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Introduction

The present volume is largely comprised of articles submitted by participants in the First Jane Addams Conference on Social Entrepreneurship, which was held in Uppsala, Sweden, on November 18th–19th, 2010. The conference, hosted by the Department of Sociology, Uppsala University, was organized on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the birth of the once prominent woman sociologist, symbolic interactionist, and pragmatist Jane Addams. Addams is better known today throughout the world by means of a broad range of other identities that associate her with the settlement movement, charity, social work, the activities of public intellectuals, the progressive movement, social reform, feminism, the women’s suffrage movement, pacifism, and, above all, the Nobel Peace Prize, which she was awarded in 1931.

The First Conference

The event brought together more than 80 scholars from nine countries who represented various sociological traditions and a number of social and humanitarian sciences, including social work, psychology, philosophy, economics, media and communications, ethnology, cultural anthropology, and aesthetics. The presentations highlighted the two interrelated purposes of the conference. On the one hand, the aim was to celebrate the life and work of Jane Addams as a leading sociologist from the classical age of the discipline, who seamlessly combined social entrepreneurship with her professional role as a sociologist, working for the realization of the goals of early sociology in North America, namely, democratic social change and a better social life by means of peaceful social interaction and reform. On the other, the conference was intended to call the attention of sociologists to the burgeoning field of social entrepreneurship, in which sociology has been underrepresented, and to help social entrepreneurship root itself in sociology by association with Jane Addams’ work, symbolic interactionism, and engaged public scholarship.
A deeper motivation for organizing this conference at the Department of Sociology in Uppsala resides upon the history and development of the Department from its establishment by its first professor, the moral philosopher, sociologist, and symbolic interactionist Torgny Segerstedt. Symbolic interactionist social psychology, which forged a sociologically dominated unity of the disciplinary perspectives of sociology and psychology at the beginning of the twentieth century, has always been an essential element of the Department’s educational and research profile. For more than forty years, symbolic interactionism has been taught in Uppsala to Swedish and international students of sociology, social psychology, and a range of other disciplines in the social sciences. Following the publication of Mary Jo Deegan’s *Jane Addams and the Men from the Chicago School* in 1988, Jane Addams’ *Democracy and Social Ethics* became mandatory reading in the Department’s introductory course in symbolic interactionism, which has a particular focus on the emergence and classical period of the approach.\(^1\) Within the educational and research traditions of the Department, Jane Addams has always been regarded, along with such other celebrated scholars as Cooley, Mead, and Blumer, as a pioneer, founder, and important contributor to the emergence of not only symbolic interactionism, but also the Chicago tradition of sociology. For these reasons, it was only natural to celebrate the anniversary of Jane Addams’ birth as an important milestone for symbolic interactionism as well as sociology. In addition, recent changes in the Department’s profile that involved the introduction of a new educational program in social work were also important elements of the background for the conference insofar as they brought to the fore the controversial question of the relationship between sociology and social work, whose separation along gender lines in Addams’ Chicago a century ago is an important issue addressed in Deegan’s work.\(^2\)

Why Jane Addams?

30 years ago Mary Jo Deegan opened the case for Jane Addams being a sociologist with the claim that although Addams had been “the foremost female sociologist” during the founding years of American sociology (1892–1920), her contribution to the emergence of sociology and the establishment of its foundations in the United States had come to be “entirely overlooked.” Deegan depicted Addams as a leader in sociology who not only cleared the way for educated women without institutional affiliation to form a “separate network,” but also was a “social theorist of major pro-

\(^1\) See Jan Trost’s article in this volume.

portions” who adhered to nothing less than “a different vision of sociology than that practiced today.” Addams has never been completely forgotten, of course, primarily because of her enduring fame as a public intellectual, social reformer, pacifist, social worker, and Nobel Peace Prize winner. In addition, her recognition as a pragmatist at a time when pragmatism was not even taught in university philosophy departments, whose admirable philosophical skills of practicing “deliberative” and “cooperative rhetoric” were highly instrumental in her gaining an authoritative “voice” in public affairs concerning the identification and possible resolution of pressing social problems, has been unchallenged and enduring.

However, such recognition was not converted into an acknowledgement that she was a professional sociologist as well. Furthermore, the generation of sociologists who followed her did not regard her sociological merits as evidence of sociological professionalism – even though these included being a charter member of the American Sociological Society, an invited speaker at a number of its meetings, a lecturer in university courses, an author of sociological books and articles that were written for and published in sociological journals.

That Addams considered herself to be a sociologist and stated that her professional interests lay within sociology has also apparently had no influence upon her reputation. Albion Small, the founder of the first university department of sociology in the United States, wrote that sociology was a “movement” at the end of the nineteenth century, and that many outside academia called themselves sociologists even though not all of them contributed to the discipline, with the words and actions of some indeed being harmful to it. All that is known about Addams from biographical material and various expositions of her life and work leaves no doubt that she perfectly matches Small’s description of what distinguished the true sociologists of his time. He argues, for example, that sociologists at the turn of the twentieth century in the United States were identified by their efforts to more deliberately and definitely than any other distinguishable group... focalize scientific attention upon the active living, aspiring, striving human being, as the center from which all human valuations must be computed.

Perhaps various contemporary sociologists might find it difficult to recognize the characteristic features of their professional commitments in this description – which is more than a century old – particularly if their ca-

5 Small 1908, p. 9.
reers reside within what is known today as the “sociological mainstream.” Nonetheless, Deegan’s demand that Addams be acknowledged as an important early female sociologist, the leader of a network, and the founder of an alternative sociology that has been lost in the transformation of sociology into a modern discipline, struck a chord with certain members of the social science community. As a result, scholars have now begun to recover what was lost, referring to it as the Chicago Women’s School of Sociology, which is described as comprising a network of female scholars who linked together social theory, research, and social reform in their sociological work. This network has come to be regarded as the previously unrecognized counterpart of the male-driven Chicago School of Sociology.⁶

Insofar as Addams was the founder and acknowledged leader of a sociological tradition that has remained essentially unexplored, her case is more complex than those of the other forgotten sociologists brought up for discussion by Deegan’s challenging work. Formulated in this way, Addams’ “case” cannot simply be subsumed under a general quest to recover forgotten social scientists, nor can it be regarded as but one case among others of a more specialized search for forgotten women-sociologists from sociology’s classical age.⁷ Perhaps the successful recovery of Addams’ sociology and the reconstruction of her sociological project will in fact make it possible to uncover the meaning of the unacknowledged sociological contributions of other early women-sociologists and members of her network, who played important roles as both participants in and contributors to it.

Why Addams and Social Entrepreneurship?
The conference was not aimed solely at providing delayed recognition for an important female sociologist by acknowledging her contributions to community and society as an important social entrepreneur.

From the very beginning it declared its ambition to delve into controversial issues associated with the emergence and the institutionalization of Chicago sociology as a science committed to social change and reform. It also engaged with the advent of sociological social psychology as central to the growth and entire subsequent development of sociology in America; the birth of the tradition that eventually came to be known as symbolic interactionism, one of the distinctive features of the Chicago School; and the relation of all these to settlement sociology and the activities of the sociologically-minded residents of Hull-House. The preliminary hypothesis was that what distinguished the so-called Chicago Women’s School

---

⁷ Rynbrandt 2000.
of Sociology was that it comprised a group who acted upon their belief in a sociology that was not limited to a purely scholarly enterprise enclosed within universities, but rather operated from within life itself and, as such, was interwoven with what would today be called a social enterprise.

The conference also made clear its intention to inquire into the role of early women sociologists in these developments, particularly in respect to their methodological and theoretical sociological contributions, by focusing on arguably the most remarkable representative of this scholarly type among them. In addition, since this conference was both international and interdisciplinary in character, it took to heart the task of building new bridges between the American pragmatist and social entrepreneurial traditions and their relatively scattered European correlates; between sociology and other social sciences with overlapping theoretical interests and methodological skills; and between theoretical and applied social science traditions.

The two round tables on the second day of the conference concerning Sociology, Social Entrepreneurship, and the Future of the Social Sciences generated an interesting and lively scholarly discussion that addressed questions of significant theoretical and practical importance. Highlights included the nature of social entrepreneurial activity; its relationships to charity, sociology, and social work; its role as a harbinger of individual, community, and social well-being; as well as prominent examples of these points from around the world. Questions about the lost public role of sociology in a time of the decline of welfare states, new public management, globalization, individualization, and migration were also addressed.

The question of the relation between social entrepreneurship and social work, which was of particular interest in discussion both inside and outside the conference rooms, drew attention to a number of points well-known in the literature as topics of potential disagreement. For example, why should Addams, who was regarded for the greater part of the twentieth century as a leading social worker and charity worker, now be venerated as an important sociologist, not least when the discipline managed to make dramatic theoretical and methodological progress with no obvious reliance upon her intellectual heritage? How and why should new life be poured into sociological works that for decades have been left ignored and forgotten, with apparently no impact upon the development of sociological thought and social reality? Why is it necessary now to identify Addams as a social entrepreneur, adding yet another identity to her already extremely broad and rich identity profile? Might this not create further obstacles to recovering her sociological identity instead of assisting us in this regard? And if she was a social entrepreneur, as the conference participants believed, how
INTRODUCTION

can our knowledge of a social entrepreneur who lived a century ago help us better understand the nature of social entrepreneurship and the interest in it today? Moreover, what type of social entrepreneur was Addams? Does her life and work support a definition of social entrepreneurship as always not for profit, or does her career as a social entrepreneur fit the image of a happy marriage between social science and business? It became evident that the conference participants held two different views in this regard. There were those who believed that Addams was an outstanding example of social entrepreneurship as an entirely not-for-profit endeavor associated with morality and social ethics. Others were firmly convinced, however, that all entrepreneurship involves profitable enterprise, even when it is “social” and directed to a noble cause, and that Addams’ case was no exception.

The Follow Up

Interest in the further discussion of issues left unresolved by the First Jane Addams Conference on Social Entrepreneurship led to the organization of the Second Jane Addams Conference on Social Entrepreneurship, which was held in Uppsala in November 2011. The featured theme of the conference, which was sponsored by the Department of Sociology, Uppsala University, in cooperation with the Department of Technology and Society, University of Skövde, addressed the nature and various forms of social entrepreneurship in relation to Addams’ own entrepreneurial activity, together with her written reflections in this regard and those of other residents of Hull-House. This mini-conference attracted Swedish social scientists and practitioners with an interest in social entrepreneurship, not all of whom were convinced that Jane Addams was a good example of non-profit entrepreneurialism. The discussion centered upon the issue of for-profit and non-profit social entrepreneurship, and while it was rich in new insights, it nevertheless remained inconclusive, with further exploration being necessary. It is important to note, however, that this conference was significant in that it confirmed the central importance of the issue. It also identified the latter as a starting point for more rigorous sociological intervention in the field of social entrepreneurship insofar as it addressed key sociological issues pertaining to the no less inconclusive micro-macro sociological debate.

Certain questions not fully examined at the First and the Second Jane Addams Conferences on Social Entrepreneurship were again addressed at a subsequent major international scholarly event hosted by the Department of Sociology in Uppsala – the IVth Conference of the European
Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction (ESSSI) in August 2013 – which coincided with the celebration of the 150th birthday of George Herbert Mead, widely credited as the “Father” of symbolic interactionism and one of Addams’ important collaborators. Insofar as Addams’ work was the focus of a number of discussions at this conference, which served as a continuation of the project that began in 2010, a degree of clarity was achieved regarding the ways in which Addams was an early symbolic interactionist and a significant contributor to the tradition’s methodological and theoretical foundations.

Examining the material produced by these three conferences led to a more explicit awareness and articulation of their common overall goal – the resolution of a number of mutually interwoven and convoluted identity puzzles concerning certain complex personal, professional, institutional and disciplinary identities. The conferences taken together were thus instrumental in strengthening the conviction that addressing these questions separately has constituted a major obstacle to resolving sociology’s notorious identity crisis. In this regard, one important result of these conferences was that they made it evident that whoever undertakes the effort to examine Addams’ identity as a sociologist must also be prepared to discuss the identity of sociology as a science with a focus on certain particular issues. Major among these are the relations between the European and American traditions in sociology in its classical age; the significance of social psychology and symbolic interactionism in the formative years of sociology as a science and profession; as well as the relationship of sociology to other social and humanitarian sciences, and even to such other social spheres as politics, religion, education, and art, as important sources of influence in the crystallization of its identity profile. However, these conferences confirmed the impression that the opposite claim is also true – whoever undertakes the effort to examine sociology’s identity and tackle the question of its identity crisis should be prepared to discuss the question of the identities of Chicago sociology and the Chicago sociologists, including those who resided and carried on sociologically relevant activities at Hull-House, among whom Addams was the leading figure.

Another important motivation for a follow up in terms of publications and conferences on related issues came from the fact of a certain backlash against the notion that the sociological canon should be expanded to include newly recovered authorities on an equal footing. On the one hand, there are evident symptoms of fatigue among those who are dedicated to excavating sociology’s classical foundation, but have become discouraged by the lack of any decisive outcome of their more than three-decade long efforts. On the other, this seeming lack of progress in the quest to recover
and establish the unique contributions of “the forgotten sociologists,” of whom Addams is the most prominent example, has made it possible for supporters of the dominant historiographies to recover momentum after the initially successful attack on the sociological canon as deficient and biased. The view that the exclusion of certain classical sociologists from the sociological canon was justified by their lack of contributions of acceptable quality appeared again in the discourse as supposedly supported by the very results of the quest to include them.

It thus appears that all the early women sociologists who had been nominated for inclusion in the canon have been disqualified on the supposed grounds of inherent shortcomings in their social thought, with some being criticized for presenting ideas that are “fiercely contested” today, particularly in respect to race and gender. Certain of the papers in this volume indicate that charges in this regard were leveled even against Addams, and that the case against her has not yet been closed. For example, both Deegan and Hill present observations about the unreliable grounds for such claims that encourage another and more thorough review not just of Addams’ thought, but also of her expositors’ interpretations and the positions from which they have been launched. Stated otherwise, what Luhmann termed “second order cybernetics” has become necessary, namely, an observation of the observations of those who observed Addams in order to identify their blind spots and the nature of the ground upon which they stood.

Acknowledging that Addams was an important classical sociologist, and that the settlement sociologists at Hull-House made significant contributions to the emergence of sociology, has proven to be no easy task. It involves nothing less than abandoning the preconception that sociology, although it was a modern social science of both the conscious and unconscious facets of society and social life, merely had to meet the same accepted standards that allegedly applied to any science in general. However, celebrating Addams not only as an important classical figure in sociology, but also as one of its founders, does not imply that we have to abandon “the entire ‘science, cumulation, and theory narrative,’” as has at times been assumed. It rather implies that we have to enrich it with a new narrative that makes possible the growth of science as a whole because it accommodates the true story of the coming into being of the modern sciences as products of radically new social conditions in a world that outgrew its civilizational childhood and could no longer be subordinated to the rules of patriarchic fathers, kings, and queens. This also implies that the relationship between

---

8 Law 2011, p. 2.
9 Turner 2014.
democracy and the emergence of social science – particularly the reasons why sociology could not be institutionalized before the age of democracy and the expansion of civilization into a new world without a royal history – has finally come into focus, been properly understood, and recognized as decisive. Against this background, the fear that recognizing the roles played by Addams and other women in the so-called classical age of sociology would somehow jeopardize the idea of science as a whole is manifestly ungrounded. Without studying Addams' sociology on its own terms and comprehending her vision of sociology as a unity of theory, method, and practice, one can hardly claim the authority to judge it as bereft of a concern “with sociology as a discipline,” or as having no “special vision for the future of sociology, and a methodological program to get it there.”

Claims that including Addams in the canon would supposedly constitute both a sign of tolerance of her “disdain” for “ivory tower” male sociologists, and an expression of a preference for a type of sociology comprised of publicly accepted “experts” solely interested in social reform, are no more than mental obstacles that need to be eliminated so that new interpretations of sociology’s past, together with new visions concerning her present and future scientific and social roles, may come to light. In this respect, the present volume may be regarded as a response to that “distanced appreciation for sociology” and its research field which regards as problematic efforts to integrate an “abstract concern for theoretical truth” with the “task of converting students with passions for social change into sociologists with an objective eye.” It thus displays a commitment to questioning the authority of the numerous pessimistic prognoses of sociology’s future that began appearing after the introduction of humanist and feminist concerns into the discipline. On the one hand, sociology’s further development has been depicted as marked by progressive amnesia, the abandonment of its initial scientific standards, and the adoption of an ever greater distance from its early days as an academic discipline, when it had its own public as well as its own authority based upon scientific competence, entrepreneurial enthusiasm, and successful participation in society’s efforts to resolve social problems and improve social life. On the other, sociology is presented as facing the loss both of its concern with theoretical truth, and its capacity for abstract theorizing, which leads in turn to the loss of its status as an “objective science.” It would then be fated to a gradual return to the partisanship and commitment to empowering the powerless of its early

10 Ibid.
11 Ibid., p. 5.
12 Ibid., p. 117.
days. From the point of view of the present volume, a glimpse into the “meaningful future of sociology” should not be expected to arise “from the comfortable remove of a philosopher’s chair,” where a critique of sociology is formulated from an observation position external to the discipline. One is instead convinced that old philosophy of science biases with no sociological concerns have been seamlessly woven into the very fabric of self-reflexive sociological thinking, notwithstanding the official narrative of sociology’s emergence and institutionalization as a modern science – and that they have been responsible for the unsuccessful, but persistent efforts to force sociology into the Procrustean bed of standard positive science. Rather than provide sociology with a stable scientific identity, this has led to a deep-seated and wide-ranging identity crisis.

The intention underlying this volume will be realized if it encourages new explorations into sociology’s classical past aimed at recovering forgotten historical facts and dissociating them from mistaken interpretations that gave sociology the false consciousness of being a supposedly man-made and male driven science born into a man’s world, from which women were either entirely absent, or present only at the margins as imperfect followers of the men who were leading the way. The goal is to supply sociology with a well-balanced and sufficiently broad classical foundation that can not only provide an historical consciousness to all the various types of sociology practiced today, but also remove the blinders that have prevented scholars from viewing women as more than deficient players in a man’s game made for men. The point is to change the image of women in science, for while they have long been presented as handmaidens, they were in fact, no less than men, the leaders and creators of social games in which the roles were unbiased and thus suitable for everyone.

In light of the discernable decline of interest in the forgotten sociologists in recent years, there are even more reasons than before to publish a selection of presentations from the First Jane Addams Conference on Social Entrepreneurship, some of which preserve the initial spirit of the gathering, while others have been significantly revised in response to subsequent events, challenges, and research. The sentiment is that not only has the quest for new and more inclusive interpretations of the history of sociology not yet reached its conclusion, it may well still be in its beginning phase.

---

13 Sica 2015, p. 147.
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Who is Addams in Sociology?

The contents of this volume reflect the initial idea of the First Jane Addams Conference on Social Entrepreneurship. They are not limited to the keynote presentations of experts who have a profound knowledge of Addams’ work and thought, but also comprise a focused discussion with professional sociologists who possess expertise in a variety of research fields. This volume thus comprises a collection of sociological views involving who Jane Addams was and what she stands for today as they are represented by the various areas within sociology in which the speakers have their primary expertise.

Mary Jo Deegan’s opinion about Addams is well known from her extensive efforts to bring to light her contributions to sociology. In the present volume she introduces Addams as a feminist pragmatist and leading sociologist who founded the Hull-House School of Sociology and promoted a new “third-way” social vision concerning the most important social issues of the time. However, the particular purpose of Deegan’s paper is to confront certain misrepresentations of Addams’ views as well as myths about her values and commitments which emerged as a result of misinterpretations that reside upon insufficient factual knowledge about Addams’s world and the activities at Hull-House. Deegan chose to focus upon what she identified as the four most important areas of Addams’ work – race, class, gender, and peace – in order to challenge offhand qualifications of Addams as “racist, bourgeois, essentialist, anti-feminist, and weakly committed to peace.” She regards such unsubstantiated charges as having unjustifiably, but grossly harmed Addams’ scholarly image.

Jan Trost’ Addams is a “great sociologist,” social psychologist, and symbolic interactionist, whose sociological works continue to fascinate and inspire both scholars and students of sociology to this day. Trost regards her most impressive theoretical ideas to be “the definition of the situation,” which developed into a basic symbolic interactionist concept, as well as her view that democracy was synonymous with social ethics and constituted a replacement for the outmoded notion of charity. He views another very important element of her contribution to sociology to be her idea of “sympathetic understanding and introspection,” which is not only necessary for acquiring an understanding of social experiences – both ours and that of others – and the social order, but also a prerequisite for empathic action – helping people help themselves. Trost thus in effect maintains that on these two points Addams anticipates both W. I. Thomas and Charles Cooley, who are closely associated with these two theoretical principles. For Trost there is no doubt that Addams was a social entrepreneur, and he considers her social entrepreneurship to be one of the major reasons why
Addams’ spirit is “still alive even among those who have never heard of her and her important work.”

Andrea Salvini depicts Addams as a social scientist and pragmatist whose legacy has exerted an important influence within Italian social science over the last twenty years, particularly in the field of professional social work. This fact can be explained by reference to the need for new theoretical themes and methodologies to complement those found in Mary Richmond’s work. Most important in this regard are Addams’s views concerning the relations between theory, research, and social action, and her notion of “knowledge as a social endeavor,” which implies that reality is lived, intersubjectively documented, and changed according to need. Addams was also an early promoter of sociological methods that “give voice” to the people, including action research, participatory observation, and ethnography. Salvini views these methods as particularly important for the study of dramatically changing social realities, such as those which Addams herself investigated. They have a more general importance for transforming modalities of intervention “from a focus on individual cases to a focus on the community” that includes new forms of action.

In Robert Dingwall’s account, Addams was a social reformer associated with the “first generation” of Chicago sociologists who were inspired by Spencer’s approach to sociology, but also appalled by his “indifference to human suffering,” the values associated with his evolutionary ecological model, and the human consequences of laissez-faire. Dingwall refers in this regard to the growing distance between economics and sociology in Addams’ time, with the former supporting the dissociation of ethics from the technology of government and thus abandoning the issues of the “good society” and the moral order of markets, while the latter aimed at integrating the moral with the technical and constraining “the unbridged pursuit of riches.” At this venture emerges the agenda for sociology that inspired efforts to apply “its findings and lessons in the form of social enterprise” and explain its commitment to “not ‘let social evil work out its own salvation.’” Addams was also a pacifist with “radical associations” who was more isolated from mainstream politics than were her contemporary intellectuals who were attracted to Communism. He claims that just like them, however, she could not find “a coherent doctrine to justify her efforts.” Dingwall argues that such justification may follow from focusing on social entrepreneurship, and from shifting our concern from the question of local and global social justice to the questions of peace, citizenship, and the resolution of social conflicts since it is to such goals that social entrepreneurship may best contribute.
Lauren Langman depicts Addams as a “mover of movements.” She was a brilliant intellectual, the most important female reformer of the progressive era, a social activist who led the settlement house movement, and “a social movement entrepreneur” who mobilized social movements. In this sense she expanded the sociological understanding of social entrepreneurship and provided “a role model for our own lives” as sociologists, while the settlement house movement under her leadership became “a model of social entrepreneurship.” But although Addams is often deemed to have been a “revolutionary,” Langman emphasizes that this has little, if anything, to do with the traditional understanding of the term since she, as a progressive reformer, participated in the movement “that would ultimately preserve the nature of American capitalism,” not in the movement that struggled to abolish it. Langman nevertheless maintains that revisiting Addams’ life and work today is important for the sociology of social movements in a twofold way – it not only leads to a better understanding of the process of becoming of a leader, but also encourages a rethinking of the sociology of social movements itself, which at the moment has very little to say about the “intersection of history and biography” and the role of the agent of social change.

The aim of Ivo Zander’s contribution is not to present the economist’s point of view on either Addams, her entrepreneurship, or her intellectual heritage. He rather seeks to extend a challenge to the sociological community, on behalf of economics, that celebrates Addams as a social entrepreneur in order to inspire sociologists to “make significant contributions” to social entrepreneurship by “filling in the gaps in the extant knowledge.” Zander contends that economics regards social entrepreneurship as a research field “specific to sociology” because of its focus on social value and social movements, rather than on profit and new business opportunities. He emphasizes that there is thus a need for vigorous and frequent contributions to the field on the part of sociologists, particularly in respect to the application of the substantial body of sociological knowledge in working towards an understanding of the basic social mechanism involved in social entrepreneurship, including the elaboration of its key concepts and issues.

For Per Wisselgren, Addams was a social reformer and social entrepreneur, with connections to the contemporary Swedish social entrepreneurial scene, who played a leading role in women’s domestic and international peace movements and was strongly committed to “efforts to inculcate peace in society.” He regarded her knowledge creation geared towards practical work and “researched-based reforms” to be an important element of her pragmatist-inspired entrepreneurial activity. Wisselgren argues that the international women’s peace movement and the emerging new social
 sciences were not “entirely separate arenas” insofar as they were focused on the same social issues. He claims that this fact indicates that studying Addams’ life and work is perhaps the best way in which to reveal the gendered creation of social knowledge.

Michael Hill’s Addams is an “outstanding sociologist” who represents an alternative and creative model of sociological work outside academia, within a constellation of models of sociology as a vocation. The latter include that of Addams’ friend and admirer Charlotte Perkins Gilman. Hill argues that one element of these women’s professional lives that rendered them “alternative” was what he terms their “central entrepreneurial basis.” The vulnerability of their collective heritage to marginalization and “intellectual hijacking” for destructive ends is associated with their progressive ideas, advocacy, and courageous actions, which taken together comprise an intellectual basis for the introduction of social change. In this regard, their alleged racism and “exuberant lesbianism” were used as examples of issues that supposedly discredited the progressive and innovative ideas that were produced at Hull-House.

Rita Braches-Chyrek’s Addams was a scholar who framed her ideas about the application of knowledge in modern life within the context of the settlement movement and played an important role in theoretical discussions addressing social work and its establishment as an academic discipline and profession in Germany. Important in this regard were Addams’ emphasis on the link between practice, theory, and action; her concerns about social ethics as the basis of democracy; and her focus on the humanist and moral aspects of assistance rather than on monetary assistance. She contends that, within the context of social work, further research is needed concerning Addams’ role within the international political debate; her work as the head of Hull-House, where she was surrounded by both social workers and reformers; and the importance of her views regarding intercultural education within a European context. Braches-Chyrek’s discussion also extends a challenge to feminist democratic theorists who hold a “negative view of the social as a bureaucratic structure of control,” encouraging them to abandon their “truncated materialist version” of Addams. She argues that they should instead build upon her key insight that “the engendering democracy rests on socializing it,” which implies a reevaluation of her “theory/activist approach to formulating and enforcing social welfare policy.”

For Miriam Adelman, Addams was an intellectual, writer, and activist who became one of the early women social protagonists as well as a leader in the historical struggle for the recognition of the personal stories, experiences, and subjectivities of migrants who come from outside the center.
She argues that this latter point was picked up and carried further by postcolonial theory. Addams’ struggles, both academic and extra-academic, for social change, with a focus on women’s increased mobility, their possibilities to cross a variety of social borders, and their participation in exchanges on a global scale, make her life and work relevant to modern sociology.

Erik Schneiderhan’s Addams is not only “one of sociology’s greatest thinkers and activists,” but also “our greatest public sociologist” who additionally made an important contribution to pragmatist theory. Schneiderhan focuses on one particular aspect of Addams’ work in his reflection on creativity and pragmatism, namely, her notion of “perplexity,” an issue that Dewey discussed some years later. He further identifies Addams’ notion of the non-habitual, which stems from perplexity and leads to “experimentation” and creativity, as central to her theory and practice of helping others at Hull-House. Schneiderhan reveals an important dialectics by which pragmatist thought, as “grounded in perplexity,” encourages experimentation and pragmatic non-habitual actions that lead to growth and, in turn, encourage new perplexities which condition further experimentation. He notes, however, that Addams’ ideas in this regard, along with their potential to inform creative practices, remain unutilized today.

Mark Hutter’s Addams is “a pivotal figure” in late nineteenth-century tenement house reform and in the conceptualization of the intellectual foundations of the settlement movement. His particular focus is on Addams’ conception of the reciprocal dependence between classes, which challenges the common belief that urban poverty in Chicago was an immigrant phenomenon. His example of the situation of New Orleans after Hurricane Katarina encourages us to revisit Addams’ intellectual heritage and gain a new appreciation of her ideals of political and social democracy, which are based upon mutual respect. Hutter finds Addams’s discussions of “race antagonism” and segregation, as well as her conviction that “African-Americans could become fully integrated into the larger American culture and make significant cultural contributions,” to be particularly relevant to modern sociological debates about social problems that are entangled with issues of race and native cultures. He also observes that the history of African-Americans in New Orleans, including their success in developing a vibrant and exciting cultural life and invigorating New Orleans’ “symbolic economy,” provide strong support for such beliefs. Hutter argues, in line with Addams’ understanding of the need for cooperation among all classes, well to do and poor alike, in improving sub-standard community and social conditions and building social democracy for the benefit of all, that the contributions of all citizens, from every cultural and
class background, are needed to rebuild communities that have suffered from social or natural disasters.

