 1930, 15–18; "Fight Proposed Ban on All Immigration," *New York Times*, Dec. 16, 1930.

⁷⁵ Foreword to *Proceedings of the 1933 Annual Conference of International Institutes* (1933), 6, YWCA Records.

⁷⁶ "Committee Named on Ellis Island," *New York Times*, June 23, 1933; Ellis Island Committee, *Report of Ellis Island Committee* (New York, 1934), 5, 122.