Vessela Misheva’s Addams is a sociologist who regarded sociology as both a science and a social enterprise. This explains how and why she was able to successfully play the roles of sociologist and social entrepreneur, seamlessly combining them in one and the same professional profile. Misheva’s paper, which represents an elaborated version of her presentations at the three interrelated conferences described above, traces the emergence and development of her conception of the nature of Addams’ distinctive contribution to sociology as a founder of microsociology. The discussion of the various designations of Addams’ activities at Hull-House as charity work, philanthropy, applied sociology, settlement sociology, and social work helps to build the argument for the hypothesis that Hull-House was the prototype of a not-for-profit social enterprise that embodied a conception of sociology that linked the production of true knowledge about social life to the production of social value. Addams’ sociological enterprise consequently became a driving force for the emergence of a number of radically new social enterprises, including the establishment of academic sociology and social work as autonomous sciences, through the creation of the scientific and social conditions necessary for their development and institutionalization. Addams is thus given scientific credit for being both the founder of microsociology and a pioneer social entrepreneur. She left a wealth of autoethnographic sociological records that may well prove invaluable for advancing our knowledge concerning the essence and main principles of social entrepreneurship, which distinguishes it from traditional entrepreneurship, as well as the socio-psychological motives and social forces that bring it into being.

* * * * *

The purpose of the conferences was neither to invite speakers who shared a common perspective on Addams’ identity, nor reduce the differences in the views presented such that the contributors would appear to be speaking with one and the same voice. The variety of views were rather celebrated as illustrating the enduring significance of Addams’ ideas and legacy for sociology in the anticipation that this will foster the return of Addams’ case, which Mary Jo Deegan first opened, to the agenda of sociology. The series of conferences that this volume represents supports the demand for a revision of Addams’ status as a forgotten sociologist, whose contributions to sociological theory, methodology, and practice supposedly remain unclear, or at least of no relevance or value for modern sociological thought.
and concerns. This new revision is particularly necessary in light of the large-scale changes in our social reality that are underway today, which certain contributors to this volume have revealed as being no less significant and dramatic than the circumstances in which Addams, her collaborators from Hull-House, and her colleagues from the University of Chicago lived and worked. Their efforts to not only encourage the transformation of a society at the turn of the twentieth century that was marked by rapid industrialization and modernization into a truly democratic ethical society, but also foster the emergence of a truly scientific sociology, as both a social and humanistic science, in order to help attain this goal, continue to retain their meaning and significance today.

Although the publication of these extended conference presentations in the series *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Sociologica Upsaliensia* signals the end of a project that attempted to invigorate two different discussions in the social sciences – those involving Addams’ contribution to sociology and sociology’s contribution to the interdisciplinary research field of social entrepreneurship – by linking them together, it can also be regarded as having prepared the ground for other, more ambitious sociological projects. In this sense, the fundamental significance of this collection of papers is that it illuminates more clearly than previously the contours of the larger and still unresolved problem of sociology’s own emergence, identity, and canon.

The three Uppsala conferences have removed all reasonable doubt that Addams’ thought and intellectual heritage are of great relevance and value for sociological discussions on a wide range of research fields today. They have also served to indicate that the addition of social entrepreneurship as a research interest in respect to Addams’ contributions to the emergence and the institutionalization of sociology as a science is particularly useful. Doing so has not only provided new possibilities for interpreting the relationship between Addams’ intellectualism and activism in sociologically relevant terms, it has also lent further support to the case that Hull-House was an important location for the birth and early development of sociology.

That which has been attained today by what may be termed Addams scholarship is impressive. It reveals Addams as a prolific writer and a key figure in classical sociology who must be taken into account in any serious attempt to reconstruct the sociological canon. Further progress in this regard depends, however, on the degree of success enjoyed by the still ongoing efforts of committed social scientists to plead Addams’ case. While much has been done to reveal one or another reason why Addams should be regarded as a major early sociologist, the essence and significance of her
ambitious sociological project, and how her work has shaped the discipline, have yet to be fully grasped.

The hope is that the present volume will contribute to further endeavors in this regard by generating new insights and inspiration for the work that has yet to be completed.

Vessela Misheva
Uppsala, 2018

Literature
Editor's Note

On behalf of the editors, I wish to draw your attention to a donation made by Mary Jo Deegan and Michael R. Hill to Uppsala University on the occasion of the First Jane Addams Conference on Social Entrepreneurship. The item in question is a rare copy of Charlotte Perkins Gilman's first book, Gems of Art for the Home and Fireside, which was published in 1888 by J. A. and R. A. Reid, Providence, Rhode Island.

This donation was received by Prof. Vessela Misheva in conjunction with Dr. Hill's conference presentation, which served to broaden the conference theme in that it was not focused on Jane Addams' own work. Dr. Hill's discussion highlighted the fact that the emergence of sociology can be connected not only with the social entrepreneurial efforts of outstanding individual women sociologists, such as Addams, but also with the more general phenomenon of women's social entrepreneurship. Although the latter is widely discussed today in the scholarly literature, it remains insufficiently explored in both theoretical and historical terms.

Gilman, a near exact contemporary of Addams, was one of the early women sociologists, social entrepreneurs, reformers, feminists, writers, and lecturers whose contributions to the nascent discipline of sociology and to social entrepreneurship have long been left out of consideration in mainstream thinking. Since the question of how influential figures later took upon themselves the responsibility of deciding who should and should not be regarded as thinkers worthy of recognition in the formation and establishment of sociology is discussed at some length in the collection below, we will only note here that Gilman's work has received scant scholarly attention from sociologists until recently. The main themes she addressed involve the need to transform marriage, the family, and the home in order to better the quality of life in general, and her numerous public lectures engage such questions as women's issues, ethics, labor, human rights, and social reform. The approach she took turns upon the view that the participation of women in public life and the professions is of essential importance for the improvement of marriage, motherhood, social justice,
and economic life. But although Gilman was a well-known suffragist, she did not believe that social progress depended solely upon women having the right to vote. She argued that it was also necessary to broaden people's minds, stimulate their thinking, and encourage hope and initiative so that both men and women would be emboldened to undertake action that would lead to progressive social change.

Gilman, who was a trained and accomplished artist, believed that art played an important role in this process. She was first drawn to art by watching Harriet Beecher Stowe, her great aunt and the author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, paint watercolor still lifes, but did not take up a professional career in art because of her underlying commitment to improving society as a whole, not least of all the lives of women. Gilman was convinced, however, of the positive value of the influence of art not only in public spaces, but especially in the life of the home and upon the development of children insofar as acquiring an appreciation of beauty generates compassion for others and stimulates joy. This idea is associated with Gilman's own writings and publications, which include a long list of poetry, short stories, drama, novels, and novellas that illustrate sociological concepts in addition to her non-fiction works. Much of Gilman's most influential published material, such as *The Yellow Wallpaper*, relies upon the expression of conceptually and experientially significant issues in literary form, and this appears to be the case in a certain sense with *Gems of Art* as well.

*Gems of Art for the Home and Fireside* was little known until recent years, with both scholars and collectors of rare books seemingly unaware of its existence. This is in part the case because it was authored under her married name at the time, Mrs. Charles Walter Stetson, but Gilman herself discussed it neither in her autobiography, nor in her diaries. Consequently, we have at the moment no way of knowing the circumstances under which it was published, the number of copies issued, the price, how the books were sold, and details about her contract with the publisher.

The text is a large format, handsomely designed collection of 104 pages in length consisting of forty-nine black and white illustrations of famous works of art accompanied by Gilman's eloquent narratives concerning them and their impact. It comprises what we would today call a coffee-table book, intended to be a subject of conversation in the sitting room. It was not meant to be a scholarly work, but rather was designed to be a beautiful object that itself contained other objects of beauty and would hold a prominent place in the middle of the home. It would display works of art in casual moments to members of the family and their friends. Perhaps we may then assume that *Gems of Art* was an early demonstration of Gilman's conviction that coming to understand beauty, particularly in the setting of
the home, would serve to expand the minds of men, women, and children so that they might eventually become capable of viewing themselves and society in a new light, thereby act in accordance with humanistic ideals, and help foster social reform.

This donation to the *First Jane Addams Conference on Social Entrepreneurship* calls to mind a period in which progressive thinkers first began examining how changes in family life, in the roles held by women, and in the upbringing of children comprised prerequisites for larger-scale changes in society. Charlotte Perkins Gillman was one of the brightest leading lights in that movement for forty years. We are honored to have received an example of her early work that symbolizes the value of her contributions to the promotion of human rights, social reform, and women’s rights, as well as her desire to improve the lives of all.¹

*Andrew Blasko*
*Uppsala, 2018*

I.

Sociological Concerns:
Ethics, Theory, Research, and Action
Introduction

Jane Addams was a charismatic intellectual and community activist who changed the world. Many scholars today study her life and invest much energy seeking to understand her, but I wish to advance a thesis that I hope will be controversial: Despite our efforts, we know very little about Addams as well as her influence upon a broad range of leaders and everyday people who have carried on and enacted her ideas and practices.

I can present two examples from my own work to support this thesis. In 2002 I published a book on Addams and race relations after I had learned that a number of scholars were writing matter-of-factly that she was a racist. I found this common assertion shocking and entered into a long journey in order to examine her work on this topic. I discovered that Addams and about 70 other people fought against racial discrimination by generating a third way that fostered a new view and approach concerning this ancient evil. This third way challenged almost the entire literature on race relations in the United States, which suggested that only one path was radical and righteous. This so-called correct response demanded that everything and everyone who chose a different path to equality was explicitly racist or, at the very least, accommodationist. From this perspective, W.E.B. DuBois supposedly represented the morally right position, while his enemy Booker T. Washington was taken to objectively support racism because of his accommodationism. Although Addams was a friend of both men, her alliance with DuBois had been forgotten and her alliance with Washington was interpreted as irretrievably racist. In order to understand this paradox, I needed to understand how Addams viewed both of them as compatible allies, as great teachers and leaders, who were supportive of her ideas and practices. Her third way refused to view either of these men as enemies of the black community, and she drew from the work and vision of each in her continuing battle to finally bring an end to the social con-
tinuation of the American Civil War. Her approach, which characterized the lives of her 70-plus allies in Chicago, represented a new and often successful pattern of race relations that had been ignored for almost a century.

Similarly, Anna-Maria Wahl and I introduced and edited a collection of articles by Ellen Gates Starr in 2003. Although Starr had co-founded Hull-House with Addams, this was the first book on a remarkable scholar and activist who was central both to Addams’ undertaking and to life in the Hull-House neighborhood. These two publications illustrate the fact that a very large group of Addams’ friends and allies have not been studied. Learning about this vast network who worked directly with Addams is key to gaining a deeper understanding of her impact on the world. I will briefly examine in the discussion below how to approach this largely under-researched world of Hull-House and Jane Addams, and will begin by presenting my understanding of how Addams created a worldwide vision that emerged from a group process located in a concrete historical moment in the American city of Chicago.

I have chosen to discuss four specific areas of Addams’ work – race, class, gender, and peace – because they are particularly important and controversial today. In addition, certain scholars have criticized Addams as racist, bourgeois, essentialist, anti-feminist, and weakly committed to peace. I will examine these incorrect readings of Addams as well in order to cast light on some of the reasons why Addams has been so misunderstood.

I will first address what I term feminist pragmatism, which is the theory of ideas and action underlying her work.

Feminist Pragmatism

“Feminist pragmatism” is an American theory that unites liberal values and a belief in a rational public with a cooperative, nurturing, and liberating model of the self, the other, and the community. Furthermore, the type of practical work that follows from this theoretical position must be carried out nonviolently. Education and democracy are significant mechanisms for organizing and improving society, while nonviolence allows for freedom as actions and values are exchanged between the self and other.

Feminist pragmatists study social behavior and believe that each individual is born with rudimentary and flexible instincts or impulses. Infants primarily learn by observing, imitating, and responding to the gestures of others, particularly their parents. They can then abstract the meaning of gestures, particularly vocal gestures, and become able to generalize about the other, the group, the community, and institutions. This process enables the individual to develop a mind, intelligence, a self, and the ability to take
the role of the other. The self learns the organized attitudes of the community towards social situations, and people sharing the same neighborhood and community develop shared experience, which is the greatest of human goods. This great human resource of shared experience fueled Addams’ work. A very important insight that follows from the views of feminist pragmatism is that the self emerges from others and is not in conflict with others unless it is taught to be in conflict. In addition, education is a major way in which to learn about one’s community, participate in group decisions, and become a citizen.

Feminist pragmatism inspired the work of Addams, her friends and colleagues, and everyday people as well. Not only was feminist pragmatism adapted and expanded by other social scientists, it came to be enacted in varying degrees by hundreds of thousands of Americans and through worldwide movements for peace and justice. At least three patterns of leadership, different areas of specialization, and bureaucratic structures coordinated this work, from the neighborhood level to an international worldview and consciousness.

Prior to 1920 six male sociologists were pragmatists from the University of Chicago: G. H. Mead, John Dewey, W. I. Thomas, Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess, and Charles Zueblin. In addition to these male faculty members, five female sociologists, all feminist pragmatists, were also on the faculty at the University: Edith Abbott, Sophonisba Breckinridge, Annie Marion MacLean, Marion Talbot, and Mary McDowell. However, these women held gendered and less prestigious positions than the men. A series of women also taught sociology through the Extension Division of the University, including Addams and Florence Kelley. MacLean held her position in the Extension Division from 1903 until her death in 1934, while the other four women worked in three units affiliated with the Department of Sociology – Household Administration, the University of Chicago Social Settlement (UCSS), and the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy (CSCP) – which are discussed below.

Creating Feminist Pragmatist Leaders in a Democracy

As an intellectual, Addams attracted a core group of close friends who literally made themselves central to each others’ lives. As a group these leaders created an institutional powerhouse – they consciously changed the world and needed each other to do so. This group was composed of unmarried professional women – Edith and Grace Abbott, Emily Greene Balch, Sophonisba Breckinridge, Alice Hamilton, Julia Lathrop, and Mary

1 Deegan 1978.
McDowell, to name only a few— all of whom became famous. I refer to this powerful and intimate world of intellectuals, world leaders, and friends, which emerged from an American tradition of female friendship that flourished in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as the “Chicago female world of love and ritual.”

A large segment of this world institutionalized a particular sociological theory and praxis, namely, the Hull-House School of Sociology (HHSS). Although there are sixteen areas of specialization in the HHSS, only a small portion of these have been studied. The topics of immigration, poverty, social work, and urban life are most often discussed, but the four areas I am examining today, as well as such others as ecology, play, art, museum studies, and autobiography, are rarely analyzed. But the sociologists in the HHSS wrote hundreds of books and thousands of articles. They also founded and led dozens of social movement organizations, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the National Urban League (NUL), the National Consumers’ League (NCL), the Women’s Trade Union League (WTUL), the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

Addams also inspired the work of intellectuals and activists, both men and women, who were married, such as Samuel and Henrietta Barnett, Louise deKoven Bowen, W.E.B. DuBois, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Henry Demerest Lloyd, Florence Kelley, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, and Fannie Barrier Williams. This latter group—a vast array of people who worked closely with Addams, usually for decades—have been studied as part of Addams’ intellectual circle far less than the first. In fact, some of these intellectuals have mistakenly been identified as opposed to Addams. Michael Hill and I have documented this type of error for Addams and Gilman, and I have studied the same type of misperception concerning Addams, DuBois, and Wells-Barnett. Addams included twelve of these friends and intellectual leaders, many of whom were involved in social justice projects before they met Addams or visited Hull-House, in her moving book on friendship and death.

Young people were also drawn into this network of hope and power, and were taught feminist pragmatist ideas and practices at Hull-House and at the University of Chicago. They established life-long commitments to each other and their shared vision. In addition, they often became officers

---

2 Deegan 1996.
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in voluntary organizations through which they legitimated feminist pragmatism, and they brought everyday people into these groups as well.

A second type of leader emerged from Chicago citizens who were inspired by American dreams and values that are foundational to feminist pragmatism. These established adults often led Chicago churches, civic clubs, and social reform institutions. These community leaders attracted, in turn, a third group consisting of grassroots leaders who were often involved in one or two organizations with very specific goals. These everyday citizens thus became connected with other leaders, which provided for direct communication concerning invigorating ideas and practices with both specialized and general goals throughout all these groups. This powerful world was also connected directly with Addams’ neighborhood and the everyday citizens living there.

Race
Addams wrote extensively on the black experience, but few of these essays are read today. She based her ideas on the work of her father, an abolitionist, and his friend Abraham Lincoln. The many Civil War veterans whom Addams knew as a child also inspired her to continue their unfinished battle into the next century. Some Hull-House residents, particularly Edith Abbott, Julia Lathrop, Florence Kelley, and Mary McDowell, shared this commitment as well as Addams’ family background in abolitionism. The Chicago pragmatists, especially Mead, Dewey, Park, Zeublin, and Thomas, were also dedicated to this cause. In addition, a number of African American intellectual leaders, including W.E.B. DuBois, Margaret and Booker T. Washington, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, and Fannie Barrier Williams, worked closely with Addams on the issues of racial justice and liberation. Addams also befriended many African Americans who worked in the community, particularly in black social settlements and civil rights organizations.

The multiple interactions among pragmatists and between them and the black community led to the founding of the NAACP and the NUL as well as their respective Chicago branches, the CAACP and the CUL. The NAACP and the NUL have often been viewed as competing and opposed organizations because the NAACP was associated with W.E.B. DuBois and the NUL with Booker T. Washington at a time when each man defined the other as his enemy. The pragmatists from Chicago, however, developed a third perspective that combined interracial cooperation, a refusal to choose between Washington and DuBois, and a radical opposition to racism. This third way emerged from the pragmatist commitment to avoid dichotomies and to practice nonviolence. Pragmatists favored the development of an
international consciousness and political apparatus, promoted the study of African American life and culture, and sought to develop practices that would eliminate racial inequality and social injustice, especially in the legal system and the marketplace. They thereby became crucial to changing race relations in the United States.\(^6\)

Addams worked closely with feminist pragmatists and black community leaders in a series of black social settlements, first in Chicago and then across the United States. These settlements, in turn, worked with black club women, and the two types of organizations drew in thousands of black women. Black women usually headed these social settlements and clubs, and Addams was often an advisor, fund-raiser, and club member during a period when interactions in the United States between these two groups of women were characterized by segregation and animosity. Mary McDowell, who chaired several important inter-racial committees from 1919–1936, shared in these activities and this role with Addams.\(^7\)

Because few scholars have studied the relations between Addams and African Americans, many of them make the false assumption that Addams was a racist, regardless of the facts. She worked with both DuBois and Washington, however, and refused to make either of them her enemy. And while Addams was committed to nonviolence and co-operation, the study of black and white relations in the United States has been dominated by either integrationist or conflict models. Similar biases can also be found in studies of Addams and class relations.

Class

The feminist pragmatists encouraged the study of social class and labor relations and analyzed the processes of work, unionization, and worker exploitation. Not only was Chicago a center of union organizing at this time, the women also endeavored to adapt Fabian socialism to the creation of an American welfare state.\(^8\) During the 1890s these core intellectuals worked closely with then Governor Peter Altgeld to enact legislation to end child labor. They were later integral to the development of a Federal Children’s Bureau, which provided information and collected data to help achieve children’s optimal development. The Bureau established many public policies, such as initiating birth and death registries for children; supporting well-baby clinics; and investigating infant, child, and maternal mortality,

\(^6\) Deegan 2002a, b.

\(^7\) Deegan 1988b, 2002b.

\(^8\) Small preferred the more conservative model of the German welfare state with a major role for academic experts.
juvenile delinquency, child labor, mothers’ pensions, and nutrition. Feminist pragmatists widely distributed the information thus obtained as well as advice to thousands of young mothers. They worked through women community leaders in a vast network of women’s clubs, particularly the Chicago Women’s Club, involving hundreds of thousands of women. This work has been documented by Theda Skocpol and Joanne L. Goodwin, but these writers lack a theory of leadership, which was so crucial to the feminist pragmatists.

The feminist pragmatists emphasized urban sociology, the benefits of city life and urban planning, as well as working to solve the problems of poor housing and sanitation. They studied criminology, focusing on juvenile delinquency, the court system, and notions of justice. The feminist pragmatists, in conjunction with Chicago clubwomen, faculty wives, and female faculty and students in the UCSS, were instrumental in establishing a series of world-class institutions associated with juvenile delinquency and justice. They founded the world’s first Juvenile Court in 1899; developed probation and parole as institutions to reconnect juvenile offenders with the community; and helped to found the family court system, the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute, and the Institute for Juvenile Research. Mead and Henderson were also involved in some of these groups.

The women also studied and practiced the process of making and enjoying art, connecting art and paid labor, and art and the home. Addams and her allies, especially Charles and Rho Zueblin, played major roles in the creation of the Chicago Arts and Crafts Society, one of the most important arts and crafts societies in the United States, which was partially based on John Ruskin, Charles Ashbee, and the British group that emerged from Toynbee Hall.

The feminist pragmatist welfare state applied the epistemology and praxis that was developed in this way to the state apparatus, which led to the creation of a system of social welfare with strong support for women and children. Several wives of male Chicago sociologists, most notably Clara Cahill Park, became significant figures in this massive social movement. They campaigned for the Progressive Party and worked closely with former President Theodore Roosevelt and, later, with Robert La Follette. These women helped establish numerous government agencies,
notably the Children’s, Women’s, and Immigration Bureaus. Through such groups they created a new welfare state, what I call the “feminist pragmatist welfare state.” Their applied sociology emerged directly from their conceptual apparatus – feminist pragmatism.

Teaching Feminist Pragmatism in the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1904–1920

Feminist pragmatism is fundamentally connected with citizens’ rights and the voice of the community. The development of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy (CSCP) at the University of Chicago emerged from this same commitment. Its primary founders were Graham Taylor, a Baptist minister, sociologist, and head of the Chicago Commons social settlement, and Addams close friend Julia Lathrop. The feminist pragmatists knew that their particular interests in women, the home, the family, and housing were not well-represented in the male faculty’s course offerings in sociology. Furthermore, although so-called applied sociology was integral to the discipline, it increasingly suffered a second-class status compared to more abstract sociology. As a result, the practical sociologists, dominated by women and including men who were later ostracized from the sociological tradition, joined together in 1904 to form the CSCP, with Abbott and Breckinridge being its primary staff members. Addams and the Chicago pragmatists frequently gave guest lectures and even taught courses there, weaving their social thought and activism into a coherent praxis. The CSCP merged in 1920 with other campus divisions to become the School of Social Service Administration (SSA), which was the professional school of social work at the University of Chicago.

Because few scholars have studied Addams and social class unless they were Marxists, many scholars have made the false assumption that Addams was unconcerned with class. In addition, Addams’ commitment to nonviolence and co-operation is problematic to Marxists, who assume that you either support conflict and condemn the bourgeoisie, or are an enemy of the proletariat. This false dichotomization violates the assumptions of feminist pragmatism.

15 See Skocpol 1992 and others on the “maternal” welfare state.
16 Addams 1935.
17 Deegan 1988a, pp. 74–76.
Gender
Addams drew on the tradition of the woman’s movement of the nineteenth century in the United States and the close ties it had with Quakers, Unitarians, and the social science movement. Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Caroline Severance, Lucretia Mott, and the women who gathered at Seneca Falls in 1848 were her guides in this respect. Addams surrounded herself in her own era with brilliant and dedicated women who lived at the settlement, wrote together, gathered statistics, investigated factories and industries, conducted health research, examined sanitary conditions, lobbied for legislative and political reform, and organized for social betterment in their congested, immigrant, working class district. Addams created in this way a powerful female sociological network.

Women – as mothers, wage-earners, home-makers, and forces for social change – were a focus of study for all the pragmatists. The feminist pragmatists built upon traditional as well as modern ideas concerning women, which they developed in their writings. Addams and W. I. Thomas were particularly important in such work, but Mead’s views concerning cooperation and community also fostered the development of a compatible epistemology for understanding women and public social change. As has been noted, the feminist pragmatist welfare state applied this epistemology and praxis to the state apparatus, thus creating a system of social welfare with strong support for women and children. Several wives of male Chicago sociologists, most notably Clara Cahill Park, became significant figures in this massive social movement.

All of the women and most of the men supported the women’s suffrage movement between 1900 and 1920. They worked through the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), women’s clubs, social settlements, and a series of female-dominated groups, such as the NCL, ACLU, and the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), to expand the public role and citizenship of women. In addition, they supported women’s work in sociology as an ideal profession for breaking through the traditional barriers facing women in the marketplace. But the women were usually far more radical than the men in their views concerning the role of women in sociology and in public life. This reflected a general political division between these groups as well as a gendered fault line. This fundamental difference split the largely united schools into two gendered segments over the issue of war and peace.
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19 Deegan 2006; Goodwin 1997; Skocpol 1992.
Divisions within Women’s Sociology:
The University of Chicago Social Settlement (UCSS), 1894–1920, and Household Administration, 1894–1920

In 1894 the University of Chicago Social Settlement (UCSS) was established with the help of Dewey and certain religiously oriented men. It was aligned closely with Hull-House through the appointment of its head resident, Mary McDowell, who was a former resident of Hull-House. Mead, Henderson, and McDowell became a new force for public sociology and they initiated a series of important sociological studies. Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge, also Hull-House residents, generated an important group of housing studies that ultimately resulted in several articles published in the *American Journal of Sociology (AJS)* and two books. In 1928, when the University sought to sever McDowell’s appointment to the Sociology Faculty, Mead successfully defended her position. She remained an officer of instruction in the Department of Sociology until her death in 1936.

Marion Talbot was brought to the University of Chicago in 1892 to be the Assistant Dean of Women. Her home department was sociology because she concentrated on the study of the home as an institution and on the social process of creating opportunities for women in higher education. She was trained by Ellen H. Richards at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in what is now recognized as a foundational approach to social ecology. In 1881 Talbot became a founder of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, now called the American Association of University Women (AAUW). This organization spearheaded opportunities for educated women in both the academy and broader society, and it was an important organization in Talbot’s public sociology. Richards and Talbot were also major figures in the Lake Placid Conferences, which were radical meetings concerned with studying the home and its role in society. These conferences became the basis for the later, more conservative academic discipline of home economics, but the original vision was to re-design the home and its functions within a society in which women and men were equals and the home was part of the public sphere. Talbot was included within the structure, teaching, and practice of sociology at the University
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20 The culmination of this work is found in Abbott et al. 1936.
21 See the annual *University of Chicago Catalogs, 1923–1934*.
23 Talbot and Rosenberry 1931.
24 See Clarke 1972.
of Chicago as the head of “women’s work” throughout the institution.\textsuperscript{25} In 1895 she became an associate editor of \textit{AJS}, a position she held until her retirement from the University of Chicago in 1925. In this capacity, Talbot critiqued women’s work in sociology and provided a woman’s perspective for the most important journal in the discipline.

Talbot and Breckinridge, who also served as Assistant Dean of Women, were members of the Department of Sociology at the University for many years. However, the complex organizational titles and placement of women in a separately administered “woman’s department” within the Department of Sociology called “Household Administration” fundamentally gendered their work in the discipline.\textsuperscript{26} In addition to their administrative and teaching responsibilities, Talbot and Breckinridge were intellectual allies. For example, certain themes in their book \textit{The Modern Household}\textsuperscript{27} illustrate their ties to the Chicago pragmatists, such as Dewey and Tufts, and to the feminist pragmatists Addams and Abbott.

The Department of Household Administration was a major training and teaching area for students, above all female students. This is where Breckinridge trained Abbott, which ultimately resulted in Abbott’s classic statement on \textit{Women in Industry}.\textsuperscript{28} Abbott and Breckinridge moved into Hull-House in 1908, beginning an intimate and collegial career pattern unparalleled by any male sociologists. The Department of Household Administration, regardless of the gendered organization at the University of Chicago, should be regarded as the first women’s studies program in the United States, if not the world, and it was firmly based in sociology. It examined women’s roles in the economy, politics, government, and the institutions of the home and education.

Gender and Class in Women’s Trade Unions
The most important women’s labor unions in America were based, and often founded, at Hull-House. Ellen Gates Starr was particularly active in the Women’s Bookbinders’ Union (WBU) and the Women’s Trade Union League, both nationally (NWTUL) and in Chicago (CWTUL). The strongest branch of the NWTUL was in fact in Chicago, where they published their national organ, \textit{Life and Labor}. The Dorcas Federal Labor Union was also started at Hull-House, while other female unions met there because of its openness to their cause. Starr herself in the course of this work be-

\textsuperscript{25} Talbot 1936.
\textsuperscript{26} Deegan 1978.
\textsuperscript{27} Talbot and Breckinridge 1913, rev. 1919.
\textsuperscript{28} Abbott 1910.
friended such powerful labor leaders as Catherine Breshovsky, the “Little Mother” of Russia; Mary Kenney O’Sullivan,\textsuperscript{29} first of the WBU and later of the Amalgamated Garment Workers of America (AGWA); and Sidney Hillman,\textsuperscript{30} President of the AGWA.

Few feminist scholars have studied Addams and gender because they assumed that she was an ally of traditional women’s and family structures. Marxist feminists in particular have opposed Addams’ commitment to nonviolence and co-operation. Addams was regarded as a white, middle-class, and intrusive representative of government and patriarchy who needed to be condemned. And since women’s clubs were viewed as the bastion of conservative womanhood, their crucial role in political activism was forgotten for decades. White clubwomen’s opposition to black clubwomen’s integration into club work was assumed to be true for all white women, and the exceptional work of feminist pragmatists in support of black clubwomen has been ignored.

Peace

Addams’ commitment to peace was based on the American abolitionists, including Abraham Lincoln, William Lloyd Garrison, Susan B. Anthony, Fannie Barrier Williams, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Wendell Phillips. Later pacifists, such as William James, Leo Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi, and John Haynes Holmes, also inspired her.

The feminist pragmatists, including Balch, Abbot, Breckinridge, and Kelley, encouraged education for citizenship, articulated reasons for and also led social movements, and transformed the United States. This work was directly linked to their commitment to world peace. Addams and the other core leaders became national and international leaders in pacifism based upon their understanding of women as co-operative, nonviolent, and nurturing members of society. Addams thereby both held an important position as a pacifist during the Spanish-American War in 1898 and also made a significant intellectual contribution to the movement for peace as the author of \textit{Newer Ideals of Peace} in 1907. But it was World War I that catapulted her to the leadership of the first international movement of women devoted to peace, the Women’s International League of Peace and Freedom (WILPF). Drawing upon feminist pragmatism, the WILPF leaders argued that women were ideal peace-makers,\textsuperscript{31} and through the WILPF

\textsuperscript{29}Kenney 1990.

\textsuperscript{30}Matthew 1952.

they created a worldwide network of women, some of them social scientists but most of them national leaders, with ultimately tens of thousands of women working for peace around the world.

This important world-wide social movement led to Nobel Peace Prizes for two feminist pragmatists, Jane Addams in 1931 and Emily Greene Balch in 1946. Female relatives of male pragmatists were also active in the peace movement, including Helen Castle Mead, wife of G. H. Mead, as well as her sister-in-law and aunt.\(^{32}\) Morris Janowitz has suggested that the highly visible national role of Harriet Thomas in the WILPF was a major reason that her husband, W. I. Thomas, was followed and later arrested in a sexually compromising position, which led to his being fired from the University of Chicago.\(^{33}\) The WILPF connected these wives and relatives of male sociologists to international pacifism and to the Chicago female world of love and ritual.

Prior to the entry of the United States into the Great War, the male pragmatists were considered international pacifists. Mead and Dewey, in particular, were local if not national leaders in the analysis of nonviolence, international co-operation, and global change. After 1917, however, both Mead and Dewey became vocal supporters of America's intervention and participation in WWI. They spoke and wrote as national experts, opposed most critics of the war, and were opposed to Addams' pacifism, particularly Dewey. Although Mead did not support secular opposition to the war, he listed Addams among a small group of protesters whom he regarded as acceptable because of their supposedly religious-based objections.\(^{34}\) Thomas initially shared the positions of his male colleagues, but in 1918 he was fired for moral turpitude and his sociological career was devastated for the next decade, as noted above. The fact that the women opposed the war, while the men dramatically supported it, led to a division between the HHSS and the UCSS that never healed, although individual men regained their alliance with the HHSS after the war.\(^{35}\)

Addams’ commitment to nonviolence and pacifism is studied considerably less than her work with immigrants and neighbors, and it is addressed within a context largely stripped of its political and state implications. Addams has thus come to be regarded as an iconic, caring female leader, while her penetrating criticism of racism, capitalism, sexism, and militarism have been misunderstood if not indeed distorted. Some scholars, such as Harriet Alonso and Scott H. Bennett, have defined Addams as
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\(^{32}\) Deegan 1999.

\(^{33}\) Janowitz 1966.

\(^{34}\) Deegan 2008.

\(^{35}\) Ibid.
less honest in her commitment to peace than the more radical pacifists were.\textsuperscript{36} In fact, most books on American pacifists do not include her on their list of significant leaders, although such recent work as the publication of Addams’ writings on peace will help improve this situation. Integrating Addams into the American peace movement requires considerable future scholarship.

Conclusion

Addams’ intrepid allies, whether her close cohort of feminist pragmatists, or her close but less comprehensive allies on specific issues, joined her in leading the struggle for social justice and freedom. Various friends and neighbors provided a community liaison augmented by hundreds and sometimes hundreds of thousands of everyday people in massive social movements. These often gigantic groups of people generated massive social change with a direct grassroots connection between the feminist pragmatists and everyday life.

From 1892 to 1920, the innovative and critical ideas of the feminist pragmatists and sociologists of the HHSS and the UCSS were broadly accepted by the public. These women developed a sophisticated theory and practice that dramatically shaped and enacted American values. Their actions, particularly in the contested terrains of race, class, gender, and peace, must be honored and recognized so that we can understand and continue their work today.

In this short paper it has only been possible to take a brief glance at the many friends, neighbors, artists, and areas of sociological specialization associated with Addams and her allies. Addams worked to keep Hull-House a home, to be a good neighbor, and to develop a world consciousness. We ourselves will be able to understand how Addams was a social entrepreneur, public sociologist, and liberation sociologist as long as we remain committed to social justice and nonviolence and endeavor to be good neighbors. A growing number of sociologists are now engaged in analyzing this great alternative tradition and heritage in American sociology. They envision a new and more empowering horizon for action in a more just and liberated society and scholarly discipline, and this present discussion is but a small part of that effort.

University of Nebraska – Lincoln
Department of Sociology

\textsuperscript{36} Alonso 1995; Bennett 2003.
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Jane Addams and Social Change

Jan Trost

Introduction

More than 25 years ago, when I had not yet heard about Jane Addams, I came across a book by Mary Jo Deegan that I found fascinating. Through it I first learned about Addams, and since then I have read much more about her and by her. Addams’ work captivated me. When I discovered her Democracy and Social Ethics, I introduced it in one of my classes, where it has remained for many years even though I am no longer involved with that course.

One of the reasons I introduced Democracy and Social Ethics as course literature was that my students more or less demanded that I use original works instead of textbooks. I was happy to oblige them and soon added other works as well, including Charles Horton Cooley’s Human Nature and the Social Order. These two books, which were both first published in 1902, are similar and yet different, and they complement each other well.

How might I explain the fascination that I came to feel for Addams? One way in which to do so concerns the fact that I had evidently already begun thinking along similar lines while still a university student. I had no idea at that time that the approach I had taken resembled what I later learned was termed symbolic interactionism.

For example, the notion of defining the situation was one of the first important ideas I took up, kept, and used in my thinking. Although everyone refers to Thomas and Znaniecki when speaking about the importance of defining the situation – and it is true that they coined the term – the concept as such can be found in certain of Addams’ works that precede theirs by some years. Another issue concerns change in the world around us. Heraclitus’ remark from two and a half millennia ago that one can never step into the same river twice has been a part of me since my youth. His comment underlies, among other things, the optimistic tone one can find among those concerned with promoting social change.

These are just some of the reasons why I would like to briefly present my interpretations of certain basic notions in the views of Jane Addams, whom I regard as a great sociologist, social psychologist, and, to use a term
that became accepted not long after her death, symbolic interactionist. The first issue I will address is what democracy means in the tradition that Addams fostered.

**Democracy**

Jane Addams regards democracy and social ethics as synonymous. She remarks, for example, that democracy demands that we believe in the “essential dignity and equality” of all human beings.\(^1\) She further states that democracy can be justifiably regarded as having replaced the old-fashioned idea of charity. Although we all find ourselves in need of charitable help at various times, Addams argues that charity cannot simply be reduced to financial support or practical assistance because it necessarily involves consolation as well as freedom.\(^2\)

At the same time, however, Addams appears to have been somewhat too optimistic in this regard insofar as she at times exaggerated the degree to which society had changed, anticipating changes that had not yet taken place. One such example is when she wrote in 1902 that although poverty was once regarded as synonymous with laziness and moral depravity or vice, it no longer was.\(^3\) I would argue that regarding poverty as connected with a certain type of personal character and an individual’s lack of initiative still persists to a significant degree well more than a century later, in both Europe and the United States. Although such a view is no longer officially accepted, it continues to be tacitly countenanced in social reality.

Addams’ claim that there is a difference in kind between the help given by a neighbor and the assistance provided by what she terms a charity visitor at first appears rather unusual. She argues that the former giving to the needy comprises a situation that is substantially different from the latter providing help. This type of reasoning in fact draws us towards Addams’ idea of empathy, whereby she regards a person empathizing with another in a given situation as something remarkably different from what he or she would otherwise do.

**To Empathize**

We need to empathize in order to practice social ethics and thereby realize democracy. It is important in my judgment to emphasize the verb “to empathize” instead of the noun “empathy” insofar as the verb involves the
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\(^1\) Addams 1902, p. 6.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 14.

\(^3\) Ibid.
idea of action while the noun instead tends to create the impression of a static trait. The verb to empathize came into use in Swedish only a few decades ago, and it still is not officially considered to be a proper word. Nevertheless, my students and I began using the expression in this way quite some time ago and, as a good optimist, I assume that it will soon be formally accepted.

Addams and Cooley discussed these matters using such terms as sympathetic understanding[^4] and sympathetic introspection[^5], which in my terminology mean to empathize. Although these words are obviously nouns, Addams and Cooley used them in their discussions as if they were in fact verbs. For example, Cooley stated that sympathetic introspection meant “putting himself into intimate contact with various sorts of persons and allowing them to awake in himself a life similar to their own, which he afterwards, to the best of his ability, recalls and describes.” Addams remarked in the same vein that many problems in society involve the lack of any real understanding of other human beings’ experiences, feelings, and emotions.

It is necessary for our own well being that we have social experience and interpret what that experience means to us. Social experience is necessary for us to have the possibility of understanding the social order evident in our surroundings. This includes the variations existing within that order associated with the differing perceptions that people around us have of the various situations in which we together find ourselves.[^6] This provides us with the possibility to understand others’ behavior, such as the behavior of a criminal – or, more properly stated, to understand criminal behavior. Addams relates the story of how she was awakened one night by a thief who had entered her bedroom as he was preparing to leave through a window. She told him to use the door instead since he might otherwise injure himself. She added that while he had to leave immediately, he could return the next day if he needed a job. The uninvited guest returned at 9:00 the following morning and Addams in fact offered him a job.

Addams tells us the following story in *Twenty Years at Hull-House* about how the so-called Jane Club was established.

[^6]: Addams 1902, pp. 7–9
fell too far behind. After a recital of a case of peculiar hardship one of them exclaimed: “Wouldn’t it be fine if we had a boarding club of our own, and then we could stand by each other in a time like this?” After that events moved quickly. We read aloud together Beatrice Potter’s little book on “Cooperation,” and discussed all the difficulties and fascinations of such an undertaking, and on the first of May, 1891, two comfortable apartments near Hull-House were rented and furnished. The Settlement [Hull-House – J.T.] was responsible for the furniture and paid the first month’s rent, but beyond that the members managed the club themselves. The undertaking “marched”, as the French say, from the very first, and always on its own feet. Although there were difficulties, none of them proved insurmountable, which was a matter for great satisfaction in the face of a statement made by the head of the United States Department of Labor, who, on a visit to the club when it was but two years old, said that his department had investigated many cooperative undertakings, and that none founded and managed by women had ever succeeded. At the end of the third year the club occupied all of the six apartments which the original building contained, and numbered fifty members.7

Addams offers another example concerning the importance of empathizing with others.

If a poor woman knows that her neighbor next door has no shoes, she is quite willing to lend her own, that her neighbor may go decently to mass, or to work; for she knows the smallest item about the scanty wardrobe, and cheerfully helps out. When the charity visitor comes in, all the neighbors are baffled as to what her circumstances may be. They know she does not need a pair of shoes, and rather suspect that she has a dozen pairs at home; which indeed, she sometimes has. They imagine untold stores which they may call upon, and her most generous gift is considered niggardly, compared with what she might do. She ought to get new shoes for the family all round, “she sees well enough that they need them.” It is no more than the neighbor herself would do, has practically done, when she lent her own shoes. The charity visitor has broken through the natural rule of giving, which, in a primitive society, is bounded only by the need of the recipient and the resources of the giver; and she gets herself into untold trouble when she is judged by the ethics of that primitive society.

Social Change
Cooley once remarked that “We notice nothing except through contrast,”8 and I am inclined to accept such a simple and straightforward statement as it refers to social change. The traditional definition of social problems
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7 Addams 1994, p. 81.
8 Cooley 1922, p. 67.
is that they are phenomena which the society involved regards as social problems, whereby they indeed become social problems. Briefly stated, if society does not perceive them as problems, then they are not. In an analogous fashion, social change is what society perceives as social change.

Let me take an example from societies in which both people and the system support pronatalism. In such situations, the mass media, politicians, and various other members of the community become very much concerned with low and declining birth rates, and public and political debate springs up concerning the threat to society posed by women not wanting to have children. When the birth rate begins to rise, however, the debate dies away even if the level remains significantly below the so-called replacement level of 2.1 children per mother. It is only a falling birth rate that is regarded as a social change, while a rising fertility rate, regardless of the actual degree of change, is not. The former thus provokes concern and discussion, while the latter does not.

Another example concerns Addams’ interest in activities that help people, which led to her efforts to make changes in social and technical systems. She once obtained a position as a garbage collection inspector in a neighborhood where poor people lived, and she was at work at 6:00 AM observing the garbage workers. Since they knew that she had administrative power over them, they altered their work procedures in order to improve their job performance. Addams thus ensured that there was a social change for the better in the daily lives of the poor.

Magnus Axelid, a Swedish entrepreneur living in the Uppsala area, began a project some years ago named Meeting-Place Relationship (Mötesplats Relation). The aim was to help the owners of small businesses come into contact not only with each other, but also with regional and local government representatives, various organizations, and other business people as well. His company, Relation AB, has organized Relationship Days (Relationsdagen) using the Relationship Boat (Relationsbåten) in order to offer decision makers in the Uppsala region inspiration, knowledge, and useful contacts in a way that is both professional and enjoyable. The Relationship Boat is a chartered cruise ship where 1000 decision makers and more can spend a day and night together in order to get to know each other, develop new business contacts, and expand already existing ones. I regard such activities as comprising not only entrepreneurship, but also social entrepreneurship insofar as they are aimed at fostering social contacts that lead to social change, especially for small businesses.

One example of this involves a female hairdresser who began her own small business a few years ago. She heard of the Relationship Boat and registered for the excursion. There she made contact with an automobile
sales and service company, which led to the company offering hair care at her business to customers who were waiting as their cars were being serviced. This supplied the company with a possible advantage against their competitors, but also guaranteed the hairdresser new clients and one full day a week of new business. Her entrepreneurship is thus supported by the social entrepreneurship of the automobile company owner, who himself is engaged in both social entrepreneurship as well as business entrepreneurship.

My conclusion is that the spirit of Jane Addams is still alive even among those who have never heard of her and her important work. I regard the Relationship Boat and other similar ventures as completely consistent with Addams’ efforts to understand and empathize, which reflect a view of democracy understood as social ethics, neighborly support, helping people help themselves, and the fostering of social change on micro-, meso-, and macro-levels. Giving a thief a job and encouraging the start of what became the Jane Club share a common spirit with other types of social entrepreneurship today.

_Uppsala_  
_Uppsala University_
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The Relevance of Jane Addams for the Social Sciences in Italy

Andrea Salvini

Introduction
The aim of the following discussion is to briefly examine certain issues concerning how the legacy of Jane Addams may exert a fruitful influence within the social sciences in Italy, particularly in the field of professional social work.

This is a rather straightforward task in one respect because Addams, frankly, remains little known within the scholarly sociological community in Italy. Nevertheless, interest in her life and work has grown noticeably over the last twenty-five years, even though there are still relatively few published references to her vast body of work. The fact that a number of relevant volumes have recently appeared in Italian, including translations of some of her most important essays, assists us in an examination of the value of her theoretical and practical undertakings today.

However, this renewed interest in Addams also makes it difficult for us to evaluate the impact she has had precisely because the materials and studies currently available in Italian are still too fragmentary. Furthermore, not only is Addams now being read from a number of diverse disciplinary perspectives, each of these focuses upon a particular aspect of her voluminous production. There are, for example, discussions concerning Addams’ engagement with the social settlement movement in the United States,¹ her notion of social work,² her ideals of peace and feminism,³ as well as her religious inspiration for social action.⁴

¹ Rauty 2011.
² Bortoli 2006.
⁴ Providenti 2004.
Jane Addams and Italy

Two issues stand out regarding Addams’ significance within an Italian context, namely, her views concerning the relations between theory, research, and social action, on the one hand, and the roles of the public social services and the third sector in the processes that are changing the Italian welfare state today, on the other.

I would like to begin by noting that Addams’ biography contains important connections with Italy. First, Hull-House was located in an area in which there was a significant Italian immigrant community. Consequently, her writings contain many references to the harsh everyday conditions in which poverty-stricken Italians lived – men, women, children, and families – as a result of social degradation and cultural backwardness. It is specifically through the stories of these Italian immigrants that Addams exemplified and illustrated the efficacy of her methods, which turn upon the introduction of small but critical changes in individual and collective behavior through community life, sharing, and socialization. It is well known that a characteristic trait of Addams’ settlement house work was for people to live together, whereby networks of relations were established within the informal modality of daily life as both a method and an objective at local as well as global levels.

In addition, many aspects of the dramatic social reality in which Addams worked are present in Italy today, as well as in other countries. For example, Italy constitutes one of the primary points of entry into the European Union for the constant flow of immigrants coming from throughout the world, including Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe. Even though current laws impose severe restrictions on such immigration, the latter has not only become unstoppable, it has also brought about significant changes in the social, cultural, and economic fabric of the country. Associated issues of pressing importance involve the organization of urban areas where immigrants can settle, processes of integration, the potential for urban conflict, and the incompatibility between local lifestyles and those of the new foreign communities. Although Addams’ encountered all of these questions in her reform work, today they possess completely new elements that necessitate a careful examination of the current processes of integration and inclusion. One of the most prominent of these is the way in which recent female immigrants have come to serve as care providers in Italy, particularly for the elderly. It would be most interesting to ask ourselves how Addams would have read and interpreted the role such women now hold within the organization of social welfare and family support in Italy.
The fact that some of Addams’ most important essays have been collected in Italian translations in three recent publications facilitates any examination of her impact upon the social sciences in the country. The two more recent of these open with a presentation of Addams’ biography and work, which makes it possible to begin a general study before moving on to her many important works that remain in English. The third has the merit of being the first monograph to present Addams as a person to the Italian public. It also describes her thinking and her work, setting off from a pedagogical and philosophical perspective.

A number of articles that address the relevance of Jane Addams for social work have also been recently published in Italian professional journals. There are, in addition, references to Addams in Italian sources specifically devoted to social work, its historical development within the country, and its concepts and methods of action. Other references to Addams, including a comparison of her and Mary Richmond as sources of inspiration for the development of social services in Italy, can be found in a variety of volumes devoted to historical figures who are internationally important either for the development of social work, or for the gender perspective within social work.

Addams is in fact most frequently referenced in Italian social science literature in connection with the field of social work, where she is regarded, together with Richmond, as one of the founding figures of both the discipline and the profession. Although it is a widely-held opinion among Italian scholars that social work in Italy has been influenced more by Richmond than by Addams – a point discussed below – I maintain that the renewed interest in Addams is an important indicator of the need to introduce new methodologies and theoretical themes into Italian social work. These are associated with a different way of conceiving social action, and they are directly connected with Addams’ ideas and with the perspectives of community work and network intervention. We might add that what Addams has to offer for social work and for the development of the social sciences has not yet been fully appreciated in Italy.

The awakening of a new interest in Italy in Addams’ life and works is not simply historical in character, but rather represents a response, perhaps still timid but doubtlessly effective, to the need to bring together more
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5 Rauty 2011; Bianchi 2004.
6 Bellatalla 1989.
8 Fargion 2009; Bortoli 1997.
9 Bortoli 2006, p. 185.
10 Benvenuti and Cristina 1998, p. 76; Benvenuti and Segatori 2000, p. 90.
closely theory, research, and social intervention. Today’s interest in Addams thus arises from the need to explore new methods of research as well as new ways in which to link social knowledge, research, and social change.

In *Twenty Years at Hull-House*, Addams describes the case of a man who had worked for an extended period of time in an enclosed area where no physical exertion was required. She convinced him against his own misgivings after he lost his job to accept a position involving manual labor in an open air excavation. He became ill after only a few weeks, however, and soon died. Addams’ subsequent reflections, which are not without a certain remorse, are particularly significant on both a human and a methodological level insofar as she expressed the realization that the “proper attitude towards the difficulties of an individual comes from an appropriate and a deep knowledge of his life, his biography, his habits.”

Although this might seem obvious and perhaps even trivial, it in fact anticipates by many years Herbert Blumer’s still valid exhortation in *Symbolic Interactionism* that we need to acquire an intimate familiarity with reality. Kathy Charmaz remarks in this regard that

Gaining intimate familiarity means looking, listening, and learning about studied life. It means sustained interactions with people and with written data. It means experiencing wonder about their world, being willing to plunge into it, opening oneself to the unforeseen, and grappling with uncertainty. Gaining intimate familiarity has been called getting an insider view. Now we realize that an insider view always reflects conditions of the particular situation, including the extent to which the researcher shares this situation.

We know that pragmatism constitutes the conceptual basis upon which symbolic interactionism was later grafted, and that symbolic interactionism itself may be understood in certain respects as a type of applied knowledge. We also know that Addams’ pragmatist tendencies led her to conceive of knowing as a social endeavor. She thus regarded knowing as always conditional and dependent upon experience insofar as a new point of view can provide a new interpretation of a given problem. Acquiring knowledge from within interaction is consistent with the idea that knowl-
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11 See Addams 1912, pp. 161–162. This passage was used in a recent introductory text concerning social work (Fargion 2009, pp. 17–18). The author presented it as an example of her own views about the role of knowledge in social intervention, the importance of constantly redefining one’s own perspective, and learning from interaction with people in given contexts.

12 See Blumer 1969 for a presentation of this point.

edge cannot be an end unto itself. Knowledge rather implies living a reality, documenting it intersubjectively, and intervening to change it as needed.

This particular circular conception of knowledge, research, and intervention as a unity that is ever flexible, open to the unforeseen, and capable of incorporating new perspectives is present in Italian sociology and social work today only to a limited degree. The development of these two disciplines has been heavily influenced by a reaction to the idealistic orientation, epitomized by the work of Benedetto Croce, which was widespread in Italian philosophy in the early twentieth century. Croce considered sociology to be an unstable science, and the response to this criticism, characterized by an almost obsessive search for supposed scientific objectivity, developed as if in an effort to overcome an inferiority complex. This generated a tendency towards the adoption of standardized and reproducible protocols in both social investigation and social interventions.

Only in the 1970s did a reform movement arise in Italy in both social work and sociology that promoted greater attention to living social actors, particularly those who were more or less marginalized. This made it possible to conceive of the social sciences as a way in which to give – or give back – a voice to people by means of research methods that Addams had promoted many years earlier, including action research, participatory observation, and ethnography. This culminated in legal changes that were in the forefront internationally, the most important of which was the 1978 law concerning psychiatric assistance, better known as the Basaglia Law. Nevertheless, divisions persist within scholarly work, and nearly four decades later there still exists a gap between research and action in the Italian social sciences, even if there has been a slow process of change.

Today we find ourselves in a contradictory phase of development in Italy characterized by two relatively opposed sets of demands. On the one hand, the welfare system is in need of a greater degree of standardization in social intervention procedures. This follows both from the practice and terminology widely employed in epidemiology and in the area of public health, and also from the need to evaluate the impact of intervention in order to assess the rational or effective use of resources in social policy. This has led to the creation of more sophisticated analytical protocols and the identification of specialized synthetic quantitative indicators for policy evaluation.

On the other hand, however, it has become increasingly clear that the more or less widespread risk of social conflict due to economic crisis, changes brought about by immigration, and the resulting current vulnerability of social relations necessitates a qualitative change in both the presence and efforts of social workers within the community. This not only includes a
new way of engaging with local social realities that involves learning from life itself (Jane Addams) or living reality (William James), it also reflects both the meaning and method of Addams’ work. This is particularly the case on the level of local communities. Such change will demand a strenuous effort on the part of sociologists and social workers in Italy, whose professional self-definition and organization of work does not include such constant engagement.

This brings us to the second point of the present discussion, which refers to the roles that the public social services and the third sector play today in processes of social reform.

The Role of Professional Social Work and the Third Sector in Social Reform in Italy

Jane Addams was a reformer who built upon the circularity of theory, research, and action. She frequently reiterated that action reveals not only the limitations of a given idea, but also the full range of its ethical implications. We also know that action is embedded in the community, and that it is above all interaction or, in Blumer’s terms, joint action.  

14

These considerations have a number of implications. Perhaps most significantly, if professional social work strives to be “closer” to the people, it cannot be satisfied with merely shifting one and the same set of procedures from an office desk to the streets of the community. It must instead adopt ways of working and of establishing a presence at the local level that are substantially different from the bureaucratic practices which now characterize a large part of social work. The spread of the network perspective in social intervention that we can observe in Italy today makes such changes possible to a certain degree, even if this frequently remains merely at the level of good intentions or of metaphor. Social workers have long sought to match needs with resources, identifying and acquiring the means needed for those to whom they normally refer as their clients. Addams clearly reminds us, however, that the client terminology which has become commonplace is completely inappropriate for describing the situation of individuals who are in need. Such individuals should always be viewed as citizens.

The network perspective in social work should nevertheless be extended because it implies that social work needs to be constantly immersed in the community. Addams draws our attention to this point as well. Community work and the network perspective can come together and reciprocally empower each other to a certain extent so that both can function not

14 Blumer 1969.
only within primary networks, or the core networks in which people are embedded, but also within larger relational contexts. In the city where I reside, however, which has a population of approximately 150,000 people, every social worker is, on average, requested to assist in more than 100 cases over the course of a year. This unfortunately makes it impossible in practical terms to conduct research on such important issues as how to promote lifestyles directed towards individual and collective well-being within a community, how local communities can become more aware of their own character and resources in order to be more autonomous in their local responses to their own needs, and how community members rely upon each other in respect to mechanisms of beneficial joint action.

Such problems obviously reflect the crisis afflicting the Italian welfare system today. Social services continue to be characterized by an approach that is, in general, derived from the casework tradition in social work, which aims to bring about change in individual subjects through psychosocial therapy rather than by promoting action within the social context. This type of approach is untenable because it in fact prevents the qualitative changes that are necessary in both the orientation and organization of social work.

This point merits further attention even if we are not in a position at the moment to present a detailed picture of the history of social services in Italy, which became a professional discipline only after the Second World War and the end of Fascism. Social workers had been closely tied to the dictatorial regime during the Fascist period, when their role was limited to providing assistance in an essentially paternalistic fashion, particularly in the industrial sector. We can understand the post-war development only in respect to a specific historical context that made it necessary to reconstruct a militarily defeated country not only on societal and economic levels, but also – and perhaps most importantly – on civic and moral levels as well. One could argue with justification that the new type of social work that began to emerge provided a natural outlet for anti-fascist and democratic civil action, and that a central element in this process was the effort to provide a course of professional training for those able to shoulder the burdens associated with the type of reconstruction needed.

The attention given to the need for professional training, coupled with the previous nature of social services in Italy, generated a situation in which a number of different schools of social work arose. While these had diverse sources of inspiration, a predominant role was played by values associated with Roman Catholicism. Another important element in this development was the adoption of models and methods of intervention from countries with more established systems of social work, particularly the United
Kingdom and the United States. Among the different alternatives from which to draw, what may be described in general terms as a person-oriented perspective most closely responded to the needs of the new type of social work. We must not overlook the fact that, in both the United States during the early twentieth century and in Italy after the Second World War, the moral dimension was considered key to gaining an understanding of hardship and social problems, the causes of which were viewed as residing primarily within the individual. In this regard, a fine thread that is primarily religious in character ties together social work in Italy and in the United States, prime examples of which include the Charity Organization Society and the Social Gospel movement. In addition, even though the need to promote social change was not extraneous to the new type of social work being developed, the individualization and “psycholization” of problems, and thus of the modes of intervention, was paramount. This took place under the strong influence of the American social worker Mary Richmond (1861–1928).

Richmond’s approach came to be accepted as consistent with the needs of social work in Italy in three respects. First, Richmond maintained that social work properly had an essentially individualistic character in light of the fact that the fundamental causes of a person’s problems supposedly resided within her personality. This gave rise to the acceptance of the so-called casework model, which has since been widely accepted in daily practice. Second, a methodological formulation that tied together knowledge and intervention in respect to individual situations lent importance to the precise and systematic collection and analysis of information. This led to a further individualizing of the causes of problems, from which it is but a short step to the supposedly scientific individualizing of solutions. This type of perspective clearly responded, from a certain point of view, to the existing need to provide the social sciences and social work with a more solid and reliable foundation than had been the case previously. Third, Richmond’s formulations were appealing by virtue of the highly systematic way in which she articulated her position, which is presented in two volumes that may be described as comprising a handbook or guide for social work. In contrast, the method and approach characteristic of Addams’ voluminous writings is less systematic in nature and much more oriented to narrating accounts of interactions, encounters, and working life that are drawn directly from daily experience.
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16 Richmond 1917, 1922.
However, social work in Italy was shaken towards the end of the 1960s by an apparent paradigm shift in the social sciences in Europe, whereby there was a gradual decline in structural-functional perspectives and a concurrent rise in critical, interpretative, and constructionist approaches. Important in this respect was a greater sensitivity among social workers regarding the obligation to voice their concerns, which also had a political significance. Greater importance was also placed upon the community-oriented context of the genesis and spread of social hardship as well as the various courses of action adopted to remedy it. Consequently, social work became more focused not only on the structural mechanisms that led to marginalization, but also on the need for social workers to voice their criticism concerning the suffering with which they became intimately familiar in their work. Increased emphasis was also placed upon promoting the well-being of the general population – not just the well-being of individuals – within the dynamics of local community development. This led to the translation of relevant titles that had been originally published in the United States.17 Although there were only a limited number of references to Addams and to the settlement house movement during that period, and in spite of the rapid decline in Italy during the 1970s of interest in community work, the subsequent practice of social work could not fail to take into account the need to explore those theoretical and operational horizons which emphasized that both problems and solutions are tied to the social context, even if this meant leaving aside references to specific cases.

This broadening of horizons was associated in Italy with the spread of the systemic18 and integrated19 models, which were adopted from both the social sciences and social work in the Anglo-Saxon world and modified for the Italian context. Notwithstanding such efforts, which are reflected today in the spread of network models in the literature,20 social work in Italy finds itself torn between the need to provide immediate and concrete responses to situations of particular hardship, which the current economic situation has only accentuated, and the demands of the institutional bureaucracy. The latter, forced to deal with diminishing resources, has imposed both limits and standardized forms upon interventions. This is accompanied, however, by the awareness that social action needs to be conducted effectively on multiple levels and in multiple circumstances, and that there must be a greater involvement on the part of social workers in fostering the needed community-oriented social dynamics. Although

17 See, e.g., Ross 1963.
18 Campanini 2002.
there is no real possibility today for such an understanding to be translated into concrete action, a growing number of social workers in Italy are nevertheless attentive to the possibility that the content of their work can be changed, and that new meaning can be given to their professional presence within local contexts. It is precisely in such a situation that Jane Addams can serve as a unique source of inspiration.

Professional social work in Italy must now find the strength to redefine its position within the welfare system in terms of its community-oriented dimension. There must also be an easing of the pressure associated with traditional casework, and the dynamic and complex constellation of third sector organizations, particularly volunteer organizations, can be particularly important and useful in this regard. The activities of such organizations make it possible to enter deeply into social reality, ensure a continuous presence within local communities, and promote a sense of solidarity and interdependence in respect to the wider relational and spatial context. The community work performed by volunteer organizations thereby facilitates a reduction of social isolation and enables local identities to open themselves to an expansion of their social horizons. Both relational openness and withdrawal strictly depend on the characteristics of the social context as well as the conscious interactions among the various social actors capable of promoting joint action, sharing, and socializing. Addams viewed the latter as providing a “finer social quality that has a greater social value than the more effective individual action.”

Volunteerism in Italy comprises a broad range of activities capable of promoting a spirit of solidarity. It is also capable of taking up demands that the rights of citizenship be enhanced, and that social justice be extended through action and interaction with people in the places where they live, work, and study. Italian law, particularly in the reform of social assistance that was enacted in 2000, recognizes the third sector as a collective agent for intervention and social planning. This makes it possible for the professional social services and the third sector to promote a different notion of being, working, and living within social reality without giving rise to competition between public and private forms of intervention.
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21 Addams 2006 [1902].
Conclusions

I have sought to outline various points of contact between Italy and the work of Jane Addams, with a particular reference to the way in which social work in Italy has developed. It is important to emphasize that the latter can extricate itself from the state of contradiction in which it presently finds itself only through, first, a reduction in the pressure coming from the institutional bureaucracy, which tends towards the standardization of interventions, and, second, the effective transformation, at least in part, of the modalities of intervention from a focus on individual cases to a focus on the community, which involves forms of action that are clearly different from those imagined by the community movements of the 1960s. Although this has been foreshadowed by a steadily increasing interest in network intervention, no more precise role has yet been established for such changes regarding theory and the modes of intervention in Italian social work. Additional factors that apparently indicate new and fruitful developments include the current growth of social volunteerism and the emergence of new forms of collaboration between the third sector and public social institutions.

I believe that the critical re-evaluation of Addams’ work which is now underway will point towards, if not answers, at least paths for further reflection in sociology, professional social work, and the third sector. As Rosalie Otters observes,

\[\text{We social workers revere Jane Addams, but often at a distance; we need to take in the full breadth and depth of her life and thought. She successfully integrated practice with research and theory. It is time to reappraise her work and life. Though this process has been made all the easier because other applied disciplines have also recently reassessed her contributions to their own disciplines, we seem to be standing on the sidelines.}\]^{22}

In addition, a re-examination of the potential contribution of pragmatism and symbolic interactionism to social work in terms of theoretical reference points, methods of analysis, and modalities of social intervention can be useful for revealing the dynamics of persons-in-interaction and interactions-within-communities.\[^{23}\] The interactionist viewpoint in sociology, social work, and social policy can help illustrate how individuals adapt their own courses of action in respect to those of others within the complexity of group life. This lends a humanistic quality to both analysis and

\[^{22}\text{Otters 2009.}\]
\[^{23}\text{Forte 2004; Johnson 2001.}\]
modes of intervention that should always be the overriding characteristic of social work.
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From “Is” to “Ought”: A Pragmatist Sociology and Moral Science

Robert Dingwall

Introduction

“Social Entrepreneurship” is an elusive concept. Mair, Robinson, and Hockerts, for example, provide ten different definitions within the fifteen chapters of their collection of papers from a 2005 conference on the subject.¹ Ziegler also discusses the problem of definition at some length in his introduction to another collection,² noting that it involves some combination of social mission and business skills. We might formulate this to define a social entrepreneur as someone who recognizes a social problem and uses an entrepreneurial approach to organize, create, and manage a venture to achieve social change. Ziegler also notes, however, that this begs numerous questions about the recognition of a social problem, about the choice of methods to address this issue, and about the cultural significance of this movement. Why, we might ask, is there so much emphasis on charismatic or transformational leadership when this has been increasingly questioned as a model outside the bizarre phenomenon of reality TV shows?³ Why the emphasis on social change as the product of individual action rather than of social movements? Why the stress on exporting this particular leadership model to a sector in which it has historically struggled to survive, becoming routinized in the form of state or charitable bureaucracies?⁴

As Robert Boddice points out in an important corrective to the origin myths currently being peddled, “The apparent newness of social-entrepreneurial activity belies the traditions upon which it rests, and panegyrics in its favour… tend to draw a veil over the substance and variety of motives and ideologies carried by social entrepreneurs themselves.”⁴ He goes on to discuss the very different contexts and motives of a number of claimed
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¹ Mair et al 2006, pp. 4–6.
² Ziegler 2011.
³ Denis et al. 2005.
⁴ Boddice 2011, p. 133.
progenitors and concludes by noting the lack of self-reflection associated with the movement.

   Acting in a certain way because it is thought, by the actor, to be the right (or necessary) thing to do, is not a good enough justification for acting. It pays no heed to the tendentious nature of right and wrong, of cultural chauvinism and of historical mutability… To do something for someone else still does not explain why it is that you are the one to do it, nor how that thing… came to be perceived as a “problem” in the first place.5

   Evoking Lewis Carroll’s Cheshire Cat, Boddice suggests that social entrepreneurship is like the grin that remains as the cat vanishes, an appearance without a substance.

   In raising the question concerning how the social entrepreneur comes to perceive a problem, Boddice is, of course, asking something that has long been at the core of pragmatist sociology. The most elegant statement is still to be found in the words of Willard Waller, a contemporary of Jane Addams, who states that

   The term social problem indicates not merely an observed phenomenon but the state of mind of the observer as well. Value judgments define certain conditions of human life and certain kinds of behavior as social problems: there can be no social problem without a value judgment.6

   What legitimates the value judgments of the social entrepreneur? Deegan’s work on Jane Addams explores her connections with the “first generation” of sociologists working in Chicago up to 1918, including Albion Small, Charles Henderson, and W. I. Thomas, and the tensions that emerged with the shift towards a more “professional” approach under Robert Park and Ernest W. Burgess in the 1920s.7 While the first generation saw pragmatism as a potential basis for the specification of means and ends in social action – for the rational definition of a Good Society and the methods by which this might be brought about – the second generation were more skeptical. As Deegan notes, the result was a growing divorce between sociology and social reform. Despite periodic attempts to resuscitate this relationship – particularly in association with the civil rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the post-modern turn of symbolic interaction in the late 1990s, and the fashion for “public sociology” provoked by Burawoy’s Presidential

5 Ibid., p. 148.
6 Waller 1936, p. 922.
7 Deegan 2005.
Address to the American Sociological Association⁸ – sociology has tended to cling to its technical character as an academic discipline, whether in qualitative or quantitative versions. It claims a mission to understand the world rather than to change it. It may be worth asking, however, whether a “science of society” necessarily precludes policy conclusions – or whether the problem has instead been the reluctance of sociologists to follow the logic of their inquiries rather than the cultural fashions of their time. If there is a pragmatist model of social reform, perhaps it simply does not look like the world that many reformers aspire to create.

Sociology as a Moral Science
Strong observed in his last published work that “Social science began as, and in fundamental respects continues to be, a ‘moral science,’ an attempt to create an ethically justifiable public policy on a secular and materialist basis.”⁹ As he pointed out, however, this ambition was in tension with the Enlightenment project that gave birth to the social sciences. The transition to modernity had discredited the idea that morality could be derived from a supernatural source and established secular materialism as the dominant creed of the nations that had led this process. Although there were elements of societies everywhere that had not accepted this transformation, it was now unlikely to be reversed, particularly given the lack of agreement on which supernatural source could replace the secular order. Progress in the economy, science, and culture did not come about as a result of ethical imperatives, but as a result of contest, competition, and critique. Open economies, societies, and cultures sustained a diverse ecology of ideas and practices. Some of these would prove more successful over time than others, and their models would, at least temporarily, dominate. Finally, after a flirtation with radical skepticism in the seventeenth century, the Enlightenment project settled for practical rather than absolute certainty as the basis of knowledge and action in the world. There might be no knowable ultimate truths, but this did not prevent us from having a sufficient degree of confidence in what we knew to be able to act effectively.

In part, the Enlightenment project was a reaction to the conflict and chaos that dogged Europe for the best part of two centuries as Reformation and Counter-Reformation struggled for supremacy and for the right to impose their visions of the *summum bonum*, or ultimate good. The reformers challenged the Catholic hegemony in politics, economics, and culture that had imposed a particular vision upon Europe since the end of the Dark
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⁸ Burawoy 2005.
⁹ Strong 1997, p. 189.
Ages. Although some reformers would have described themselves as independent thinkers, seeking liberty of belief and conscience for all (except possibly Catholics), others thought to create a new Jerusalem, a presbyterian theocracy that would simply substitute one hegemony for another. The end of the religious wars is conventionally taken to be the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which established the right of sovereigns to choose the religion for their state, provided they allowed individual dissenters to practice their beliefs in private settings. This prompted a new interest among European scholars, particularly from countries where religion remained a divisive internal issue, concerning attempts to think about how individuals could lead moral lives in a world that they regarded as immoral or, at least, morally problematic. Having seen the devastation wrought by conflicts over the definition of the *summum bonum*, these writers asked whether it was possible to devise forms of social organization that would instead offer a minimal security against the *summum malum*, the ultimate evil of chaos and disorder represented by Thomas Hobbes’ state of nature. How could humankind arrange its affairs to prevent a return to the situation where life was “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short”? Was there a basis for government in mutual respect for individual diversity rather than in a common culture ordained from above? Could the state serve as a framework for individual projects rather than demanding uncritical obedience to those of its sovereign?

The attempts to answer these questions divided eighteenth century thinkers. At the risk of some violence to the intellectual genealogies involved – because the thinkers concerned had more mutual respect than the categorization implies – we can distinguish between a European response and a Scottish, or British, response. The Europeans, exemplified by Rousseau, turned initially to a search for a new moral vision, a new organic community. Released from the chains of state-imposed religious belief and practice, humans would supposedly discover a commonality of ends in liberty and self-expression spontaneously. A good society would thus be produced from the Romantic expression of human passions. The Scots were not so sure. They looked instead to the rediscovered tradition of the Stoics as the basis for their answer.

Stoic thought had been eclipsed by the synthesis of Aristotle and the Bible that had been the foundation of medieval and early modern thinking concerning nature and the social world, which had located meaning in the essential nature of objects. With the revival of classical scholarship, how-
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11 Strong and Dingwall 1989.
ever, the diversity of ancient thought became more apparent. The Stoics were the first social constructionists, holding that the meaning of events and objects was fundamentally created through human engagement with them. From this they developed a moral theory based upon the idea of the “wise person,” who understood the virtues of moderation and self-restraint in all expressions of passion, and upon self-interest as the precondition of both social interactions and society itself. We might now describe this as a transformation of functional prerequisites into ethical imperatives capable of spontaneously generating order.

David Hume explored the difficulty of deriving moral conclusions, or sentiments, from empirical observations, or facts.\textsuperscript{12} His argument has generally been understood as a fundamental obstacle to this process – empirical sciences cannot produce normative conclusions. This may, however, over-simplify his position. The role of self-interest in generating a just society is, for Hume, a matter of fact that can attract the approval of observers, which provides a basis for virtue. This conclusion is extended by Adam Smith in \textit{The Theory of Moral Sentiments} to form a broader analysis of the relationship between moral conduct and social relations. In contrast to, say, Emil Durkheim’s model of moral order, which rests upon internalized conformity to the sentiments of a group, Smith proposes a moral order based upon the minimal conditions for social interaction – trust, mutual understanding, and self-restraint. Smith states that

\begin{quote}
One individual must never prefer himself so much even to any other individual, as to hurt or injure that other, in order to benefit himself, though the benefit to the one should be much greater than the hurt or injury to the other… by this unjust preference, he renders himself the proper object of the contempt and indignation of mankind; as well as of the punishment which that contempt and indignation must naturally dispose them to inflict, for having thus violated one of those sacred rules, upon the tolerable observance of which depend the whole security and peace of human society.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

The mechanism Smith identifies for achieving this understanding will be familiar to any symbolic interactionist.

\begin{quote}
We suppose ourselves the spectators of our own behaviour, and endeavour to imagine what effect it would, in this light, produce upon us. This is the only looking-glass by which we can, in some measure, with the eyes of other people, scrutinize the propriety of our own conduct.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
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The man who is conscious to himself that he has exactly observed those measures of conduct which experience informs him are generally agreeable, reflects with satisfaction on the propriety of his own behaviour. When he views it in the light that the impartial spectator would view it, he thoroughly enters into all the motives which influenced it.\textsuperscript{15}

Without explicitly crediting Smith, C. H. Cooley and G. H. Mead would later develop this approach into the familiar terms of the “looking-glass self” and the “generalized other” while lessening Smith’s insistence on the normative implications.\textsuperscript{16}

The Scottish Enlightenment has had a strong influence upon pragmatism through three different routes. First, many of the American Republic’s early scholars and public figures were either educated in Scotland themselves, or by teachers who were. The drafters of the United States Constitution and the authors of the Federalist Papers were strongly influenced by this tradition and its understanding of a civic morality for the new nation.\textsuperscript{17} Second, the work was taken up particularly by Kant and linked into the Idealism that was studied by many of the early pragmatists at German universities.\textsuperscript{18} Finally, there is a demonstrable direct influence upon early Chicago sociology through Small’s enthusiasm for Smith’s work. Small argues that

\begin{quote}
[T]he apostolic succession in social philosophy from Adam Smith is through the sociologists rather than the economists. The sociologists have kept alive the vital spark of Smith’s moral philosophy. They have contended for a view of life in terms of persons rather than in terms of technology. That is, they have put persons in the center of their picture of life, and have assigned a subordinate place to the theory of those technical activities which deal with the material products of persons. The economists are the separatists and heresiarchs, in exaggerating the importance of a technology till it has overbalanced, in social doctrine, the end to which it is normally tributary.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

Small’s vision for sociology explicitly looked to its preparation for social reform, if not, indeed, for social enterprise.

There is little likelihood that men who personally observe actual social conditions, according to the method we propose, instead of speculating about them in their study, will want to fold their hands and let social evil work out its own salvation.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{flushleft}
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Who were these men “speculating... in their study”?

The Debate with Spencer

There is a myth that England never produced a great classical sociologist. This is true only if one focuses on the canon that has come to be accepted since World War II – Marx, the socialist; Weber, the liberal; and Durkheim, the social democrat. Herbert Spencer, the unabashed advocate of laissez-faire capitalism, has disappeared entirely from view. Yet more than anyone, Spencer invented sociology for the Anglophone world. He wrote the first major texts in English with “sociology” in the title and was the leading public intellectual of his day, drawing huge audiences on his lecture tours of the United States.

During the years 1870 to 1890, Spencer was probably more widely read and discussed in the United States than any other living philosopher. His works were known and debated throughout the literate population and he enjoyed a vogue that has not been known by any philosopher before or since.  

Most sociology before World War I was either derived from Spencer, or emerged in debate with his work, even when this is not acknowledged. Durkheim, for example, develops much of his treatment of the division of labor from Spencer’s work, and Georg Simmel’s original, rejected, draft of his doctoral thesis included a substantial critique of Spencer. Spencer laid the foundation of sociology as a secular, materialist discipline, with an understanding of social systems as analogous to, but not identical with, biological and engineering systems. In the latter respect, he defined the basic parameters of the evolutionary ecological model that marked the Chicago School’s approach to most substantive topics. 

However, the values inferred from this approach proved unacceptable to men like Albion Small and women like Jane Addams. He took Darwin’s bleak understanding of the amorality of evolution and turned this into the armchair justification of laissez-faire to which Small took such exception. Social Darwinism was essentially Spencer’s creation – if evolution was indifferent to human suffering, then so, too, should public social and economic policy. The best role for the state was to get out of the way of the processes of natural selection that ensured that the fittest individuals prospered to produce the societies best adapted to their competitive interna-
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tional environments. His vision is a spectral inversion of Marx’ – states will ultimately wither away because they have no role in a society of perfect information, in which markets perfectly co-ordinate the rational pursuit of human self-interest. States that try to manage or shape this process simply divert resources from more productive uses into systems of command and control that are doomed to failure by their less perfect knowledge of the situations faced by individual actors. Capitalism was a natural phenomenon, and intervention, whether by governments or by misguided philanthropists, merely prevented progress towards a future Utopia.

The human consequences of *laissez-faire* appalled the reformers of Jane Addams’ generation, although they still derived much inspiration from Spencer’s approach to sociology. Her friend and contemporary, the English social scientist and reformer Beatrice Webb, was also close to Spencer, with whom she conducted a mutually respectful, but critical correspondence to the very end of his life. She visited him frequently in the weeks before his death, and recalled in her diary how he had been the only person who had thought she had an intellect worth cultivating, and how much she had admired his integrity, even as his example increased her distaste for utilitarian ethics. For her, however, capitalism was a failed social experiment.

> [W]ith regard to the purpose of life, science is, and must remain bankrupt…. The goal towards which we strive… depends on a human scale of values… which alters from race to race, from generation to generation and from individual to individual.

What neither Webb, nor Addams solved was the problem of justifying the goals of action. In Webb’s case, this led her first to return to the nonconformist religion in which she had been raised, rejecting Spencer’s atheism, and then to an uncritical admiration for Soviet Communism as practiced by Joseph Stalin. Webb stated in her diary ahead of a visit to Russia with her husband Sidney in 1932 that

> What attracts us in Soviet Russia, and it is useless to deny that we are prejudiced in its favour, is that its constitution, on the one hand, bears out our Constitution for a Socialist Commonwealth, and, on the other, *supplies a soul* to that conception of government – which our paper constitution lacked.
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The Webbs’ flirtation with Communism was not unusual among British intellectuals of their generation, and it did not isolate them from mainstream politics to the same extent as Jane Addams’ pacifism and radical associations during the Red Scare of the 1920s in the United States.\textsuperscript{28} It is clear, however, that Addams was no more successful at finding a coherent doctrine to justify her efforts to, in effect, respond to the question posed by Boddice about how we can find the cat behind the grin. Spencer, at least, had a coherent teleology – it was simply that his indifference to human suffering made the results seem intuitively unacceptable.

This problem has never been fully resolved by pragmatist sociologists, who are often more anxious to demonstrate that their heart is in the right place than to show how it got there.\textsuperscript{29} It is certainly not going to be solved within the brief compass of this discussion. However, it may be possible to sketch a strategy that would draw together the threads of the pragmatist story in a way that is both consistent and normative.

### Justifying Social Enterprise

One place to start might be Small’s view that classical economics – and, by extension, the neo-classical economics of our own time – had perverted Adam Smith’s holistic vision of a science of society that was both moral and technical. Economics had essentially created a technology of government that was no longer accountable to any system of ethics. Its only goal was the collective maximization of wealth with no attention to any question of what that might be used for or how it might be distributed. Humans were valued only as factors of production. Sociology instead aimed to reunite the moral and the technical, restoring the questions about the nature of the good society that economics had abandoned and setting constraints upon the unbridled pursuit of riches. This derived in part from the recognition that even markets depended upon prior moral orders that they could not themselves generate, what Small’s contemporary Durkheim would call the non-contractual aspects of contract. To an important degree, the fundamental moral vision was functionalist, a recognition that societies could not operate without some basis of mutual respect between members derived from shared normative foundations. This was what stood between people and the Hobbesian potential of the classical economic market to dissolve all social bonds. Self-interest needed to be enlightened by mutual recognition of its limits, Smith’s “sacred rules,” if societies were to survive and prosper. Here was an agenda for sociology – and for those inspired

\textsuperscript{28} Deegan 2005, pp. 320–323.

\textsuperscript{29} Strong 1988.
to apply its findings and lessons in the form of social enterprise, men and women who would not “let social evil work out its own salvation.”

How far could the sociologist go in advising the social entrepreneur? Arguably, two notions became confused in the answer to this question. On the one hand, we find the notion of a social order sustained by processes of social control in the interests of a particular class. On the other, we find the problem of order or, as Harold Garfinkel put it, order*, where the wild card symbol * signified anything and everything having to do with order in everyday life.30 Loosely, we might gloss this as an idea of orderliness, where everyday life can be treated as stable, trustworthy, reliable, valid, and capable of being the basis of rational and planned actions. Garfinkel argues in this vein that we should treat the assumptions made by most classical and neo-classical economists as remarkably difficult and contingent human achievements, which stands in contrast to the conventional sociological concern for exposing class or other interests. Schegloff states in this regard that

However well-intentioned and well-disposed towards the participants – indeed often enough the whole rationale of the critical stance is the championing of what are taken to be authentic, indigenous perspectives – there is a kind of theoretical imperialism involved here, a kind of hegemony of the intellectuals, of the literati, of the academics, of the critics whose theoretical apparatus gets to stipulate the terms by reference to which the world is to be understood – when there has already been a set of terms by reference to which the world was understood – by those endogenously involved in its very coming to pass. (The issue is not unlike those who speak of Columbus as having “discovered” America, as if there were not already indigenous people living there.).31

Could we then think of order*, or orderliness, as a possible goal in providing security against the *summum malum*? We may not be able to achieve an idealist’s Utopia, but we might be able to construct a society of civility, in which matters can be resolved without resort to theoretical imperialism. Indeed, we might argue that this is what the drafters of the United States Constitution had envisaged in their separation of powers such that a powerful impetus for compromise is built into their political system. The result may sometimes be paralysis, where groups fail to respect the need to build a majority by agreement, but that can be seen as a failure of the civil mission rather than as an inherent property of the system. One might go further and argue in evolutionary terms for the importance of cultivating

---

this local order. Conversation analysts have pointed to the way in which interaction is built around a preference for agreement between the parties – disagreement is much harder to accomplish interactionally. As John Heritage once remarked in conversation, this is obvious when one thinks that human groups which did not evolve such a preference would never have survived to the present. It should be emphasized, of course, that this does not in any way imply a biological foundation for this preference. Culture is perfectly capable of evolving according to its own processes which, as Spencer noted, may be either Darwinian or Lamarckian.

The Role of the Social Entrepreneur

Where does this leave the promoter of social enterprise? More work is needed to define the possibilities, but two come immediately to mind, namely, stimulating the capacity for citizenship and promoting the resolution of social conflict.

Adam Smith placed considerable emphasis upon the importance of taking a positive view of the preparation and development of citizens for exercising civic responsibilities and duties. He maintained that

The man whose whole life is spent in performing a few simple operations… becomes… not only incapable of relishing or bearing a part in any rational conversation, but of conceiving any generous, noble or tender sentiment, and consequently of forming any just judgment… unless government takes some pains to prevent it.32

The corollary of the division of labor, and the development of a society in which many people were required to carry out vital but repetitive and mundane tasks, was thus the responsibility of the sovereign power to invest in the compensatory development of their civic capacity through education and purposeful leisure opportunities. Such investments, however, would not necessarily best be channeled through the state so much as facilitated by it, partly in order to create wider opportunities for engagement, and partly to avoid the creation of monopolies in knowledge or intervention that would block innovation and creativity.

To this we might add a special role for supporting actions directed to the resolution of conflicts. Traditional societies had been strongly marked by institutions that discouraged conflict. In modern societies, conflict is understood to be a more creative force that should not be unduly repressed because of its role in facilitating innovation and change. This is,

for example, central to Schumpeter’s understanding of entrepreneurship.\textsuperscript{33} Nevertheless, both the process and the outcomes may need to be managed if the results are to be generally experienced as positive.

But it is not entirely possible to escape the accusation that this is merely the posturing of middle-class liberals. Commenting on a response by John Dewey to a 1938 essay by Leon Trotsky, George Novack, a prominent American Trotskyite, asked

But what is the objective historical end of the middle classes…? [T]heir function is to deny the crucial importance of the class struggle… to curb its development by the working class, while its enemies remain unrestrained and powerful… Dewey (was) representative of those liberal middle class elements who aspire to be the supreme mediators and moderators of class conflict.\textsuperscript{34}

Certainly, social entrepreneurship tends to deny the relevance of class and other inter-group conflicts. These can, it would seem, all be resolved by transformative leadership and the right technical interventions. We are happy to offer university education in preparation for this, while we are not willing to offer degrees in class struggle. Academics can legitimately serve as conceptive ideologists for one kind of social movement, but not another. Nevertheless, as Schegloff pointed out, there is also a good deal of everyday life that can be improved by the promotion of civility.\textsuperscript{35} Unless one is the kind of Marxist who favors the greater immiseration of the socially disadvantaged in order to advance the day of revolution, which in any case may not bring radical change to the world of everyday interaction, anything that brings about modest improvement is worth having. There may be a time for war – class or otherwise – and a time for peace, but a wise Stoic will prefer more of the latter than of the former. If social enterprise can contribute to that goal, then let us support its aspirations without necessarily imagining that it can achieve global or even local justice.

\textit{Nottingham}
\textit{Dingwall Enterprises}

\textsuperscript{33} Swedberg 2011.
\textsuperscript{34} Trotsky et al. 1972, pp. 72–73.
\textsuperscript{35} Schegloff 1997.
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We have learned to say that the good must be extended to all of society before it can be held secure by any one person or class; but we have not yet learned to add to that statement, that unless all [people] and all classes contribute to a good, we cannot even be sure that it is worth having.

Action indeed is the sole medium of expression for ethics.

Jane Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics*

**Introduction**

One of the most popular debates in university history, philosophy, and sociology classes is the question of the relationship between history and the individual. Stated in more sociological terms, this is the question of the relationship between structure and agency, understood both individually and collectively, in fostering social change. Do people create the times, or do the times create people? Did Napoleon, Hitler, and Gandhi shape history, or were they indeed products of their historical context – were French expansionism/defeat, Nazism, and Indian independence historically inevitable? I will attempt to show in the following discussion that the question cannot be answered in such simple either/or terms.

The two dominant perspectives of contemporary social movement theory, namely, resource mobilization theory (RM) and new social movement theory (NSM), say little about the role of individual agents of social change even though such theories supposedly deal with this question.¹ We might thus ask: 1) What are the conditions that lead to the social mobilizations
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¹ Although resource mobilization theory directs a great deal of attention to the social movement entrepreneur, it regards the latter as acting more like a *deus ex machina* than an individual who might possess certain necessary qualities. Not the least of these include motivation, self-confidence/confidence in one's interpretive frameworks and visions, organizational skills, and that bit of charisma required to inspire other people.
that would bring about transformative social change? 2) What kinds of people are likely to be drawn to social activism/social movements in the first place? 3) What kinds of people are likely to become the leaders or “social movement entrepreneurs” of such movements? To understand these issues, I would like to look at the life and times of Jane Addams, the founder of Hull-House and of the settlement house movement in the United States.

PART I. Activism and Leadership
A. Social Theory and Social Movements
1. Classical Social Theory
The foundation of contemporary thinking about social movements begins with Marx and the premise that domination fosters resistance. Marx argued that capitalist domination fostered the movement toward proletariat revolution, and that, more specifically, the material foundations of capitalism – the private property that enabled bourgeois domination – led to the creation of the proletariat, who exchange their labor power for wages, undergo alienation, and suffer exploitation and immiseration. Marx viewed this as a dialectical contradiction, that is, a negation that needed to be overcome in order to realize the telos of history, namely, freedom, creativity, community, and the fulfillment of what he referred to in his early works as species being. Although capitalism required and created the proletariat, whose labor created exchange value, that same proletariat would eventually overthrow capitalism. How? In the first place, capitalism and its need for a large concentration of workers transformed scattered rural peasants into an urban proletariat. The resulting conditions of their discontent, misery, and exploitation were the first steps toward revolution. At this point the common plight of workers would become understood, which would foster the transformation of their movement from a “group in itself” to a “group for itself.” Workers would then become self-conscious as a group whose goals and interests were diametrically opposed to those of the capitalists. It is at this point that contradictions at the level of political economy migrate to the superstructure, specifically to those spaces in civil society where various actors, typically workers and/or disenchanted members of the bourgeois classes, join together and embrace critical ideologies, such as socialism, in order to contest the domination of capital.

2 By transformative social movements I mean movements that either directly, or through political pressure, lead to major societal changes, such as unionization, suffrage, civil rights movements, or antiwar movements.
Proletariat organizers and sympathetic intellectuals emerged in response to the adversities of capitalism and offered a critique of existing conditions that included unmasking the ruling class ideologies which, while remaining hidden, sustained the inequalitarian system. This reflects the manner in which Marx understood religion. For example, prayer was the wail of the oppressed, but religion as the opium of the people assuaged the pain and misery of capitalism and promised redemption—in the next life. Similarly, the nationalisms that flourished later in the nineteenth century with the rise of industrialization obscured ruling class interests by creating a “people” or “classless” citizenry who shared a loyalty and devotion to the nation state. The political control exercised by the state supposedly served to sustain the culture of the people, but it was, of course, the elite who actually gained power, not the “people.”

2. History and Charismatic Leadership

Although history as a discipline might be said to date from the ancient world, most early history was an account of events with little in the way of explanatory frameworks. In contrast, historians in the modern period have attempted to explain as well as chronicle the flow of events over time. Modern historians have sought to explain events, discern patterns, and even envision a telos of history—perhaps Hegel remains the best example of this. Others, such as Max Weber, maintained that there were no evolutionary laws of history or historical inevitabilities. Although Weber observed how a number of factors led to greater rationality in the Christian West, he did not view these as comprising a singular “motor” of history, as Hegel regarded the weltgeist and Marx viewed class conflict. Weber instead argued that the economic practices, social organizations, systems of rankings, and religion of a particular epoch influenced subsequent history.

Weber was more concerned with establishing certain sociological principles common to different historical moments. He observed in this respect that although certain trends or directions were evident within history, certain individuals, groups, or events could nevertheless act as “switchmen on the tracks of history” insofar as they altered either the course, or the destination. For example, certain times and conditions are more conducive to social change, particularly various crises of the economy, polity, or religion. At such moments, when the typical patterns of authority fail, people become prone to embrace charismatic authority, that is, authori-
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3 Gellner 1996.

4 For instance, while fascism was perhaps the inevitable response to the economic conditions of the 1930s and to the failure of the left parties to coalesce, the fact that Hitler became a leader, rather than someone else, had enormous consequences.
ty based upon emotional appeal and personal power, especially oratorical power. Certain individuals who act as prophets, exemplars, or emissaries emerge in times of crisis, and they command the respect, devotion, and loyalty of their followers through the dynamic power of their personality, the elegance of their words, and their complete self-confidence.

Freud observed that the power of the leader is based upon the emotional attachments a follower has towards her – and the charismatic leader clearly evokes powerful emotions within her followers. She dramatically expresses the emotions that her followers feel, including anger, outrage, sympathy, or care. Moreover, the leader exemplifies and celebrates the values of the group – she personifies the ego ideal of the group that serves to foster attachments between the followers, feelings of community, and loyalty to both the leader and to the other group members. The charismatic leader then depends upon the group to recognize her power to persuade others, frame reality, and propose a vision replete with tactics to attain the desired state. We know from history that charisma can be both benevolent and malevolent, but, in either case, the power of the charismatic leader is based upon emotional resonance. The charismatic leader is as likely to gain power by example and/or conviction concerning ethical goals as she is because of her declarations of anger and outrage, rants, ravings, and expressions of fury and vengeance.

3. Social Movement Theory

Social movement political and social theories have attempted to explain how certain adverse social conditions lead to collective actions/mobilizations in order to reverse or remedy the given adversity. However, traditional social movement theories say little about the mediating processes by which this takes place. The central issue for understanding social movements in fact concerns such mediating processes as the nature and roles of leadership, the recruitment of followers and supporters, the framing of problems and issues, the articulation of goals/visions, and the formulation of strategies to attain these ends.

a. Resource Mobilization/Political Process

RM theories reject the notion that social movements either consist of irrational mobs, or are responses to anomie or even situational crises and tensions. They similarly reject functionalist theory, which regards social movements as means for restoring social equilibrium. RM theories instead regard social strain as relatively constant rather than episodic. They maintain that certain “social movement entrepreneurs” either acquire, or already possess, the resources needed for mobilizing rational actors to engage
in social struggles concerning political goals in order to attempt to change state policy. Such theories tend to be less concerned with the larger social structure than with the organization and organizational processes of social movements. The latter are dependent upon the available resources (time, material assets) that the social movement can muster as well as the extent to which the larger political structure is either conducive or adverse to mobilization efforts (political or structural opportunity). RM theories assume that social movements are primarily rational attempts to promote new or change existing laws and political agendas by employing strategies to both garner wider social support and bring pressure to bear upon legislators.

b. New Social Movements
NSM theory is rooted in Marxist and Critical Theories, but it nevertheless rejects economic/class reductionism. It does not view economic determinism as the sole explanatory framework for social development, nor does it regard workers as the moving force of history with the overthrow of capitalism as the primary goal. However, it does tend to view long-term structural, cultural, and political changes as fostering stresses, strains, and, indeed, legitimacy crises concerning system integration (steering mechanisms) and social integration (legitimating values). Although capitalist contradictions and crises remain important for such theory, it often happens that a crisis migrates from one sphere to another, such as when a political or economic crisis moves into the realms of motivation and disrupts identity.

When these various crises become discordant, disturbances in the life-world evoke powerful emotions that, in turn, dispose people to mobilize – but the mediation between structural crises in particular mobilizations depends upon a number of factors. New social movements consist of a variety of actors whose identities are not so much based upon their economic roles as on other aspects of selfhood that lead them to embrace a particular identity. These movements thus tend to focus on collective struggles over contested meanings and identities. They seek to transform current values, lifestyles, and identities in the hope that society will generally become more progressive and democratic and acquire more inclusive goals, including gender and racial equality, social justice, the realization of human and/or civil rights, and, finally, the establishment of a changed relationship between humanity and the natural world built upon a more ecologically sound lifestyle.
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5 Habermas 1975.
c. Integration

I would like to suggest that neither of these two perspectives (RM and NSM) is complete. Furthermore, since they are newer social theories, they have tended to ignore certain valuable contributions of earlier social theory in general and social movement theory in particular. NSM theory is more sensitive to macrosocial factors that impact social change – especially the kinds of legitimacy crises that are tied to the rise of industrialization within advanced capitalist countries and the coordination/integration between the economic, political, cultural, and social psychological realms. Nevertheless, it has not paid sufficient attention to the mediating processes through which political economic and social factors become translated into social movement organizations, in which the role and qualities of individual leadership are often crucial. Emotions and feelings have played central roles in NSM theory, to its credit. But NSM theories have generally been more concerned with the constructions of identities, meanings, visions, social and virtual networks, and the fostering of different types of social and personal life.

Although NSM theory has, more often than not, focused on progressive social movements, as Castells has pointed out, many reactionary social movements comprise attempts to restore traditional identities that have been undermined and threatened by social change. We might note at this point that many of the issues raised by NSM theory are indeed not so new. For example, the women’s suffrage movement was not simply a collective mobilization to secure an advantageous interest – the vote – but also an attempt to redefine the nature of women as being equal to men in rights and abilities. Stated otherwise, the vote was not simply the right to make electoral choices insofar as it also redefined the nature of female identity in a way that would contest male constructions of subalternity.

Although RM theory has, in contrast, addressed the importance of leadership on the part of “social movement entrepreneurs,” it has generally directed little attention to the qualities of particular leaders. Nor has it paid much attention to the macrosocial contexts and “causes” of social movements, especially mobilizations and responses to various crises of political economy. It has also paid little attention to the roles of such emotions as anger, resentment, and fear, and to the ways in which various reactionary movements can rapidly emerge as a result. For example, RM theory emerged as an attempt to understand the civil rights movement in the United States during a period of general economic stability and, indeed,
sustained economic growth. If, on the other hand, we consider moments of political and economic crisis, such as the Great Depression, we instead see the emergence of Communist and Fascist mobilizations. We have also seen left and right mobilizations in the more recent Great Recession. The outlines of a theory that could take such issues into account were already clear to the Frankfurt School in the 1930s, but, given the School’s neo-Marxist position, the theory never attained a great deal of popularity within academic circles in the United States.

In the discussion below, I will draw upon the legacies of social movement theory, beginning with the various critiques of capitalism and mobilizations of revolution or reform, in order to understand the relationship between movers and movements, particularly Jane Addams, Hull-House, feminism, pacifism, and racial toleration.

B. Social Conditions and Social Movements

Social mobilizations and movements are not regular features of society, but rather emerge in order to deal with a particular crisis and/or problem. As is well known, industrialization led to the creation of enormous wealth, but, at the same time, also created a vast number of social problems. The nineteenth century factory system demanded large numbers of workers. As a result, many peasants came from the countryside to the cities, where they more often than not lived in squalor akin to that which Marx and Engels described, not least of all in Engels’ *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*. The concentrations of poverty led to such social problems as crime and delinquency, alcoholism, violence, gambling, prostitution, family breakdown, and rape, but there were few institutions in place to care for the poor and unfortunate.

Crises generally call forth a number of responses from the state in addition to various popular responses. The state typically attempts to pass reformist legislation that might prevent future crises in order to avoid hardship for the ruling classes. In contrast, popular mobilizations and responses typically seek either to change the conditions that might have led to the crises, fashion solutions within civil society, or pass legislation to the advantage of the popular classes. Various mobilizations emerged because of the combination of migrations to the city and the inherent instability of the capitalist system, including the labor movements, many of which were led by socialists. Other movements were more concerned with attempts to reform or transform the system, such as those generated by the great deal of popular pressure for the growth of various entitlement programs, including unemployment and/or social security legislation. These first ap-
peared in the 1870s under Bismarck, but they did not reflect the benevolence of the ruling classes as much as they were a system of control to quell the revolutionary sentiments of radical movements coming from below.

1. Activists
How and why do people become social activists? There are no simple answers or a one-size-fits-all explanation, although it seems fair to say that, in general, intellectual classes support reforms while petty bourgeois classes support reactionary regimes. There are also many different kinds of social movements, including philanthropic movements to help the sick or needy, such as Doctors Without Borders or Oxfam, environmental movements concerned with preserving wildlife, such as Greenpeace, and movements to protect human rights, such as Amnesty International. But as worthy as it might be to provide medical help to the poor, find treatment for an illness, or rescue abused animals, such movements little change the structure and/or culture of a given society.

Other movements are largely cultural, such as certain resistance movements – punks, goths, or hip-hop – which embrace genres of popular music that reject the morals and values of the dominant culture. There are, in addition, transformative political movements that would change or reform society in either progressive or reactionary directions. These include movements that would radically transform the social structure, such as feminist movements and civil rights movements that support equality and the inclusion of the heretofore marginalized. Other pertinent examples are antiwar and peace movements, which seek an end to the military and to the military industrial complex that supports it, as well as revolutionary movements that would radically transform the nature of leadership, property ownership, or even both. Certain environmental movements, such as Greenpeace, are more likely to want to transform the world, while the more reformist Sierra Club would preserve a pristine environment and try to influence the political regime without transforming it. Yet other movements promote various kinds of wellness, ranging from diet to exercise meditation. Their leaders, while quite often true believers, often prosper from the lifestyles they advocate.

Different types of social movements attract different types of people. Some people come from activist families. (As will be noted, Jane Addams’ parents were abolitionists.) Serendipitous factors move others into activism, such as when one or a member of one's family or friendship networks suffers a preventable misfortune or becomes ill. Similarly, when a close friend or family member is lost due to a drunken driver, war, or abuse and/or harassment, one might seek to mobilize others who can join together to
eliminate the cause. Quite often, people move to activism because of their social networks. It is always important to remember that the historical context of political system creates opportunities for mobilization.

*a. Social Location*

I would like to suggest that, for two reasons, one of the most important antecedents to activism is location within social networks. First, membership in various groups typically involves sharing the attitudes, values, and goals of that group. Academics in the arts and sciences, for example, are more likely to be liberal on most social and political issues than upper echelon executives. A long-standing research tradition has generally shown that people with higher levels of liberal arts education tend to be more socially liberal, but this also depends upon their particular field. Sociologists and philosophers tend to be more liberal and critical of society than academic physicists or mathematicians, notwithstanding individual variations. Similarly, media executives tend to be more liberal than their counterparts in banking, oil, and the defense industries. The primary point in this respect is that being in a group and maintaining certain kinds of friendships is quite often based on having certain areas of common interest and common values.

Second, people in different social locations have greater or less access to certain types of information. Thus, for example, one’s age, level of education, and occupation are associated with paying attention to news and current events. But because we often hear people complaining about information overload, we might well ask what kind of information this involves. Some surveys have suggested that young people spend eight hours a day texting friends or in online social networks, but pay little attention to what is transpiring in local, national, or international politics.

For our purposes it is sufficient to note that not all people are exposed to and/or aware of various types of social problems, tensions, or malaise. It is axiomatic that many of the rich go to great pains to insulate themselves from the poor by living within enclaves that are socially, culturally, and spatially quite distant. Nevertheless, there have always been “deviants” who forsake their elite class positions and class interests and attempt to ameliorate the adversities of the unfortunate. Similarly, there are people who are upwardly mobile, but retain memories of social disadvantage and would seek to ameliorate the adverse conditions they experienced in their
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8 It would appear that Weber’s analysis of stratification helps us understand why honorific status in terms of lifestyles and associations is more salient than economic class in respect to one’s opportunities in life.
own youth. Lastly, people of privilege often have social networks they can utilize to both recruit followers and garner resources.

b. Deviance

As was noted above, transformative social movements often attract people who tend to be deviant in one way or another. They need not be rebellious, just sufficiently different from the rest of the population to want a change in the status quo. In general, most people tend to conform to the status quo and, more often than not, do very little to actually engage in social change. Yes, people may have strong attitudes and values about a range of things, but it is always a small minority who actually participate in social movements and attempt to change society.

Being deviant in one sphere of life seems to make it more tolerable and possible to be deviant in others, especially when one is in a subaltern role or can empathize with other people in such a role and/or the various hardships experienced. I propose that a departure from general norms and values enables certain people to take another perspective concerning the taken-for-granted assumptions of “normal” social life. This is much in the same vein as Simmel’s (1908) observation that the “stranger” is able to glean a more accurate perspective on a given society, and that the “outsider” is more likely to be aware of things that the natives fail to see.

c. Empathy and Emotion

But deviance is not necessarily the path to social activism – it can in fact more often lead to prison or social isolation. It is rather when deviance or marginality enables a person to have empathy, especially for those who may also be quite different and/or quite distant, that one might come to understand the experiences of another and be motivated to resolve a problem affecting them. Symbolic interactionist theory regards “taking the role of the other,” and eventually the role of the “generalized other,” as an essential part of the development of selfhood. For most of us, however, the Other tends to have a similar background and is relatively close to us in most ways.

When Jane Addams was born in 1860, why would affluent Northerners, quite insulated from the South and the plight of slaves, be able to
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9 As will be seen below, Jane Addams was deviant, and in a number of ways. She was a sickly child, lost her mother at two years of age, and, unlike most women of her class at that time, highly educated and well-traveled. Finally, she was perhaps gay at a time when that was not quite acceptable. She spent most of her adult life with Ellen Starr, the co-founder of Hull-House.

10 Simmel 1908.
Imagine the hardships of domination, empathize with strangers’ suffering, and become abolitionists? In a similar vein, we might ask why people reach into their pockets to help distant victims of misfortune, especially when they may be very different, as is the case with charitable outpourings from affluent Americans and Europeans to the AIDS victims of Africa, the earthquake victims of Haiti, or the flood victims of Pakistan. I would suggest that the deviant person who in some way or another questions or rejects the dominant social norms – or perhaps has been rejected by the normative social order – becomes particularly sensitive to those who may also be different in social terms or spatially distant from one’s own zone of comfort.

Empathy not only allows one to take the emotional perspective of another, it can also lead to anger and outrage at the domination and/or violence perpetrated on others when one has information as to how and why the other person is distressed, oppressed, or otherwise victimized. Consider, for instance, the anger many people felt when they saw Americans seeking their civil rights being met with dogs and fire hoses. The resulting collective outrage that resulted from the actions of a small number of such activists prepared the way for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In much the same way, George W. Bush articulated the anger that Americans felt toward radical Islamists following the events of September 11th, 2001. The fact that he used that anger and outrage to attack Iraq had, of course, absolutely nothing to do with “9/11”.

d. To Action

The final element I would like to note is a sense of agency. To have empathy with a distant stranger is a necessary but not sufficient element for engaging in transformative social activism. The final, but not the least important, essential ingredient is a feeling of efficacy – the sense that one’s actions can make an impact. Those who engage in transformative social mobilization and challenge vested interests know very well that they may face harassment, repression, and indeed, in some societies, untimely death. Social movement literature, especially in the United States, has tended to focus more on political structure and opportunity than on agency or on the emotional reactions that may lead to the concerted actions of individuals. The latter involve choices of tactics as well as actively choosing/constructing frameworks of meaning and understanding that lead to action. Jasper observes in this regard that “All strategic action is filtered through cultural
understandings, but at the same time cultural meanings are used strategically to persuade audiences.\textsuperscript{11}

2. Leaders
How and why do certain people become leaders, that is to say, social movement entrepreneurs? What is needed, over and above what is necessary for being an activist, to become a leader, to be one who initiates efforts to organize, mobilize, challenge, and confront? Just as there is no single or simple explanation for how or why people become activists in the first place, there is no good explanation for how and why certain people become leaders. The leader of a transformative social movement is usually not elected to a specific post, but rather assumes that position largely on the basis of the power of her personality – what Weber calls “charismatic” authority.

The most important qualities of a leader include absolute self-confidence and an unwavering conviction in one’s ability to understand a problem, frame its causes, articulate steps to ameliorate it, and envision a different world. But while these qualities are necessary, they are not sufficient.

Weber maintained that one of the primary qualities of most charismatic leaders was their ability to move an audience. This gift of leadership involves spellbinding oratory and persuasion that frames a problem, clarifies its origins, provides a vision, and impels people to act. This does not necessarily mean loud shouting and histrionics. In many cases, the more quiet certitude of a Gandhi or a Mandela provides a rhetoric that stirs people's feelings and arouses their emotions. Leaders, in Klumpp’s terms:\textsuperscript{12}

1. Develop a language to articulate discontent. This language uses narratives, metaphors, and other rhetorical devices to capture the morality of discontent. It is a language that identifies people in respect to a shared sense of discontent. Movements will succeed in growing as they are able to articulate such discontent.

2. Identify responsibility for the discontent. Rhetoric develops a target for action and “perfects” it by creating the target’s responsibility for the discontent. The scope of this responsibility – class, society, system, etc. – is of key importance because it brings responsibility to a focus. Rhetoric in this regard is often polemical, exaggerating the differences between the movement and its target.

3. Effectively focus and direct the energy of the movement towards the target. Rhetoric motivates continued action toward the idealistic goal. It is rich with the experience of being in the movement, dreams of success,

\textsuperscript{11} Jasper 2004, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{12} Klumpp 2008.
accomplishments of the movement’s work, and satisfaction. At this mature stage, the movement celebrates its successes.

From what has been said to this point, we may conclude that the qualities of leader as a social movement entrepreneur result from complex interactions between her social location and access to information, a certain degree of deviance from norms that makes possible an outsider’s perspective, and an empathy for the plights of others that often elicits the intense emotions which comprise the preconditions for social activism. Strains and contradictions within a given society generally foster pressures and forces that would remedy the situation and assuage the pain that the victims of hardships undergo. But how does this happen? The fundamental question at this point concerns the emergence of social movement organizations, in which the role of emergent leadership is crucial. But in many cases, perhaps most, the pressures for change are more likely to come from below rather than from elites acting upon their own volition. Nevertheless, even many popular movements have been led by people who are, in some way, privileged or advantaged.

Successful movements are typically the result of certain extraordinary individuals who have the ability to galvanize shared feelings, recruit and mobilize followers, frame an issue, and provide a vision. Jane Addams was such an extraordinary leader.

PART II. The Life and Times of Jane Addams

A. Industry Booms

The United States, at least the industrial North, flourished after the Civil War as the basis of the economy changed from rural/agricultural to urban/industrial. Part and parcel of this transition was the industrialization of agriculture made possible by the federal government’s support of scientific agronomy. The Morrill Act of 1862, which granted land to the states in order to establish universities and agricultural research centers, was of particular importance in this regard. In addition, the development of the McCormick reaper revolutionized agricultural production, lowering the number of agricultural workers who were needed. Many people then moved to the cities. Commerce also flourished as the rapidly growing railroad system expanded throughout the country. (We must recall that Jane Addams’ father was a very successful entrepreneur involved in agriculture, industry, banking, and transportation).

Chicago assumed a central position in transportation, merchandising (Sears, Wards), finance, and industry because of its central location in the country and the network of waterways that eventually connected it to
the Erie Canal, the Atlantic Ocean, the Mississippi River, and the Gulf of Mexico. And given its proximity to both coal and iron ore, the Chicago area, primarily northern Indiana, became one of the major steel manufacturing centers in the United States. In addition, not only did the McCormick factory move to Chicago, Chicago soon became the meat-packing center of the country – the “hog butcher for the world”13 – especially with the development of refrigerated railroad cars. As a result, Chicago had a growing, dynamic economy that needed large numbers of workers. It became a magnet for the “tired, poor, and hungry masses” of Europe who flocked to the rapidly growing cities of the United States.14 Most of these downtrodden “huddled masses” were not as motivated by the desire to breathe free as by the desire to find jobs in the land where the streets were said to be paved with gold. And they came from all over Europe. Not only were they poor and uneducated, but, more often than not, they could not speak English. In 1890, 80 percent of Chicagoans were immigrants. And yes, while many did find jobs, most of the available work in mills, factories, and meatpacking demanded long, tedious hours under precarious working conditions with low pay. These workers and their families faced additional hardships in adjusting to a new culture, a new language, and urban life.15

And while it should be noted that the American economy grew during this period by leaps and bounds, there were two major consequences insofar as it was a capitalist system. 1) A new class of finance-industrial capitalist elites emerged who amassed great fortunes in railroads, transportation, steel, banking, meatpacking, and so forth. This new class of elites, including Vanderbilt, Morgan, Carnegie, Rockefeller, Swift, Armour, Morris, and Pullman, came to be known, depending on your proclivities, as either “robber barons” or “captains of industry.” Their wealth and conspicuous consumption came to be called the “Gilded Age.” But their wealth depended on the exploitation of the workers who received poor wages while often laboring long hours in unsafe conditions. Moreover, these elites were able, by virtue of their great wealth, to fashion government policies to limit unionization, restrict incomes, and suppress workers’ rights. When workers tried to organize, the instruments of state oppression were called out to suppress them, such as in the Pullman strike. 2) There were inevitable crises based upon speculation in various industries or, in some cases, in such

13 This is the opening line of Carl Sandberg’s “Chicago,” which first appeared in Poetry, March 1914.
14 This and the following sentence refer to “The New Colossus,” a sonnet written by Emma Lazarus in 1883 that is inscribed on a bronze plaque set in the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor.
15 Perhaps the classical study in this regard remains Thomas and Znaniecki’s The Polish Peasant in Europe and America.
commodities as gold and silver. The nation experienced major economic crises in 1873 and again in 1893 due to speculation in the railroads, then a major industry.

The combination of the rapid ascent of urban-industrial society and the influx of large numbers of immigrants would become the basis for a number of strains and dislocations at both macro and micro levels — evident in such social problems as alcoholism, unwed mothers, crime, delinquency, and deviance. In addition, the rise of the new industrial society led to the relative decline of the rural sector. The new captains of industry also disdained the role of the state in either regulating the economy, or providing any type of aid or relief to the poor and unfortunate. We must recall that this was the time in which William G. Sumner’s social Darwinism, which celebrated if not legitimated capitalism unbound, found a small but very enthusiastic and typically very wealthy audience. Their structural location/ economic self-interests led them either to ignore the social problems they created, or to “blame the victim.” But the wealth of the capitalist classes in the face of poverty and degradation would foster resistance from other classes. Meanwhile, labor movements, often led by radicals, were growing. The Pullman strike in 1894, led by the socialist Eugene V. Debs, curtailed railroad service in the United States until the government intervened.

As financial power shifted to the new industrial structures and institutions, many people — from farmers and small businessmen to skilled artisans and workers — disdained the changes that were taking place. Their response was, quite naturally, populism, which was perhaps best exemplified by the presidential campaigns of William Jennings Bryan. But while populism may have been eventually defeated, the contradictions of capitalism endured, and even many segments of the urban middle classes resented the robber barons, especially after the panics of 1893 and 1907. At the same time, the major cities of the East and Midwest were swelling with growing populations of immigrants living in the squalor of tenement slums.

The inherent contradictions of capitalism are such that it undergoes critical moments and crises that challenge its very foundations, structure, and practices. At such times, while various groups may engage in resistance and struggle, certain individuals are likely to emerge as leaders in various struggles demanding reform — and even revolution. And as we have long known, even segments of the ruling classes turn against the system at times of crisis.

---

16 The spatial locations of different communities and their relationships to crime and deviance will become central concerns for the Chicago School of sociology, which was much influenced by Jane Addams.
As Marx (1848) claimed,

At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange... the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder. Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it, and the economic and political sway of the bourgeois class. A similar movement is going on before our own eyes.... The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring order into the whole of bourgeois society, and endanger the existence of bourgeois property.\(^\text{17}\)

The various conditions that threaten the stability of capitalism gave rise to the “progressive era,” a movement of progressive reform from roughly 1890 to 1920 that was impelled by large numbers of the angry and disgruntled and led primarily by such members of the elites as Teddy Roosevelt, Howard Taft, and Woodrow Wilson. Privileged classes typically act to preserve their privileges, and their class interests usually stand in direct contradiction to the interests of the masses. But at times when the wealth or privileges of the elites are challenged, their members will usually seek to make accommodations in order to preserve social stability – along with their own wealth and privilege. Philanthropy and reform movements, although perhaps based in part upon the noble sentiments of the movements’ leaders, thus function primarily to preserve the conditions that enable elites to maintain their advantages. The progressive era would thereby become a period of major reforms concerning the economy, politics, and social issues ranging from the role of women (suffrage, birth control, entry into the professions) to dealing with social problems. Capitalism has always been ready to accept reforms as the price of maintaining its stability and profits. And while pressures for change generally come from the masses, the leadership of reform movements are more likely to come from elites, who would gladly accept, if not initiate, changes that would preserve the system and their privileges.

Let us now turn to the central theme of our discussion – Jane Addams, the mover of movements.

B. Enter Jane Addams

Jane Addams is often painted by history books as the “nice lady social worker” who helped the poor. But while this is true, she was also so much more. At one time she was considered to be the most “dangerous woman” in America – at least by the FBI, which kept massive surveillance files on her and Hull-House. She was a feminist (suffragette), pacifist, radical democrat, supporter of equal rights, and so forth, who associated with a variety of progressives and radicals. She was a brilliant intellectual who turned down a faculty position at the University of Chicago. But she herself was a reformer, as befits her social class, not a radical, and thus became the most important female voice of the progressive era. But how did it happen that an affluent woman from a small town became a champion of the urban poor as well as one of the most important women of her time, who, indeed, had a major impact upon American history? I will not attempt to offer an extended biography or an in-depth psychological analysis of her character. I will instead seek to present Jane Addams as a mover of movements by looking at the social context of her time and certain qualities of her life that are frequently found among social movement entrepreneurs.

Jane Addams was born in 1860 into a prosperous family in Cedarville, Illinois, a small town not far from Chicago. Her father was a successful businessman, banker, and politician – he was also an abolitionist, a founding member of the Republican Party, and a personal friend of Abraham Lincoln. He was a Christian, but of a rather eclectic sort, as he had sympathies with Quakerism and the Social Gospel. Moreover, his Christianity led him to be concerned with social justice. This milieu surely influenced his daughter. Jane was raised as a Christian and much embraced the Social Gospel of caring for others. (We might note that, when she was only four, she met a runaway slave whom her father was moving along the underground railroad.) While her father was clearly a businessman and politician, he was also an example of an enlightened businessman who valued learning, culture, and ideas. When Jane was two years old, her mother died; when she was four years old, she contracted spinal tuberculosis, which would mean lifelong health problems – and feelings of inadequacy. As will be suggested, both the psychological and physical pains of her own experience would sensitize her to the pains of others.

Jane Addams grew up amidst books and ideas. She was quite widely read at a time when only affluent women had the time and encouragement for literacy and an appreciation of the arts and literature. She would eventually become a student of philosophy as well. In addition, she encountered poor people far removed from her own circle of friends and family on her early travels in Illinois. Her stepmother encouraged her to learn music as
well as the etiquette, manners, and graces “appropriate” to a woman of her station. Her father encouraged her to get an education, which was quite unusual for women at that time. Although she wanted to go to Smith College in the state of Massachusetts, she attended Rockford, which at that time was primarily a theological school, because her father insisted that she stay nearby. It was here that she met Ellen Starr, who would be her lifelong companion. She wanted to become a doctor and help the poor, but changed her direction after a year of medical school.

Addams inherited a great deal of money when her father died, which enabled her to travel to Europe. Inspired by a magazine article about Toynbee House, a settlement house in London, she went to England to see it firsthand. Addams then found her calling. With the help of her inheritance, a crucial resource that came from her class position, she established Hull-House upon her return to the United States and promoted the settlement house movement as a way in which to help poor destitute immigrants adapt to life in the United States. The settlement house was a place where the problems of the urban poor could be addressed. It was a place where ordinary people could find help and services to deal with the hardships of urban life in the growing tenements where workers tried to eke out an existence. But it was also a place where rich and poor might freely mingle, and where the better educated might offer programs in art, culture, and various other activities that would not only provide economic aid, but also enrich people’s lives.

Let us now try to understand the intersections of social conditions, social movements, and the movers who lead these movements.

Transformative social movements, whether revolutionary or reformist in character, constitute responses to various structural conditions. In the face of various crises of legitimacy, especially in the political economy and the dominant culture, various social actors respond with stress and strain, fear and anger, and become disposed to embrace collective solutions. There are cultural and structural barriers to such movements in the United States, with its strong traditions of individualism and an absence of left/labor political parties. We should note that transformative movements that would change the structure and dynamics of society are most often movements from below. That is to say that it is only when large numbers of those who are typically disadvantaged join together that such social change becomes possible. And although such change quite often tends to be progressive, there are times when it becomes reactionary.

When mounting social pressures would seem to threaten the stability or structure of society, especially the structures of wealth and privilege, some segments of the elites often attempt to reform the structure lest the popu-
lar forces foster leaders and movements that might demand revolution. As will be seen, although Jane Addams was deemed a revolutionary, she was in fact a progressive reformer and part of a larger movement to emerge that would ultimately preserve the nature of American capitalism. How, then, do we understand the emergence of social activists, especially those who come from the privileged classes?

C. Social Location

Perhaps the first point to be mentioned is that activists are typically located in social spaces where they are particularly likely to be aware of adversity and oppression. Transformative social activists are more likely to be exposed, directly or indirectly, to certain kinds of information, and they are likely to frame information within certain critical paradigms. As we have seen, Addams was born into a world of books, novels, biographies, and histories that surely expands the horizons and perspectives of a privileged young girl in a small Illinois town. In contrast, conditions of poverty and destitution, in which every day is a struggle for survival, neither put one in a position to access or be exposed to information and knowledge, nor make it likely that one has the time to read, think, or even imagine. As the psychologist Abraham Maslow put it, it is only after we find safety and security that self-actualization can flourish. Jane Addams was born into a privileged position where she had the intellect, free time, and conditions needed to pursue knowledge – often including critical perspectives.

Even though social movement leaders often come from the more affluent classes, in many cases “organic intellectuals” emerge within the ranks of the oppressed. Two prominent twentieth century examples are Malcolm X and Nelson Mandela. Malcolm Little was born poor and, despite his intelligence, pursued a life of crime rather than education. While in prison, however, he began to spend a great deal of time in the library, becoming a voracious reader with the time needed to study, think, and imagine. Nelson Mandela came from an African noble background (Xhosa), but was not born into a literate family. He nevertheless managed to become an outstanding student and scholar. In general, though, people with higher levels of income are more exposed to various sorts of information, including information about the pain and suffering of others. And while many victims may be directly aware of pain, oppression, and insult, they quite often lack the resources of education, social skills, and force of personality needed to lead social movements. This is, of course, not to ignore the fact that many popular movements have been led by the less educated.
D. Deviance

From all indications, the young Jane Addams was a very spirited young woman, but she was hardly a rebellious youth who rejected her family and background. Be that said, her devotion to scholarship was quite rare for women at that time, for while elite women of that era were surely cultured, literate, and mannered, few were likely to pursue formal education. The former traits were more likely considered to be essential for the “cult of true womanhood,” whereby women of her class exchanged their moral purity and cultural virtues for lifelong economic support—a state otherwise known as marriage. While she befriended many men in her philanthropic/activist roles, it seems as if she never had a serious romantic involvement with a man. While it is not completely clear whether she was straight or gay, it is more likely than not that she rejected the hetero-normative, highly patriarchal values of the day. She instead chose a “Boston marriage” with Ellen Starr, which would enable her to fulfill a feminist/philanthropic “calling” free of the hindrances of a husband, children, and the entrapments of a gilded cage in a doll’s house. Moreover, she spent several years upon finishing her education searching for a way in which to realize her own calling, rejecting the orthodoxy of missionary work and the bureaucracy of a schoolteacher. Her deviance thus enabled her to see things in different ways, which would become evident when she established the settlement house movement.

As noted above, social activists are in certain ways socially, culturally, and politically deviant, and, by virtue of their very deviance, more likely to think and act outside the box. They may be also cultural outsiders, strangers in Simmel’s words. For example, the French visitor to the United States Alexis de Tocqueville provided us with some of the most perceptive analyses of American society available. Jews, such as Marx, Freud, and Durkheim, who were outsiders in respect to the European mainstream, have offered some of the most perceptive observations in the history of ideas. In a similar way, activists—especially those who lead progressive movements—become acutely aware of certain adverse conditions, which can dispose one to action when combined with empathy for the pain and suffering of others. Although there are certainly many exceptions, activists are generally not only more likely exposed to information, but also more likely to have the kinds of critical perspectives that have been the mainstay of much of literature and philosophy. Crucial factors for activism thus include education, information, and critical perspectives.

---

18 Simmel 1908.
At this point we can see a number of aspects of Addams’ life that would eventually dispose her to social entrepreneurship, beginning with her background of privilege that gave her access to education and learning.

E. Empathy

Many people, perhaps most, are aware that other people suffer adversities. But if the suffering of others is far removed from their own circle of friends and family, they in fact care very little and do even less. At this point the key element is empathy with the stranger, that is, the capacity to understand another person on an emotional level and, most of all, understand the pains and tribulations that he or she may suffer. While the capacity for empathy begins with understanding one’s own feelings, symbolic interactionist theory, as noted above, regards taking the role of the other as an essential part of the development of selfhood.

Jane Addams, given her early pains and traumas with the loss of her mother at the age of two, then the tubercular back problems at age four, acquired a clear awareness of pain and suffering that many people with a more “normal” life course might not experience. Addams, through no fault of her own, was not only extremely intelligent and endowed with a strong personality, but also learned from the suffering of pain at an early age to see the world from a different perspective and have a sense of empathy for other people who also suffer various kinds of pains and tribulations, through no fault of their own. Moreover, she had been exposed to people from very different and distant backgrounds from the time she was a very young child. As mentioned above, she met an escaped slave making his way along the underground railway when just a child and encountered the poor in her travels throughout Illinois. If we then consider the important role of Christianity and the Social Gospel in her life, we might observe that, as she blossomed into her own unique person, she was already disposed to empathy for the unfortunate and to a sense of Christian social justice.

Weber remarked that many people were likely to experience a moral calling, but that for some people this might be expressed through his or her charisma. This was the case for Jane Addams.

F. To Action

In the late nineteenth century there were few government-sponsored programs dealing with the poor and the conditions of urban life – save for the police as instruments of social control. It often happened that upper-class women might visit the homes of poor women and perhaps offer them some advice about domestic life, but not only was this rather haphazardly
organized, it was also relatively ineffectual and incapable of dealing with the problems of poor immigrants. The settlement house was ideally suited for dealing with the problems of the urban poor and the deplorable conditions of the urban working class. Furthermore, that model, and its vision, provided Jane Addams with a mission and a moral calling that led to a fulfilling life for a feminist in the late 1800s. These various aspects of her life, undergirded by a sense of moral calling rooted in her Christianity and by her own version of agentic feminism, found realization in the establishment of Hull-House and in the subsequent settlement house movement that emerged as the American factories needed immigrants to perform industrial work in the growing economy. The model of social work thus changed from periodic home visits to the establishment of community centers that systematically offered a variety of services, programs, and activities.

The settlement house, as a woman-centered location and an alternative to marriage and the chains of domesticity, not only stood as a rejection of patriarchy and of subservience to men, it also rejected the bifurcation of the public and private spheres whereby the male dominated public sphere established the norms and values that migrated into the private sphere, where male constructions of the female other, the “second sex,” relegated her to being either the cultured virginal moral guardian of the “hearth,” or the wild temptress – the passionate whore. The settlement house was both a public and a private sphere. Women did in fact do the domestic work of running a nursery, kitchen, daycare center, and so forth, but, at the same time, many of its residents included women scholars, activists, and reformers who fully participated in public life.

One of the most important functions of the settlement house as a community center was precisely that it provided for communal life. And part of that communal life was the provision of often-needed medical services and various programs in arts and culture not otherwise available to poor immigrants.

G. Beyond Hull-House

Jane Addams, together with the other dynamic women who were involved in Hull-House, became known as the mother of the American settlement house movement as settlement houses were established in many other cit-

---

19 de Beauvoir 1952.

20 It was Lisa Lee, the museum director of Hull-House, who pointed out how an essential theme in queer theory contests the hetero-normative premises of the bourgeois public sphere.
ies throughout the United States. Throughout the country, the lives of new immigrants benefitted from the services, programs, and activities provided by these centers. Moreover, as Mary Jo Deegan has made so clear, the association between Hull-House and the Chicago School of Sociology led to subsequent sociological interests in crime, the city, deviance, social problems, and even questions of physical and mental health. Addams herself also exerted a considerable influence upon both feminist thought as well as the American philosophical school of pragmatism. In addition, Hull-House, as a salon and public sphere, was host to such luminaries as William I. Thomas, George Herbert Mead, John Dewey, and Peter Kropotkin.

One of the overriding principles of Jane Addams moral stance was her belief in social harmony. Indeed, she took issue with Hegel and Marx because of their assumption that contradiction and conflict were the moving forces of history. As befit both her personality and her class position, she was a reformer seeking social harmony, not a revolutionary seeking overthrow of the government/economy. Her sentiments would be extended to other causes from pacifism to civil rights, and she eventually become involved in immigrant rights, factory safety, and opposition to sweatshops, which often employed children. She also supported the eight-hour day, suffrage, and improved housing conditions. Addams was a founding member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as well as the American Civil Liberties Union. In 1912, she threw her lot in with the Progressive Party and campaigned along with Teddy Roosevelt. Given her opposition to conflict in general and war in particular, she organized the Women’s Peace Party and the International Congress of Women as WW I loomed on the horizon. In 1931, Addams became the first American woman to win a Nobel Prize.

Conclusion

The attempt to understand social movements has been limited by a number of factors, not the least of which is the self-established ranges/levels of explanation of the official canon. In the United States, moreover, the “value free” biases of sociology in general are such that the proximate cause of many social problems – the inherent conflicts and contradictions within a capitalist political economy – is little addressed. Stated otherwise, social movement theory has generally avoided dealing with larger macrostructural factors – especially the nature and consequences of capitalist alienation, domination, and episodic crisis – which then fade into a fuzzy background. Nevertheless, at certain times various aspects of the social context lead to

21 Deegan 1990.
the emergence of social movement entrepreneurs who then mobilize social movements.

Similarly, most social movement theory pays little attention to the more “individualistic” issues of emotion, motivation, desire, and character. It is as if people would never be angry or outraged about what happens in their economy or in relations with other countries. It is as if fear, shame, and disgust play no roles in eliciting collective action. In rejecting the irrational mob theories of Le Bon, social movement theory has generally thrown out emotion as well. Today, knowing how the various cues, controls, and experiences of emotion are fundamentally social, we should be open to accept emotions as a very legitimate part of explaining social movements – especially the feelings of social movement entrepreneurs.

In addition, approaches to thinking about social movements have tended to be relatively sectarian, thereby precluding integration. As a result, all we are basically left with are theories that dare not step on anyone’s toes. Their primary function is to anchor funded research that tends to be insipid, inoffensive, and thus acceptable to both the canon and to journal reviewers. This is not to ignore the many valuable contributions that have been made, but, at the same time, they have not yet been integrated into a coherent social theory. The limitations of this kind of thinking can be clearly seen in the attempt to understand the rise of the settlement house movement and the critical role that Jane Addams played in this movement, as well as the many other movements in which she played a key role.

At this venture we should remind ourselves of C. Wright Mills’ dictum that sociology, properly understood, is an attempt to show the linkage between individual biographies and collective history.\(^{22}\) For Mills, the foundations of sociology began with the attempt to understand the lives of the alienated workers in the sweatshops of Manchester, whose poverty, exploitation, and degradation were the result of a capitalist system in which economic and political power were monopolized by Protestant entrepreneurs. Weber had argued that these capitalists were motivated by a religiously-based calling and fundamental anxieties over salvation. Furthermore, given their religious ideology (economic interests), they felt no need to be concerned with workers. But even as this industrial era was flourishing, Durkheim reminded us of the extent to which it was a period of anomie, egoism, and social fragmentation.

Mills regarded functionalist theory (grand theory) – much like the more recent post-modernism – as so divorced from reality that it was worse than useless. At the same time, however, he regarded abstract empiricism and

\(^{22}\) Mills 1959.
data fetishism as having led many sociologists to equate social life with four point scales that purportedly measure something – whatever it is – that is completely independent of any social context. In sharp contrast to such views, the life and social movement entrepreneurship of Jane Addams clearly illustrates the intersection of history and biography.

I have argued that, in order to understand movements, we must first understand the larger social context, especially the historical, economic, political, and cultural realities that shape people's lives. Furthermore, given the Frankfurt School’s analysis of the rise of fascism and its more recent concern with legitimation crises, it is evident that we must bring political economy into theorizing about social movements. At the same time, though, the classical Marxist paradigm is too limited for understanding social movements apart from workers strikes. This has been clearly understood by the NSM theorists who, while having Marxist roots, focus more upon cultural factors and the meanings, values, and identities of contemporary postindustrial society. These struggles take place in the public spheres of civil society, not in factories or tenements.

Although such theorists claim that they are concerned largely with contemporary social movements, one might argue that feminism for the women of Jane Addams' generation was as much concerned with agency, voice, and identity, and offered a critique of hetero-normative patriarchy, as it was concerned with votes and wages. In addition, while emotions play a central role in NSM theory, much to its credit, such theory has had very little to say about leadership. While various networks, submerged or otherwise, may surely bring people into social movements, it is not particularly clear how or why certain people who have been recruited in this manner have the personal skills and motivation to become leaders. And without effective leadership, organizations fail, regardless of whether they are governments, armies, universities, or social movements.

RM theories pay more attention to the organizational dynamics of social movements and to social movement entrepreneurs than to the resources of leaders, movements, structural opportunities, and constraints for mobilization. But while they clearly stop short of macrosocial analyses, and although the implicit rationality of social mobilization may perhaps be overstated, they nevertheless make us aware of how organizations frame events and choose tactics that are deemed most likely to influence government policy.

To illustrate the many and complex relationships of movements and their movers, as seen in the rise of the settlement house movement, it was necessary for us to begin with the rise of industrialization and the growth of cities in which many of the workers lived in abject poverty in abysmal...
tenement housing. Social disorganization was inevitable, and a myriad of social problems ensued given the adverse conditions of sweatshop labor, often performed by children, and the overcrowding of the slums. The contrast between affluent industrialists and impoverished workers foretold chaos and instability. Under these conditions, certain individuals emerged and brought various actors together, framed the problem, envisioned an alternative, and fostered/directed social movements.

The life and times of Jane Addams have had at least two important consequences. For the purposes of this paper, the rise of the settlement house movement, led by Addams, remains a model of social entrepreneurship and how one person can make a difference to the lives of hundreds, thousands, and perhaps millions of people. At the same time, trying to understand how or why she became a leader makes us rethink the sociology of social movements. On the one hand, the theories referred to above illuminate many unseen and perhaps unacknowledged social processes. At the same time, however, they have often acted as barriers to considerations that would broaden our understanding of that which they purport to explain.

Jane Addams has bequeathed us a role model for our own lives and the impetus to broaden the sociological understanding of social entrepreneurship. Jane Addams, thank you.

*Loyola University Chicago*
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II.
Women, Sociology, and the Social Enterprise
A Note on How Sociology can Contribute to the Development of Entrepreneurship Research

Ivo Zander

Introduction

The rapidly developing domain of entrepreneurship research has increasingly focused on the emergence and development of new business ventures. Scott Shane and Sankaran Venkataraman have proposed in an influential paper that entrepreneurship research should address the questions “how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited.”  

Although many of these questions have already been addressed or are currently being explored in increasing detail, the literature has been relatively silent on a number of central elements or aspects of the entrepreneurial process. It is the contention of this brief discussion that sociology can make significant contributions by filling in gaps in the extant knowledge concerning these issues, which include the concepts of resistance, persuasion, and social entrepreneurship.

It must be noted, however, that the following brief observations by no means offer a complete or exhaustive review of the literature, particularly regarding the contributions and developments in sociology, a field in which my knowledge is limited. They rather serve more as a window upon entrepreneurship literature and the connections that may be picked up and explored by sociologists. My ambition here is merely to review certain elements and phenomena of a social nature that to date have received comparatively limited attention in entrepreneurship literature, perhaps because the traditional focus of the latter has been on the individual and her role in the entrepreneurial process. Accordingly, the main emphasis will be on describing the nature and role of both resistance and persuasion within the entrepreneurship context, with some brief observations concerning
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1 Shane and Venkataraman 2000, p. 218.
relevant work in the field of sociology and how social entrepreneurship may provide a particularly useful arena for its empirical application.

Resistance

If the entrepreneurial process is about the discovery, evaluation, and exploitation of new business opportunities, then entrepreneurship research has placed a particular emphasis upon the individual and how she discovers and evaluates ideas for new products or services. Some of the major themes in this regard include entrepreneurial cognition, or how entrepreneurs think and reason, and the various forms of opportunity recognition and discovery. There has been some research concerning how novel ideas are received in the marketplace, but there has been less discussion about this aspect of the entrepreneurial process. It is generally known that many entrepreneurs struggle to get their novel ideas known and accepted in the marketplace, and that this struggle plays an important role in shaping the popular notion of the heroic entrepreneur who, against all odds, overcomes adversity and ultimately establishes a successful business. Nevertheless, there is relatively little systematic information available about the causes of that struggle and the various ways in which resistance to novelty can be overcome.

Resistance may be evident in respect to society in general, organizations, and the implementation of new business ventures, and in many cases it is intertwined with issues that concern relations of power and authority. It is a social phenomenon associated with the process of discovering, evaluating, and exploiting new business opportunities in the sense that the entrepreneur must deal with and convince various groups of individuals, including financiers, suppliers, customers, and at times regulatory bodies, about the financial and other potential of a new business idea throughout the exploitation process. Insofar as such groups have differing goals and agendas, overcoming resistance can be a complex and often arduous process.

Resistance occurs within the business context when people take an impassive stance towards a novel business idea, in which case it may involve the withholding of critical resources that could have been allocated to support the implementation of that idea and/or actions explicitly aimed at

2 Baron 1998; Grégoire, Corbett, and McMullen 2011.
3 See, e.g., Sarasvathy et al. 2003; Alvarez and Barney 2007; McMullen, Plummer, and Acs 2007.
4 Fletcher 2006; Dimov 2007; Lindgren and Packendorff 2009.
5 See Berglund and Gaddefrs 2010.
discrediting it and preventing its realization. This can result in the delayed implementation, or even termination, of further attempts to promote and realize the idea in question. While resistance is in part subjectively perceived insofar as it relates to baseline assumptions about what would be a “normal” pace of implementation and change among individuals promoting new ideas, it is also an objective reality to a certain extent, especially when there are more or less overt attempts to prevent their realization. Such attempts may include the discrediting of ideas among people who could offer potential support as well as actions deliberately designed to delay or prevent commercialization. Practical examples include threatening existing suppliers with repercussions if they associate with new product and service providers as well as lobbying aimed at sustaining a regulatory environment supportive of established businesses or old monopoly positions.

The sources of resistance to novel ideas may be manifold. In many cases, especially when the main issue is the practical and commercial viability of a given idea, people may simply have different opinions about new business ideas and their chances for ultimate success. Consider, for example, how local townsfolk reacted to Eli Terry’s experimentation in the early nineteenth century with large-volume clock manufacturing.

The foolish man, they said, had begun to make two hundred clocks; one said he never would live long enough to finish them; another remarked that if he did, he never would, nor could possibly, sell so many, and ridiculed the very idea.

Perceived chances for commercial success may be particularly important to financiers and suppliers, who may need to commit to new and uncertain investments. They can also be important among potential customers, however, who may worry about product performance and the future availability of service for new and untried items.

Resistance may also arise from misunderstandings that inadvertently delay the introduction of new business ideas. In this case, individuals actually agree about the viability of a new business undertaking, but have implicitly misinterpreted the best or most appropriate ways in which to proceed. Although there may be official support for the novel idea and the associated allocation of resources and efforts, the new venture may experience significant delays, less than ideal execution, or even failure because of a mismatch between perceived and required efforts. Stated otherwise,

7 Jerome 1860, as quoted in Murphy 1966, pp. 173.
perfectly good intentions can be coupled with misdirected efforts at implementation.

In addition, resistance can be associated with the consequences of novel ideas. In this respect, individuals may be in perfect agreement about the viability of a novel idea or undertaking, but its implementation may nevertheless be connected with an irreversible loss for some of them, such as the loss of wealth or power. The consequences of novel ideas, particularly if they break with or contradict prior experiences, may thus elicit strong personal reactions, which can in turn translate into obstructive actions.

Given the often laborious process of establishing new business ideas in the marketplace, particularly when they are radical or revolutionary, it is somewhat surprising that the concept of resistance has not received more organized attention in entrepreneurship literature. This is an area in which sociology has developed a substantial body of knowledge that can be applied to illuminating and explaining the basic mechanisms involved. Some of the key issues that need to be addressed in this regard include why resistance occurs, the forms it takes in the commercial domain, and how entrepreneurs may act strategically to reduce its consequences.

**Persuasion**

Although new business ideas are often met with resistance, this can be counter-balanced by efforts on the part of the entrepreneur to persuade reluctant observers of their value. Such efforts may take many forms, including the development and presentation of prototypes or promised shares of future profits as well as the strategic framing of the nature and consequences of the business ideas in question.

Framing fundamentally concerns how individuals attempt to construct meaning and convey a picture of “reality” to other people. The objective is to draw attention to certain issues, problems, or projects, and to construct mental models that help others make sense of and evaluate new information. Individuals thus strategically endeavor to communicate pictures of reality that do not necessarily correspond to all objective or known facts in the effort to convey an appealing picture of novel ideas without resorting to outright misrepresentations of the truth.
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8 Churchland 2002; Dolan 2002.
9 Huy 2002.
10 See Schumpeter 1934; Kirzner 1999.
12 Benford and Snow 2000.
13 Howells and Higgins 1990.
The importance of framing is well known among entrepreneurs, who need to pitch their ideas in ways that speak to listeners’ various goals and agendas in order to attract interest from financiers, suppliers, and customers. A business plan can be viewed as a lengthier form of pitching, and it plays a particularly important role in attracting and convincing financiers about the commercial viability of new business ventures. Both pitching and business plans require a good understanding of the audience’s interests and priorities, and there is a wealth of practically derived knowledge about how to write a business plan. Framing is equally important within the context of corporate entrepreneurship, that is, when individuals attempt to introduce new products and services within already established corporations. In this regard, successful framing demands careful consideration of goals and agendas that differ across the various groups and levels of a given organization.

But while the literature on entrepreneurship has occasionally dealt with framing because it plays such a central role in overcoming resistance, entrepreneurship research would benefit from looking more closely and methodically into its role and effects within the entrepreneurial process. Much could be gained from considering the voluminous body of literature in sociology concerning the sources, contextual dependence, and consequences of framing and framing strategies. This literature can provide empirically based observations capable of helping entrepreneurs become more effective in communicating with external audiences, thereby serving as an important piece in solving the puzzle of who becomes a successful entrepreneur. Central issues in this regard are the various types of framing strategies, their effects on venture success, and the contextual and other factors that moderate their successful application.

Social Entrepreneurship
Social entrepreneurship is a field of empirical research that is specific to sociology. Social entrepreneurship is a form of entrepreneurship that emphasizes social movements rather than the exploitation of new business opportunities, and it critically depends on the entrepreneur’s ability to round up collective support without necessarily promising monetary rewards for
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15 Czernich and Zander 2012.
16 Martens, Jennings, and Jennings 2007; Rindova, Petkova, and Kotha 2007; Czernich and Zander 2010.
17 See, e.g., Benford and Snow 2000; Druckman 2001; Fiss and Hirsch 2005; and McCammon et al. 2007.
those who decide to become involved. Stated somewhat differently, this field of research highlights processes that depend upon the entrepreneur’s persuasive and social or political skills.

Social entrepreneurship takes on various forms, and one of the several definitions now current describes it as “innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors.”19 Perhaps its most distinctive characteristic is that although it emphasizes social value rather than profits and personal or shareholder wealth, it may nevertheless employ traditional for-profit business enterprises to reach its objectives. Another distinctive and related characteristic is the need to mobilize resources that include either relatively large proportions of volunteers, or resources that are paid at below market rates. While resistance to innovation and social movements may be as significant as it can be in respect to entrepreneurship in the business sector, the persuasive devices used in response to it typically do not include profit and monetary incentives. Although it is true that profits are not necessarily the primary motive for starting a business among traditional entrepreneurs,20 the possibilities for and dynamics of generating sufficient support for new ventures are nevertheless likely to differ between business entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs.

Social entrepreneurship is a rapidly growing area within the domain of entrepreneurship research,21 and one in which the involvement of sociologists could prove very helpful, particularly in light of the knowledge accumulated among sociologists concerning the nature and drivers of processes of societal change. It may also be of practical importance insofar as efforts to uncover successful ways of meeting fundamental and long-standing needs where markets have failed remain as urgent as ever.

Concluding Reflections

These brief remarks have presented certain ideas concerning how sociology can make further contributions to the development of entrepreneurship research. The aim has been to highlight resistance, persuasion, and social entrepreneurship as three specific areas in which the work of sociologists could prove particularly timely and important. There are also a number of other areas of research in which sociology can provide rich theoretical, conceptual, and empirical material for entrepreneurship studies. These in-

19 Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006, p. 2.
21 Representative examples include Peredo and McLean 2006 as well as Short, Moss, and Lumpkin 2009.
clude the dynamics of team-based entrepreneurship, which has so far been of secondary importance in the analysis of individual entrepreneurs; crowd funding, which concerns how individuals network and pool their resources in order to support various types of initiatives by other individuals or organizations; and co-creation, in which customers become actively involved in defining and developing new products and services. In that all of these issues emphasize the social nature and consequences of entrepreneurship, they can serve as important complements to the individual centered approach that has been typical of entrepreneurship research.

_Uppsala University_  
_Department of Business Studies_

**Literature**  


Jane Addams and the Contemporary Swedish Social Entrepreneurial Scene: Reflections on the Gendered Creation of Social Knowledge

Per Wisselgren

Introduction

In December 1922, only one year after universal suffrage had been introduced in Sweden, and with the experiences of the First World War still fresh in most people’s minds, Jane Addams visited Stockholm. As the poster printed for the occasion announced,¹ she did so in connection with the large international gathering, the so-called “Conference for a New Peace,” that had been recently organized in The Hague by the newly launched Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), of which Jane Addams was the initiator and first, long-term president.² The Swedish branch of the WILPF (Kvinnornas Fredsförbund, later renamed Internationella Kvinnoförbundet för Fred och Frihet, IKFF), took this opportunity to invite Addams to Stockholm along with two of her colleagues, Catherine Marshall and Jeanne Mélin. This obviously comprised a very important event for the local organizers. There was a reception at the Grand Hotel on the day of Addams’s arrival and a public lecture the following day in the large hall of the Royal Swedish Academy of Music.³

I have not been able to establish either the number or names of those who attended the reception and lecture. However, the Swedish women’s peace movement at that time constituted a well-organized and very extensive network, with a relatively large and robust core of members, and often succeeded in mobilizing many hundreds and at times even tens of thousands of sympathizers.⁴ It would thus not be overly speculative to suggest that three of those in attendance at the Addams events might well

¹ See Figure 1.
² Bussey and Tims 1980, pp. 43–44.
⁴ Andersson 2001, pp. 103–110.
have been Emilia Broomé, Ellen Key, and Anna Bugge Wicksell insofar as all three played leading roles in the early formation of the Swedish women’s peace movement.\(^5\) Emilia Broomé (1866–1925) had organized Sweden’s first women’s peace organization in 1898, *Sveriges Kvinnliga Fredsförening* (*Swedish Women’s Peace Association*, SKF), and served as its chairperson until 1911. Ellen Key (1849–1926), who was then one of the most influential public intellectuals in Sweden, was one of Broomé’s most important sources of intellectual inspiration. Both Broomé’s and Key’s social engagement was based upon the conviction, similar to Addams’ idea of “social motherhood,” that women in particular, by virtue of their specific feminine qualities, had an important role to play in the peace question.\(^6\) Anna Bugge Wicksell (1862–1928), like Broomé and Key, had also written about and brought public attention to the peace question.\(^7\) In addition, Wicksell was by the time of Addams’ visit one of Sweden’s most important figures in the international peace movement in her capacity as Sweden’s first female diplomat.\(^8\)

But although we do not know with certainty whether Broomé, Key, and Wicksell in fact attended the Addams reception and lecture, that is not the primary issue at this venture. I instead wish to use the events mentioned, first, to illustrate that Addams had Swedish connections and, second and more importantly, to introduce the main argument of the present discussion, namely, that there are many good reasons to view Broomé, Key, and Wicksell as Swedish counterparts of Addams as a social entrepreneur. In order to substantiate this argument, we need to clarify both what is meant by social entrepreneurship, and in what respects Addams may be regarded as a social entrepreneur. The general argument is analytically developed in three stages: first, a conceptual discussion concerning social entrepreneurship; second, an examination of Addams as a social entrepreneur; and third, a presentation of various aspects of the contemporary Swedish social entrepreneurial setting. Concerning the latter, Ellen Key, Anna Bugge Wicksell, and Emilia Broomé will be discussed and compared, both to each other and to Jane Addams, as social entrepreneurs.

\(^5\) Hammar 2004, pp. 11–75.
\(^6\) Broomé 1899; Key 1899.
\(^7\) Wicksell 1893.
Social Entrepreneurship – Conceptual Problems and Possibilities

What precisely is social entrepreneurship? Rather than engage here in a detailed discussion, I will confine myself to certain remarks concerning what I regard to be the analytical strengths and weaknesses of the concept.

Not the least of its shortcomings is the fact that social entrepreneurship is a new and very fashionable concept. Other examples of such policy-laden concepts now current in both everyday usage and scholarly debate include “innovation,” “knowledge society,” and “triple helix,” all of which call for critical reflection. If we restrict ourselves to debates within the scholarly community, the trendiness of the concept is readily illustrated by the fact that less than 20 articles containing the phrase “social entrepreneurship” in the title were published in 2000, and less than 50 in 2005, while nearly 600 appeared in 2016. Furthermore, of the over 2,300 titles published during that period, 80 have been cited at least 100 times, with leading articles cited over 1,000 times.9

Three conclusions become apparent against this general background. The first is that research, as represented by the journals in which articles have been published, has been heavily dominated by business and management studies. This indicates what may be referred to as the historical origins of the research field. Not only has research on social entrepreneurship grown out of more traditional research concerning entrepreneurship, this dependency is present in the current research debate as well. In this respect, one of the principal boundary questions is whether social entrepreneurship should be regarded as an element of the research area of entrepreneurship as such, or as a mature and relatively autonomous area that is driven by its own internal mechanisms.10

Second, the character of titles published illustrate that one of the central issues under debate involves the very meaning of the concept itself, that is, what social entrepreneurship is and how it should be defined.11 There is, nevertheless, a fairly strong consensus concerning a number of the basic components of social entrepreneurship, such as identifying problems, recognizing opportunities, mobilizing resources, contributing to social change, and so forth.

9 These figures were generated by an advanced search in Google Scholar conducted on November 17th, 2017, and were double-checked with information available at the ISI Web of Science.

10 See, e.g., Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern, 2006; Mair and Marti 2006.

Third, there has been a noted tendency to apply more general social science perspectives to social entrepreneurship, including insights from organizational studies, institutionalist perspectives, and research on social movements. This reveals a profoundly contextual and process-oriented approach that regards social entrepreneurship “as a process resulting from the continuous interaction between social entrepreneurs and the context in which they and their activities are embedded.”

I would argue that it is precisely this tendency towards a more general and inclusive social science perspective that renders the concept of social entrepreneurship both interesting and potentially useful from an historical and sociological point of view. By focusing on the contextual embeddedness of social entrepreneurs within broader historical processes, social entrepreneurship research provides a set of analytical tools potentially useful not only for business researchers in an examination of the success or failure of contemporary enterprises, but also for enriching our historical understanding of civic-based initiatives as collectively coordinated, institutionally embedded, and pragmatically oriented endeavors. This is relevant to such social reformers as Jane Addams.

Jane Addams as a Social Entrepreneur

Was Jane Addams, then, a social entrepreneur? It is clear that she indeed was in a general sense. She is, in fact, probably the historical example most often used in popular representations to illustrate the common argument that although the term social entrepreneurship may be new, social entrepreneurship as an historical phenomenon is not. Addams thus figures often as an historical point of reference among the many organizations that identify themselves as social enterprises today. One website rhetorically asks “What do Jane Addams, Maria Montessori and Muhammad Yunus have in common?”, and then remarks that “They are all exemplary social entrepreneurs.” Other websites describe Addams as a “pioneering example of social entrepreneurship,” a “social innovator of her day,” and a role model for today’s young women who are social entrepreneurial leaders.

But in what specific sense may Addams be regarded as a social entrepreneur – in her role as an international peace maker and Nobel Prize Winner, as a social reformer and social researcher, or as a business woman with exceptional organizational qualities and leadership skills?

It is not my intent to question whether or not it is appropriate to describe Addams as an outstanding social entrepreneur. I rather wish to draw attention to the fact that most popular representations today focus on her supposedly extraordinary, almost saint-like individual and personal qualities and skills, whereby she is regarded as an icon disconnected from the historical context in which she lived and acted. In line with the research on social entrepreneurship referred to above, it is instead more appropriate to examine her endeavors as a social entrepreneur in relation to the contemporary contexts and social movements in which she was an active participant.

Situating Addams’ broad range of activities within an historical context does not make her efforts less impressive, although they then appear less unique. I wish to briefly mention five points in this respect that I find significant for understanding her in historical terms as a social entrepreneur.

First, Addams belonged to a very specific generation of well-educated, socially engaged, middle-class women who experienced great improvements in their lives, but also continued to face obstacles as women in respect to legal rights, higher education, cultural expectations, and political opportunities.

Second, Addams’ commitment to social issues began in a way very typical for the times and for the generation of women who shared her engagement with the so-called social question. The latter consisted of the contemporary, wide-ranging, and intensively debated social problems that were conceptualized as the dark side of the new industrial society in both the United States and Europe, not least of all in England. When Addams visited London in 1883, she experienced what she vividly described in Twenty Years at Hull-House as an “ineradicable impression of the wretchedness of East London.”

Third, Addams did not merely identify and conceptualize social problems, but also recognized opportunities and found practical ways for dealing with them. When she visited Toynbee Hall in 1888 and thereby came in contact with the new settlement movement that was rapidly expanding in Europe, she found an organizational model that she regarded as an “experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems
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14 Addams 1920, pp. 66ff.
which are engendered by the modern conditions of life in a great city.”

Thanks to the resulting efforts of Addams and Hull-House, the settlement house movement later became established in the United States.

Fourth, Addams proceeded to *mobilize resources* in her activities as a social entrepreneur, concerning which her network of contacts were of the utmost importance. She pooled her own resources with those of Ellen Gates Starr, with Helen Culver providing major financial support. A broad range of social issues were taken up within this network of socially engaged women, including women's rights, immigration, the urban housing problem, the outbreak of the First World War, and the peace question.

Fifth, a significant component of Addams’ endeavors was the importance of knowledge making, which, I would argue, has often been underestimated in current research concerning social entrepreneurship. The idea of *research-based reforms* was central to the American settlement movement and to the more general social reform movement as well. Addams herself emphasized that “each new undertaking should be preceded by carefully ascertained facts.” Indeed, most of her activities and various projects were firmly based upon broad and often groundbreaking knowledge, including the social reform initiatives of the Hull-House project, with its pioneering social research at a time when academic social science was still in its formative phase. This was also the case concerning her engagement with the international peace movement and efforts to inculcate the spirit of peace in society. The social research that Addams promoted typically had a distinctly practical orientation, which perhaps reflects her relation to pragmatism. In addition, inspired by Tolstoyan ideals, she emphasized the importance of transforming ideas into practical work and strove to live in accordance with what she learned.

We will now proceed to the third point in our discussion and inquire whether Jane Addams, as a social entrepreneur, had any counterparts on the contemporary Swedish scene.

The Swedish Social Entrepreneurial Scene
Although Addams had no such counterparts in one very restricted sense insofar as each individual has a unique set of personal, cultural, and social experiences that cannot be replicated, there were in fact a rather large number of women in Sweden that remind us of her as a social entrepre-
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15 Showalter 2009, p. 92
16 Addams 1920, p. 129.
neur. This becomes clear when we consider the historically specific generation of women who were born in roughly the third quarter of the nineteenth century.

The last three decades of gender history research have demonstrated in a series of empirical studies that many of the figures active in the first wave of the women's movement were not one-sidedly focused on women's emancipation and, after the turn of the century, the suffrage question, but were rather more broadly engaged in the larger contemporary social reform movements. Furthermore, they often acted within that context as advocates of the generally embraced idea that social reforms ought to be based upon social research.\textsuperscript{19} In addition, these women often worked together with like-minded men in their efforts to promote social reform.\textsuperscript{20}

A closer look at some of the many organizations that made up the social reform movement in Sweden at that time – such as the Women’s Association for Suffrage (Landsföreningen för kvinnors politiska rösträtt, LKPR), the Central Organization for Social Work (Centralförbundet för socialt arbete, CSA), the Swedish Women’s Peace Association (SKF), and the foundations that actively promoted the rise of early academic social science, including the Lorén Foundation and The Lars Hierta Memorial Foundation – reveals a striking pattern. It was often the case that the very same network of socially engaged, reform-minded individuals actively participated in all of these associations, albeit in slightly different constellations. For this reason, one may analyze this network in terms of a single social reform movement.\textsuperscript{21}

I will seek to exemplify this broader pattern by reference to the three women whom we have already identified as peace movement entrepreneurs, namely, Ellen Key, Anna Bugge Wicksell, and Emilia Broomé. We will not emphasize their engagement in the peace movement, but rather focus on their involvement in the emerging academic social science of that period. This will enable us to show that they were similar to Addams not only as peace activists and social reformers, but also in a broader sense as social entrepreneurs.

Ellen Key is likely the individual who reminds us more than anyone else of Addams. Like Addams, Key was one of the most influential public intellectuals of her time, bringing together and inspiring a group of like-minded women. She promoted a gendered conception of social motherhood, whereby women were regarded as more suitable for certain societal tasks

\textsuperscript{19} Wisselgren 2012.
\textsuperscript{20} Yeo 1996, p. 288; Berg, Florin, and Wisselgren 2011.
\textsuperscript{21} Lundquist 1997; Rönnbäck 2004; Hedin 2002; Bokholm 2000; Wisselgren 2000; Odelberg 1981.
than men by virtue of their unique feminine qualities. This became an important argument for promoting women’s contributions to public life.\textsuperscript{22} She was also engaged in the early formation of the social sciences, as was Addams. For example, Key was one of the most important Swedish advocates of the views of Herbert Spencer, and she also introduced Charles Letourneau to the Swedish reading public in a widely distributed text concerning the social evolution of moral issues.\textsuperscript{23} Although Letourneau (1831–1902) is relatively unknown today, he was in fact the first professor of sociology in France. In addition, Key was a member of the surprisingly gender-equal board of directors of the Lorén Foundation, established in 1885, which played a seminal role in the establishment of Swedish social science in its capacity as a combined private research council and social research institute.\textsuperscript{24}

Knut Wicksell, who became professor of economics and financial law at Lund University in 1901, was one of the first Swedish social scientists, and his early academic career depended heavily on financial support from the Lorén Foundation. Wicksell’s wife, Anna Bugge Wicksell, was of at least a similar order of importance for his career as the Foundation, but it should be noted that they deliberately announced their partnership as a “union” in order to express their opposition to the patriarchal Swedish marriage laws. In a manner not surprising for the period, Bugge not only helped her husband by accepting the lion’s share of family care and household work, she also assisted him as both private secretary and manager, strategically planning his career and making it possible in practical terms for him to concentrate on his research.\textsuperscript{25} At the same time, however, she was active in the women’s movement, the suffrage movement, the peace movement, and in the general social reform movement, first in Norway and Sweden, and on the international level after Wicksell became professor. Anna Bugge and Knut Wicksell were thus intellectuals who shared a commitment to social reform issues in the broad sense as well as a couple who collaborated in the practical affairs of daily life.\textsuperscript{26}

Emilia Broomé was committed to social reform issues and the peace movement, as were Addams, Key, and Bugge, but the chronological order for her was reversed in the sense that she first became involved with the

\textsuperscript{23} Key 1891.
\textsuperscript{24} Other board members included two women, Anne Charlotte Leffler and Sonja Kovalevsky, and three men, Axel Key, Johan Leffler, and David Davidson. See Wisselgren (2000) for information concerning the Lorén Foundation.
\textsuperscript{26} Wisselgren 2012, pp. 196–199.
peace movement, as was noted above in respect to her being the founder and driving force in SKF from 1899 to 1911. She then later worked with more general social issues as the Director (byråföreståndarinnan) of the Central Organization for Social Work (CSA). While the latter may be regarded as a Swedish counterpart of the Charity Organization Society (COS) in England, it also had important similarities with Hull-House in that its aim was to promote social reform through both practical education as well as social research.27 There are also other parallels with Hull-House. For example, the CSA was primarily staffed by women, especially at the beginning, and both institutions were located either outside or at the margins of the academic sphere rather than at its center, although they were connected with it through a number of shared networks. The CSA functioned in practice as a hub of the social reform movement and, as such, exerted an important influence upon the formation of contemporary Swedish social welfare policy. It was in fact so successful that when two of the most important long-standing goals of the CSA were fulfilled – the establishment of the National Board of Social Welfare (Socialstyrelsen) (1913) and the Ministry of Social Affairs (Socialdepartementet) (1921) – its sphere of action significantly contracted.28

Three other patterns appear from a more general comparison of the lives and careers of Key, Bugge, and Broomé. First, they were born in the 1860s and belonged to roughly the same generation, shared a number of important historically situated experiences, and participated in the social reform movement and in the same networks. Second, the wider social reform movement in which they were active included not only women’s issues, but also a number of other parallel concerns, such as the peace question and the drive for social reforms upon the basis of social research. Third, they each contributed, albeit in different ways, to the early formation of Swedish academic social science. Key was a member of the Lorén Foundation and also introduced contemporary international sociology to Sweden; Bugge promoted and facilitated her husband’s scholarly career; and Broomé was the director of one of the main research and social reform organizations of the time. But in contrast to, for example, the male professors of the new academic social sciences, their contributions were partly indirect and relatively anonymous. Consequently, their mark on history has been more as social entrepreneurs than as scholarly writers. We may thus speak of them as practical intellectuals whose endeavors were direct-

ed towards collective goals within relatively anonymous organizations and social movements.²⁹

What general conclusions may we draw if we now connect our earlier remarks concerning Jane Addams with these observations concerning the Swedish scene in the reform movement and in the social sciences?

Conclusion
Most of the points made concerning Key, Bugge, and Broomé are valid for Addams as well. This serves to clarify certain general patterns that they share as social entrepreneurs with Addams.

All four of these individuals, as historically and contextually situated social entrepreneurs, identified important social problems that had to be resolved. They were skilful in recognizing the opportunities that presented themselves for securing financial and organizational resources, which they then mobilized with the help of their broad networks of like-minded friends within the social reform movement. They were thereby able to contribute to gradual social change.³⁰

The fact that Key, Bugge, Broomé, and Addams belonged to roughly the same generation and became socially active during the same period in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries meant that they experienced not only important moments in democratization and women’s emancipation, but also the great social transformations associated with the rise of modern industrial society. It is thus no coincidence that they belonged to the same generation as the so-called founding fathers of the social sciences and, like them, reflected upon and were deeply concerned with the new social questions of their time. They, too, played valuable roles in the formation of the modern social sciences.

It is also evident from a broader perspective which takes into consideration the historical role of the social reform movement that the peace movement and the rise of the social sciences should not be regarded as two processes distinct from each other. They were in fact two facets of the same issue that were united by engagement with the social issues of the time as well as by knowledge production. Although they employed different forms of knowledge production, we should not restrict our notion of social knowledge to strictly scholarly knowledge alone.³¹ In this respect, there is no contradiction between the formation of abstract knowledge in the emergent social sciences and the more practically oriented knowledge

²⁹ Ambjörnsson and Sörlin 1995.
³⁰ See Banks 1972, pp. 51–41.
produced within the social reform movement. It is also important to emphasize that men and women often worked together – at times like Anna Bugge and Knut Wicksell as a collaborative intellectual couple – in the collective social entrepreneurial knowledge practices of the social reform movement.

However, this broader perspective also reveals an important historical pattern concerning a gendered division of labor insofar as both the political and academic spheres remained relatively closed to women. Although universal suffrage had been introduced in Sweden by the time of Addams’ visit in 1922, there were still only a handful of women in the Swedish Parliament (Riksdag), and even fewer in academic social research.

What I have sought to demonstrate in this discussion is that the international peace movement was centered on the same social issues as the new social sciences, that the peace movement and the social sciences were not two entirely separate arenas – and that examining the life and work of Jane Addams helps us to reveal the gender patterns in the history of the creation of social knowledge better than is the case with many other individuals of her time.
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Introduction

Charlotte Perkins Gilman lived from 1860 to 1935 – the same years as did Jane Addams. Gilman was an American, a pioneering sociologist, an influential feminist pragmatist, a peripatetic lecturer, and a prolific author. Although Gilman died over 80 years ago, she remains today a provocative sociological presence whose writings continue to make us think, argue, and question our preconceptions, especially with regard to the vital social institutions of family and marriage. As a woman and an intellectual who contributed to the foundation and the subsequent rise of American sociology, Gilman – like Addams – did so without the routinely more secure and stable economic employment enjoyed by most of her male colleagues in the university academic world.

In order to earn her living, Gilman became innovative and entrepreneurial. She made sociology itself a paying proposition in her personal life and, at the same time, vigorously promoted an economically cooperative sociological vision in which creative communal action is central to establishing egalitarian, liberating, and peaceful societies for all women, all men, and all children. Gilman became in this way a social and sociological entrepreneur at both private and public levels. For younger social scientists who want to make a social difference – who want to meet and talk to people in everyday walks of life, who chafe under the strictures of agency regulations or the constraints of academic politics – Gilman provides, literally, a working model of another way to be a sociologist.

The subtitle of the present discussion – “A Working Introduction to Gilman’s Views of Families, Marriages, and Children” – plays on the multifaceted notion of “work.” My aim is to briefly outline Gilman’s “work,” that is, her body of writings and ideas, while keeping firmly in mind that
the generation and promulgation of these ideas was also her “work” in the
day-to-day sense of earning a living. Gilman was entrepreneurial in both
senses of work.

I add here a further gloss on the phrase “a working introduction” in
noting the publication of my new English and Italian editions of selected
essays by Gilman on the topic of families, marriages, and children. Consequently, my “work” as I write this text also provides a passing introduction
to my personal entrepreneurial effort to bring Gilman’s “work” to wid-
er audiences in the twenty-first century. Please understand that we could
keep on compounding these concatenations of “work” – the American so-
ciologist Erving Goffman (1974) referred in Frame Analysis to this type of
nearly limitless wordplay as keying – but we would incur the serious risk
of moving too far from the initial frame toward an ever distant outer rim,
as Goffman put it. Let us return to my central topic: Charlotte Perkins
Gilman and her entrepreneurial persona, Gilman as an alternative model
of how to be a sociologist – a sociologist who was concurrently a friend and
colleague of Jane Addams.

Jane Addams and Alternative Models
of Sociological Work

An important precedent is established by placing Jane Addams at the
center of discussion, namely, that of celebrating an outstanding sociolo-
gist who, like Charlotte Perkins Gilman, worked fundamentally as an in-
tellectual outside the university academy and, perhaps more importantly,
showed us how to be sociologists without becoming perversely or invidi-
ously patriarchal. Mary Jo Deegan’s studies of Jane Addams place Addams
instrumentally in the forefront of a reconstituted historical understanding
of sociology as a social, disciplinary, and personal project. At the same
time, Deegan helps us recognize that Addams worked cooperatively with
myriad other sociologists, male and female. The many sociologist resi-
dents of Hull-House – together with an extensive external network of
like-minded sociologists in and outside of the university world – formed
an interconnected constellation of alternative models of sociological work
among which Addams’ star was only relatively brighter than the others.
In addition to Addams herself, there are literally dozens upon dozens of
intriguing and creative alternative life-models for sociology as a vocation.
In Women in Sociology: A Bio-bibliographical Sourcebook, Deegan identified
over 150 women who merit our close attention – and this only scratched

1 Hill 2011a, b.
2 Deegan 1988, 2002a.
the surface. More recently, Deegan has explicated the extraordinary work of Fannie Barrier Williams, a previously unknown African-American sociologist from Chicago who lived from 1893 to 1918 and worked primarily as a journalist. Deegan and Wahl’s introduction to the little-known work and life of Ellen Gates Starr, the artistic and increasingly religious co-founder with Jane Addams of Hull-House in Chicago, provides yet another model. Indeed, we have many, many names to celebrate as models and from which to draw courage, inspiration, and ideas. Suffice it to say here that Charlotte Perkins Gilman – who was very much a friend and admirer of Jane Addams – was one of many such stars in this large, alternative, and sometimes entrepreneurial panoply of sociologists.

Methodological Issues

Several methodological issues surround the search for alternative models of sociological practice, such as those embodied by Addams and Gilman. As we look to our disciplinary past for instructive exemplars, we quickly leave the realm of survey questionnaires, interviews, and direct observation. Indeed, if we take seriously Anthony Giddens’ important suggestion that the temporal scope of sociological investigation begins with the Industrial Revolution, we immediately recognize that the ever-lengthening temporal span for which we have disciplinary responsibility becomes increasingly inaccessible by means of the empirical research techniques so commonly and widely used by far too many of my American colleagues. Obviously, would-be informants from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are neither able to answer survey questionnaires, nor respond to our requests for interviews. We can no longer directly observe Gilman in action. As a result, we are dependent on trace evidence found in newspapers, magazines, books, public records, private collections, and formal archives. I have elsewhere outlined much of the logic and specific procedures entailed in conducting and explicating library and archival research. In sum, the empirical foundations of the discussion at hand necessarily rely in large part upon archival research and the subsequent analysis and interpretation of trace data found in libraries and archives.

---

3 Deegan 1991.
4 Deegan 2002.
5 Deegan and Wahl 2003.
Vulnerability and the Historical Record

An outstanding feature of Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s work and life is that she practiced the sociological discipline in the status of what might today be called an “independent scholar.”\(^8\) Her work is well documented.\(^9\) Gilman held no permanent academic post, yet she was great friends with several leading American sociologists, including Jane Addams, Lester Frank Ward, and Edward A. Ross, was an active member of the American Sociological Society, and published in the *American Journal of Sociology*. Gilman produced sociological ideas without the benefit of professorial appointment, without tenure, without health insurance, without an employer-provided retirement account, and without formal organizational funding or support. Gilman is clearly an intriguing, inspiring, and tenacious role model for those of us who labor in the academic interstices, but I should first say a few words about the vulnerabilities of all such models.

It is difficult – perhaps impossible – to name living academic sociologists whose influence on popular thinking comes anywhere near the level Gilman attained. Gilman, like Addams and a number of other pioneering female sociologists, including England’s extraordinary Harriet Martineau,\(^10\) enjoyed widespread intellectual recognition and social efficacy during her lifetime. It is hard to think that such models can simply vanish from our collective consciousness. However, the eclipse and displacement of these women in the 1920s, during what Deegan aptly calls “the dark era of patriarchal ascendency” in professional sociology,\(^11\) is an object lesson that we ignore at our peril if our collective goals today include efficacious, democratic social change.

Female sociologists, generally – and some male sociologists, specifically – who advocate and provide the intellectual bases so necessary for democratic social change, whose ideas threaten the privileged members of the status quo, are inherently vulnerable to marginalization, derision, and dismissal. Addams, Gilman, Martineau, and many others of like mind and courageous action have given us a strong but vulnerable collective heritage that requires constant nurture and protracted protection. We must be on our guard lest they once again become marginalized or hijacked.

These women and their ideas are in fact particularly vulnerable today to intellectual hijacking, often by groups with political agendas that Addams
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\(^8\) Gilman 1935.
and her colleagues would clearly find anathema. This can occur in both a negative and a positive sense, but they remain hijackings all the same. For example, there are those in the gay and lesbian rights movement who promote Addams and her female colleagues at Hull-House as role models of exuberant lesbianism. The search for such role models is laudable and fully understandable, but the historical record provides no credible evidence that Hull-House was anything remotely like a hot house of unabashed lesbian activity. The politics of this situation are delicate, but if, as I conclude, the lesbian label is little more than wishful thinking, however positive and well-meaning, if it remains undocumented and unchallenged, then it becomes much easier for the homophobic mainstream to discredit and dismiss the otherwise progressive and innovative ideas that flowed from Hull-House.

At the same time, there are others who hijack Martineau, Gilman, Addams, and their colleagues for destructive and negative ends. This question concerns the recent spate of academics who vigorously assert that these three women, among other figures, were invidiously and irredeemably racist. The facts, however, lead me to conclude that they were thoroughly progressive on racial issues. Arguably, one can find the occasional word or phrase that can today be given a racialized interpretation, but the preponderance of the historical evidence strongly argues otherwise. This, too, is a politically delicate situation, at least for academics. At issue is the entire ideological apparatus of post-modernism and its destructive consequences for those of us working in the empirical and scientific disciplines. Suffice it to say here that hijacking Gilman and Addams as lesbian heroines, on the one hand, or as racist demagogues, on the other, not only does grave disservice to the historical record, but also raises the ever-present specter that many of the most innovative, thoughtful, and progressive leaders of our disciplinary past, those to whom we frequently look for inspiration and insight, can be too easily dismissed and suddenly marginalized, thus undercutting our own work and programs.

The fundamental processes that marginalized Gilman and Addams during the dark era of patriarchal ascendency have not disappeared – they have instead constantly re-invented themselves in various forms and guises, be it unfounded accolades of lesbian leadership, or destructive charges of racism, classism, elitism, and the like. We must be alert to these processes, and our prescription must always be careful, rigorous, systematic, and logical attention to the empirical record, wherever it may lead. And where it leads, more often than not in my experience, is to the discovery of
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earnest, dedicated, hard-working, inventive, and progressive thinkers like Gilman, Addams, and their colleagues at Hull-House and elsewhere.

Gilman as Entrepreneur

In presenting Gilman as an entrepreneur, the plain fact is that she required an income. She responded to this situation with perseverance, creativity, and frequently with humor and élan. Her annual income, which was never great, was always a matter of practical importance. One reads in her archives, for example, a diary entry where she instructed herself “Must make $3,000 this year.” At many times she balanced her accounts with little, if any, to spare.

She was not independently wealthy, but possessed a certain economic buffer by the fact of having been twice married, especially the marriage in 1900 to her second husband, Houghton Gilman. Nonetheless, Gilman attempted to live by her own credo that a wife should be more than a decorative sponge on her husband. She insisted on “paying her own way” as much as she could. And in this vein she pursued several creative, albeit modest, income generating projects.

The central entrepreneurial basis of Gilman’s life as a professional sociologist includes her work as an artist, public speaker, and writer. She promoted the core ideas that 1) humanness trumps sexual difference, 2) social logic is superior to individualist logic, 3) social evolution requires thoughtful planning, 4) social equity and fair play must hold in all things, 5) the past must not blindly restrict the future, 6) children must be well cared for, 7) beauty is not a luxury, and 8) greed, war, and waste are anti-social. Many of these ideas are present in her earliest efforts to earn a living.

Trading Cards

Gilman was a formally trained artist, having studied at what is now the Rhode Island School of Design. The idea that beauty is not a luxury shows itself in Gilman’s first significant attempt to earn money – creating designs for trade cards, that is, small colorful premiums that were given with purchases of various products, notably soap. Gilman designed a series of cards for the Kendal soap company and the Welcome soap company. Of note here is Gilman’s early visual focus on gender roles, family, and the relationships between the genders.13

---

Gilman’s First Book

Gilman’s first book, published in 1888, furthered her interest in the arts and in the introduction of things beautiful into the home. The book, *Gems of Art for the Home and Fireside*, is a large format collection of etchings of various selected paintings, for which Gilman wrote the accompanying commentary. The present obscurity of this work results in part from it having been published under the surname of Charlotte’s first husband, as “Mrs. Charles Walter Stetson.” Denise Knight suggests that this book, largely unknown until fifteen years ago, and of which there are very few known copies, tells us little about Gilman, but she understandably writes from the perspective of literary analysis, not sociology. However, Gilman’s social project is clearly – if briefly – stated in the book’s introduction – “The art instinct, so universally existent in humanity, is one of the most potent factors in civilization.” She adds that

> Art in public is good, great buildings, fine statues, galleries of paintings, but art in the home is the most strong and lasting influence. It lifts and brightens life to the worn mother and hard-working father; it adds a constant charm to social intercourse, and, *most important of all*, it helps to give our children health and pleasure – a broad intelligent appreciation of beauty everywhere.

Here again are Gilman’s primary themes: the home, the family, and children. The commercial success of this work, if any, is currently unknown.

Lectures and Public Speaking

Public speaking, for which she was regularly but not handsomely paid, provided Gilman with an important source of income. Her lectures on sociological topics were heard by thousands of paying listeners throughout the United States and in many countries in Europe, to which she made several visits. Gilman kept detailed lists of her lectures as well as the fees received. The negotiations involved in setting fees and choosing projects are particularly well illustrated in her decision to give a series of lectures for the Chautauqua movement in 1904.

In March 1904, George Edgar Vincent, an early sociologist at the University of Chicago, wrote to Gilman asking her to give a series lectures during the summer, noting that “We have long wanted you at Chautau-
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14 For discussion of the intellectual, historical, and other consequences of women’s name changes due to marriage and divorce, see Deegan 1998 and Gilman 2011a.

15 Knight 2001.

16 For details on Vincent, including his relationship to Jane Addams, see Deegan 1988, pp. 92–98.
The Chautauqua social movement in the United States was a major, widespread adult education initiative that regularly featured well-known public intellectuals, many of whom were sociologists. In making an invitation to Gilman, Vincent added that

As you probably know, our fees are very meagre. I can offer you only $125 for the five lectures out of which you would be expected to meet your own expenses. You probably know our work [for the Chatauquas] is of a purely educational character with no element of personal or private profit.

Gilman accepted, but not without probing for higher fees. In reply, Vincent remarked that

I am sorry to say that my offer is the best that I can make. Chautauqua is not a money making enterprise. All of our lecturers come to us at much lower fees than they receive elsewhere. We are very glad that we may count up on you. The topics you suggest are most attractive and we gladly accept them.

The exchange between Gilman and Vincent draws attention to the economic dimension embedded in such non-profit social programs as Chautauqua. Costs were cut to the bone in order to make Chautauqua attractive to the general public. Public intellectuals like Gilman were expected to accept reduced remuneration and, significantly, they did so. Jane Addams, for example, attracted huge crowds to Chautauquas held in the Chicago area.

Writing
Gilman became most widely known through her writings, which included poetry, short fiction, novels, non-fiction treatises, notably Women and Economics, and various journals, the most important of which, sociologically speaking, was The Forerunner, published from 1909–1916. Gilman owned, published, and wrote the entire contents of each issue of The Forerunner, and it included several serialized full-length books, to three of which Mary Jo Deegan and I have been privileged to give new life. Gilman’s writing provided remuneration, although the amounts realized were not great and subscriptions to The Forerunner were never sufficient to make it a self-sustaining enterprise. Directed to a public audience, Gilman’s writings in The
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17 Vincent to Gilman, 29 March 1904. Harvard University, Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, Charlotte Perkins Gilman Papers, 1846–1961; General Correspondence; Chronological; 1900–1905.

18 Vincent to Gilman, 11 April 1904. Harvard University, Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, Charlotte Perkins Gilman Papers, 1846–1961; General Correspondence; Chronological; 1900–1905.

Forerunner espoused her mature sociological analyses of 1) the systemic relationships between family, home, and society, 2) men and marriage, 3) motherhood, and 4) the relationships between children and parents.

Novels, Fiction, and Sociology
Gilman was a sociologist who wrote formal works as well as popular fiction that illustrated sociological issues. By turning to fiction, Gilman hoped to promote sociological ideas in a format that would sell as well as instruct. Lars Furuland (1990) has observed that

> Without the observant eye of [novelist] authors we would know infinitely less about psychological responses, attitudes, mentality, habits and conventions in various social strata. This especially applies to the time preceding modern sociology, Gallup polls, etc. But also to the period thereafter.\(^{20}\)

American examples include the Nebraska sociological novelist Mari Sandoz\(^{21}\) and the dozens of novels reviewed in *Sociology and Social Research* from 1925 to 1958.\(^{22}\) But Gilman, like Harriet Martineau, goes Furuland one better in that both women specifically used popular fiction to illustrate sociological concepts. Addams also did much the same thing in her literate autobiographies. Gilman, often writing at the intersection of fiction and non-fiction, represents another alternative way of doing sociology, one that was entrepreneurial and sociological in both conception and execution.

Scandinavian Connections
It behooves me at this point to quickly identify a few of Gilman’s entrepreneurial and intellectual connections with Scandinavia. First, we know that she was invited in 1913 to speak to the National Council of Women of Denmark. I do not know whether this became reality, but, at the least, the invitation demonstrates interest on the part of Danish women in Gilman’s ideas.

Second, Gilman criticized certain views of the popular Swedish feminist Ellen Key in *The Forerunner*.\(^{23}\) Gilman’s main point of difference with Key was the idea that young children should be cared for and taught by those who were best able to do so, and that this was not necessarily the bi-
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\(^{20}\) Furuland 1990.

\(^{21}\) Hill 1987, 1989b.

\(^{22}\) Hill 2006.

\(^{23}\) Gilman 2011b, c. For an introduction to Key, see Nyström-Hamilton 1913.
ological mother. The contrast between Gilman’s and Key’s ideas was early explored in Jessie Taft’s Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Chicago.\textsuperscript{24}

Third, a Swedish press posthumously obtained the rights to publish a Swedish translation of Gilman’s best known work, \textit{The Yellow Wallpaper}. Gilman’s daughter was paid the handsome sum of $20 for this.

Finally, Polly Wynn Allen maintains that architectural concepts incorporated in Alva and Gunnar Myrdal’s housing proposals derive from ideas originally put forward by Charlotte Perkins Gilman.\textsuperscript{25} These include such ideas as communal kitchens and common areas. At best, all I can do here is whet your appetites, and to challenge one of you to someday further document the details of the Gilman-Scandinavia connection.

Conclusion

My hope is that the wider dissemination of Gilman’s ideas will lead to substantive, constructive social change. Gilman, like many of her sociological colleagues, including Jane Addams, provides an alternative model of how to be a sociologist. Gilman’s is not a model designed to make any of us wealthy in a pecuniary sense, but it is nonetheless an intellectually exciting and inherently entrepreneurial model worth preserving and exploring.

\textit{Lincoln, Nebraska}

\textit{University of Nebraska – Lincoln}

\textsuperscript{24} Taft 1915.

\textsuperscript{25} Allen 1988.
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Jane Addams: Theory, Politics, and Profession in Social Work

Rita Braches-Chyrek

Introduction

Jane Addams regarded the reorganization and application of knowledge to be of fundamental importance in modern life, and she came to frame her ideas in this respect within the context of the settlement house movement. As she herself remarked,

The ideal and developed settlement would attempt to test the value of human knowledge by action and realization, quite as the complete and ideal university would concern itself with the discovery of knowledge in all branches. The settlement stands for application, for universal interest as opposed to specialization. This certainly claims too much, absurdly too much, for a settlement, in the light of its achievements, but perhaps not in the light of its possibilities.

In the present discussion, which draws upon my research concerning the development of both the academic discipline and profession of social work through the work of Jane Addams, Mary Richmond, and Alice Salomon, I will, first, outline the current state of research in Germany concerning Jane Addams. Second, I will classify her work theoretically, and third, I will examine the influence of the settlement house movement upon the development of the profession and discipline of social work in Germany. This will serve to present the main theoretical issues in the relevant literature in German and also indicate how the results of such research can assist in the effort to change relations between professionals and clients in the field of social work.

---

1 Whipps 2010.
2 Addams 1899, p. 326.
3 Oelerich 2005 and Schaarschuch 1996 develop an innovative concept that deals with the question of how social work can be structured and activated in order to enable the client to act autonomously as well as politically. The present discussion focuses on the quality and effectiveness of social services. See Baches-Chyrek and Sünker 2009a, p. 27.
Overview of the Research in Germany

Cathy Eberhardt began the systematization and classification of Addams’ work in the German discussion.\(^4\) Her Addams biography, which examines the process of differentiation within sociology at the beginning of the twentieth century in connection with social work and reformist politics, also addresses how the various social, theoretical, and progressive issues found in Addams’ articles contributed to the scholarly discourse. Nevertheless, both her analytic description of the social situation at the time and her discussion of Addams’ influence upon the academic discipline of social work are fragmented. Eberhardt also largely ignores Addams’ role within the international political debate.\(^5\)

Daniel Tröhler and Birgit Althans focus on Addams’ importance for pragmatism,\(^6\) while Inga Pinhard highlights her usefulness today for educational theory.\(^7\) Pinhard, who draws upon Martina Löw’s ideas concerning performance theory and the sociology of space, reconstructs Addams’ views concerning the methods and goals of education and regards her work as a contribution to critical education in the area of gender studies.\(^8\) Birgit Althans argues in her examination of Addams’ work that the formation of the profession of social work in the United States developed through the involvement of women.\(^9\) She maintains that only a minor role was played by the fact that the fundamental social changes underway, which were brought about by the increasingly capitalist-oriented industrial society, demanded systematic social work directed towards the reform of social structures. However, even though the questions raised in these works point to the need for further research, Addams’ ideas concerning the discipline of social work, as well as the theoretical and historical contexts of her position, have not yet received sufficient critical attention.

Winfried Bueschges-Abel examines how Addams’ contributions to the settlement house movement served to improve the social integration of young migrants in Chicago. He points to social work as a profession dedicated to the idea of social renewal that is characterized by constant feedback involving theory, practice, politics, and ethics.\(^10\) However, he does not discuss Addams’ views concerning intercultural education in a rigor-

\(^4\) Eberhardt 1995 is the first scholarly biography of Jane Addams in German.
\(^5\) Eberhardt 1995; Eberhardt 2009, p. 147.
\(^7\) Pinhard 2003, 2009.
\(^8\) Pinhard 2009, p. 17.
\(^9\) Althans 2005, p. 121.
\(^10\) Bueschges-Abel 2005, p. 130.
ous manner, but only introduces them descriptively. This, along with the works mentioned above, not only provides an inadequate picture of how Addams’ work may cast light upon such issues as pragmatism and social integration, but also leaves unexamined the complexity of her scholarly work as well as the role she has played in the theoretical discussion concerning social work and in the establishment of the profession.

Silvia Staub-Bernasconi undertakes a theoretical systems analysis of Addams’ view of social work as a science of action. She highlights in this regard Addams’ theoretical ideas concerning world peace and her contributions to the resolution of difficulties concerning social work, procedures, and work methods. But while Staub-Bernasconi classifies Addams, who sought to foster social reform at all levels of society, as one of the very first system theorists, she does not address her work as the head of Hull-House.

Social Space and Power

The aim of my analysis of Addams’ scholarly work, which takes place within the framework of research into the development of social work at the beginning of the twentieth century, is to explore how socio-political ideas can be implemented in the concrete design of social practice and identify various opposing conservative and radical influences within the general field of social work theory. Bourdieu’s concepts of social space and field of power lend support to this approach. They identify a location within which committed actors compete with each other upon the basis of their particular positions within a social structure, which serves to either maintain or change that structure.

That is to say that the concepts of social space and field of power can be utilized to investigate the effects of actions upon structures, which serves to reveal social differentiation and the origin of individual antagonisms. For example, an analysis of the habits, skills, preferences, styles, and knowledge revealed in the ideas and practices of Hull-House residents indicates their positions in social space as well as their recognition of economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital. My view is that an insightful analysis of the professional and disciplinary history of social work as it developed under Addams’ influence becomes possible only through a description of the differing types of capital possessed by Hull-House residents as well as the mechanisms that determine the structures of distribution between them.

14 Ibid., p. 69.
in social space. Furthermore, the approaches utilized at that time by the ruling class in the social field in order to maintain existing power relations between classes become evident through a description of how the problem groups with whom Addams was engaged perceived and reflected the bourgeois society within which they existed. Of significant importance in this regard is Bourdieu’s assumption that increased struggle for positions within a given social field influences the relative value of the various types of capital. As a result, influence and power over bureaucratic authorities acquires a special significance insofar as ruling positions become accessible by means of administrative measures. Conflicts arise in this respect over both the relative value of positions and the various means of influence.\textsuperscript{15}

Bourdieu’s ideas thus provide a framework within which to examine Addams’ theoretical ideas, which investigated key concepts and methods in disciplinary discourses regarding important fields in social space. More specifically, they serve as a framework of analysis concerning main factors in the formation of the discipline and profession of social work at the beginning of the twentieth century, not least of all in that Addams held decision-making positions at the School Management Committee, the Juvenile Protective Association, the Children's Bureau, and the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy.\textsuperscript{16} New orientations in professional activities emerged at this time because of new modes of knowledge that had developed among social reformers and a new type of political comprehension that had arisen on the basis of social movements. This development involved struggle between the owners of power and candidates for power, who strove to either maintain and renew existing ideologies and theories, or replace them.\textsuperscript{17} A comparison of the development of social work in the United States and Germany reveals that there is no universal model because of the differing problems, theories, methods, and concepts that must be addressed in both the academic discipline and profession of social work. Development within the profession was decisively influenced by findings concerning the nature and causes of specific social problems as well as by the views of bourgeois female social reformers who participated in social and political movements and sought to articulate new issues in social criticism. The degree of autonomy that was established within the new academic discipline of social work indicates the extent of their success in efforts to wrest possession of positions in the field of power from the ruling political and economic elite.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 50.
\textsuperscript{16} See Deegan 2005, p. 287.
\textsuperscript{17} Bourdieu 1998, p. 70.
These women reformers promoted feminist causes in their advocacy efforts and demanded new roles for women in the occupational and political spheres. In addition to the positions they held in the National Conference of Charities and Correction and the National Federation of Settlements, Jane Addams, Florence Kelley, and Lilian Wald played leadership roles in a broad interlocking directorate of women leaders in feminist, labor, and pacifist organizations. These included the National Consumer League, the Women’s Trade Union League, the National Federation of Women’s Clubs, the Women’s Peace Party, the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, the National American Women’s Suffrage Association, and the Mother’s Congress, which later became the Parent-Teacher Association.\(^\text{18}\) The measures these women activists and intellectuals utilized should be regarded as reflecting the specific historical and social contexts in which they worked and the character of the particular problems with which they were engaged.\(^\text{19}\) It should be noted that Heinz Sünker’s analytical model indicates how reconstructing the history of the emancipation processes at that time casts light upon the formation of a new academic discipline and profession.\(^\text{20}\)

The constitution of a given discipline is associated with institutional and discursive practices, particular forms of scientific knowledge, and standards concerning the exercise of power in a specific historical period.\(^\text{21}\) Articulating the technologies of power and forms of knowledge extant during a particular period thus makes it possible for us to identify various processes whereby an academic discipline takes shape within the context of the discourses that prevail.\(^\text{22}\) In this respect, my historical and systematic study of the development of the discipline of social work helps reveal not only the manner in which the social workers and reformers around Addams were able to interact productively with the new immigrants in the endeavor to integrate them into bourgeois society in the United States, but also the dynamics at work in the composition of the *Hull-House Maps and Papers* (2007).\(^\text{23}\) In addition, this type of historical and systematic approach illuminates the interaction that took place between social work providers and clients, the situations in which assistance was organized and provided, and the type of dynamics that obtained in the provision of assistance. This
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\(^\text{18}\) Reisch and Andrews 2001, p. 32.
\(^\text{19}\) Negt and Kluge 1972, p. 35.
\(^\text{20}\) Sünker 1989.
\(^\text{21}\) Foucault 1994, p. 236.
facilitates interpretation of how theoretical and methodological approaches as well as strategies for political intervention developed.

The latter formed the basis for the pursuit of desired social changes, which resided upon the implementation of a comprehensive vision of how to provide educational opportunities, taken in the broad sense, that would be available to everyone. Education and a growth in awareness, in turn, laid the groundwork for undertaking social reforms that would help foster a renewal of political and bureaucratic organizations that had been slow to adapt in a productive manner to changes in society. This also made it possible to further the effort to elevate society to a higher level of cultural and social development at which social spaces would be characterized by mutual responsibility, solidarity, and democracy.\(^{24}\) Addams notes that

> We have learned to say that the good must be extended to all of society before it can be held secure by any one person or any one class; but we have not yet learned to add to that statement, that unless all men in all classes contribute to a good, we cannot even be sure that it is worth having. In spite of many attempts we do not really act upon either statement.\(^ {25}\)

We will now briefly examine how and in what respect the views and accomplishments of Addams’ and those around her were transferrable to the discourse in Germany concerning social work.

**Social Work as a Profession and Discipline in Germany at the Beginning of the 20th Century**

International debate concerning educational reform, gender policy, and the national crisis in relief for the poor marked the emergence of professional social work in Germany at the beginning of the twentieth century. Alice Salomon was a central figure in this unfolding. While Salomon was concerned with overall social development in the United States, her particular interest was social welfare, particularly the connections between social work, social ideas, and social policies. She understood after her first visits to settlement houses in Chicago and New York that the methods utilized in social work in the United States at that time were not immediately applicable to the German situation. Salomon nevertheless applied important elements of these methods in her own professional activities, which drew upon Addams’ and Wald’s work concerning settlement houses.

\(^{24}\) Addams 1910; Bourdieu 1998, p. 225.

\(^{25}\) Addams 1910, p. 86.
This is evident in her conceptual modifications of girls’ and women’s volunteer social welfare groups, the aim of which was to allow them to become involved in social work by providing them with the qualifications needed for assuming responsible functions and having access to opportunities to shape social reforms. Organizing girls’ and women’s groups for social relief work that had an accompanying educational function was the starting point of these efforts, the basic goals and strategies of which were shaped by democratic ideas. Such groups were successful in fostering the awareness that students could become teachers and educators capable of “taking responsibility for the achievements of the whole.”

The early division of social work into various areas of activity, such as family welfare, orphan and child welfare, poor relief, and pre-school care, made it possible to effectively address societal risks that had not been dealt with by state institutions. This also fostered the differentiation and specialization of social work in the form of social services. Social work subsequently developed into an academic discipline with training and degree programs, which led to the establishment of a large number of schools, colleges, and universities, as well as such national and international associations as the Conference of Social Women’s Schools in Germany and the International Committee of Social Schools. Educational institutions in which students could cross class boundaries, overcome differences involving norms and values, and develop a new intellectual awareness provided the starting point for conceptual initiatives that became both nationally and internationally significant. Salomon’s extensive studies of institutions and practices in the United States, which included both personal visits and analyses of such printed materials as text books and manuals, led her to publish her own guidelines and methods in connection with the establishment of the Academy for Social and Educational Women’s Work. The Academy offered advanced courses in social work, nursing, and home economics, along with a certification program for lecturing in professional schools. The aim was, on the one hand, to train women for leadership positions in public service; on the other, it was to conduct interdisciplinary research in order to shape the development of the academic discipline of social work. Sociological studies were carried out in collaboration with

28 Salomon 1913, p. 42.
29 Salomon 1937.
30 Salomon 1926, 1927, 1928.
women doctors, lawyers, social scientists, and others, which exerted an important influence upon the development of social work methods.\textsuperscript{31}

Universities at that time were still largely divided into four faculties, namely, philosophy, medicine, law, and theology. Salomon’s creation of the Academy for Social and Educational Women’s Work provided the impetus for the emergence of a new academic discipline within the existing university framework. In addition, the lecture series that she organized and conducted, which reflected her international experiences, particularly in settlement houses in the United States,\textsuperscript{32} might well be termed academic evening programs that shared to a great degree the character of university-level offerings. It should also be noted that such changes to educational curricula, coupled with opportunities for new types of academic experience, provided a more accurate reflection of the diversity and complexity of social life and made possible new types of scholarly research.

Salomon’s notion of professionalism in social work was theoretically oriented around ethical questions and issues of social justice within a broad perspective concerning the importance of education in a democratic society.\textsuperscript{33} She states that

\begin{quote}
The question before me is therefore how it is possible for people of different nations, classes, professions, and creeds to meet here together in a unity of purpose, in a spirit of co-operation and mutual good will. What is there in social work which draws us together and binds us all into a band of comrades and fellow workers?\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

Salomon sought to highlight this integrative character of social work on both practical and theoretical levels by addressing, within the context of the middle-class women’s movement, socio-political questions that led to concrete socio-political demands.\textsuperscript{35} The particular historical role of her work lies in the call to link practice, theory, and political action not only from an educational perspective in respect to her role as a teacher, but also from a variety of contrasting theoretical and methodical positions and

\textsuperscript{31} Salomon and Baum 1930.

\textsuperscript{32} Salomon implemented new approaches to community work (settlement work) and methods of individual aid (social diagnosis) on the basis of her international connections with Jane Addams and Mary Richmond. See Salomon 2000; Preyser 1958; Schüler 2004, 2006.

\textsuperscript{33} See Addams 1930; Braches-Chyrek and Sünker 2009a, 2009b.

\textsuperscript{34} Salomon 2004, p. 597.

\textsuperscript{35} The many issues addressed included protection for female workers, protection for pregnant women, paid maternity leave, equal pay for men and women, and the prevention of child labor, prostitution, and violence against women and children.
interests. Salomon thus developed new practical and philosophical approaches towards social work in Germany.

Conclusion
Social reform movements in the United States and Germany placed a much greater value upon a humanist and moral approach to social work, including its public institutional and organizational aspects, than upon the mere distribution of monetary assistance from the rich to the poor. Both movements shared the belief that if humane and open contacts across class boundaries provided the driving force for social movements, then social development could proceed upon the basis of mutual trust, respect and honesty. This involved a certain religious motivation, a critique of official assistance programs, efforts to promote neighborly cooperation, and a determination that individual rights should receive explicit legal protection.

There was close collaboration between German and American reformers through common planning, joint reform projects, shared personnel, as well as common involvement in such significant national and international organizations as the Progressive Party, the National American Woman Suffrage Association, and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom. In addition to initiating processes of change in the social perceptions of women, children, and youth, these organizations generated new political strategies and established ethical standards for the promotion of justice in society. At the same time, scholarly and theoretical discourse continued to be shaped by differences in the international and national strategies and objectives concerning social work. On the one hand, the importance placed upon planning, which was very well received by German colleagues, led to the spread of standardized conceptions of action that tended not to question the effectiveness of concrete interventions. On the other, this initiated efforts to systematize, categorize, standardize, and professionalize social work, and fostered the development of an independent academic discipline with its own methodology and specific philosophical discourse in respect to the history and theory of science.

However, these two tendencies taken together resulted in the bureaucratization of social services, whereby they were not sufficiently sensitive to the biographical, cultural, social, and historical processes that substantially determine poverty. Moreover, negotiations concerning interests, including the differentiation of individual and collective interests, continued to be regarded as playing only a relatively minor role. As a result, the emergence of a new and more appropriate orientation in social work was tied to en-

---

36 Salomon 2000.
lightened liberal social changes that proceeded from a conception of the universal human potential for rationality.

This development involved the establishment of a new academic discipline, a new profession, and new institutional and discursive practices, which still shape the definition and standardization of social work. But a neo-liberal view that emphasizes cost efficiency, rationalized management, standardized criteria, and reductionist notions of social functioning has come to play a prominent role in social policy and social work today. This hinders those in need from developing the subjective status and competencies required to determine their own lives. The social elite still continues, under the guise of professionalism, to undermine class conflict by providing primarily financial support at a level that barely meets the material needs of everyday life. For Addams, Salomon, and other like-minded professionals, the examination of power relations and the promotion of a type of education that fostered insight and awareness provided the appropriate basis for policies and objectives concerning social work. However, the latter could enjoy success and lead to lasting positive change only in conjunction with radical and reformist social movements. Sarvasy observes that,

This distinction provides a critique of privatized solutions to care needs and points the way for how to develop a new socialized care ethic through cross-class activism in social politics. With her deeply participatory vision, Addams’ theory/activist approach to formulating and enforcing social welfare policy challenges feminist democratic theorists to rethink their negative view of the social as a bureaucratic structure of control. Only by incorporating the full Addams, not the truncated materialist version, will feminist political theorists begin to build on her key insight: the engendering of democracy rests on socializing it.

As Whipps states, “Addams believed that social democracy as an ethical system represented evolutionary progress beyond the individual ethics of family-based ethics, to that of an ethics that requires one to think of the good for the whole.”
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37 Foucault 1994, p. 236.
39 Whipps 2010, p. 278.
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Travelers and Migrants: Women from Brazil in a Post-Colonial World

Miriam Adelman

“To travel is the best way to learn and empower yourself,” said Yasmina, my grandmother, who was illiterate and lived in a harem, a traditional household with locked gates that women were not supposed to open. “You must focus on the strangers you meet and try to understand them. The more you understand a stranger and the greater is your knowledge of yourself, the more power you will have.” For Yasmina, the harem was a prison, a place women were forbidden to leave. So she glorified travel and regarded the opportunity to cross boundaries as a sacred privilege, the best way to shed powerlessness.

Fatema Mernissi, Scheherazade Goes West: Different Cultures, Different Harems.

Introduction

“The personal is global.” With this new take on the old 1960s and 1970s feminist slogan “the personal is political,” sociologist Arlie Hochschild finalizes her own contribution to the volume of articles entitled Global Woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the Global Economy. This is a wonderful book, replete with tales that range from sad and harrowing to fascinating and, occasionally, hopeful. Its well-documented chapters with stories from around the globe – with cogent sociological and anthropological analyses of how women, as well as children, families, and men, navigate the contemporary world system – provide ample illustration of the multiple contradictions within the current and ongoing processes of feminization in transnational migration. Hochschild and Ehrenreich clear indicate in their general introduction that these processes are a deep reflection of what may be termed the care deficit that has been created in so-called First World societies. As more women devote themselves to work and public life outside the home, with trends towards increased male investment in home and domestic life continuing to be relatively negligible, the scenario

1 Hochschild and Ehrenreich 2003.
for a global transfer of services associated with a “traditional wife’s role” has been created. This, in turn, generates a new space in which subaltern women’s lives become enmeshed in deeply unequal, and often very exploitative, social patterns as they seek work within this sector in different parts of what is called the developed world.

Yet there are other sides to this story as well, ones which include new forms of subaltern women’s protagonism in an ever more globalizing world, and these often emerge alongside the new turns taken by global social and gender inequality. Indeed, many women who participate on the subordinate side of these relationships – as sex workers, maids, students, or even women from Third World countries who possess professional and technical training – acquire new means to build their lives and, as anthropologist Arjun Appadurai argues, a new or renewed possibility to imagine the self that has become part of an intensified global circulation of people, goods, and images. As many of the articles in Ehrenreich and Hochschild’s book show, women are often able to take advantage of the new circumstances even where adverse conditions exist and people are harshly subjected to global economic forces beyond their control – as both individuals and members of communities. Women, in fact, frequently seek to put such circumstances to use in ways that provide them with a greater degree of freedom from the forms of patriarchal control or male domination that had previously hampered their lives or encroached upon their projects – even if this does not free them from new contradictions and new forms of subaltern existence as immigrants and workers in precarious segments of the labor market in foreign countries.

Such activists, intellectuals, and writers as Jane Addams, Sojourner Truth, and Virginia Woolf belonged to earlier generations for whom women’s social protagonism, as well as those of other – and intersectional – subaltern groups, emerged against the backdrop of visibly strong and often almost overwhelming social constraints. Their lives and work are a part of a legacy of social change that has led to the multiplication of possibilities

---

2 This comprises an intensified influx of women from countries and communities ravaged by debt, poverty, colonial histories, and so-called problems of development to the kitchens and households – and sweatshops, restaurants, and streets – of the world’s global cities and richest nations. It enables life to go on smoothly for many people even though the consequences and ramifications this has for the lives of villages, communities, and families in poor and developing countries are not often taken into consideration.

3 Domestic workers, who use the money they earn outside their country to re-situate their families in the local economies of their societies of origin, thus asserting their own capacity as providers, are a case in point. This can also be true of sex workers, who take advantage of body capital – which may be the only form of Bourdieuian capital they possess – in order to acquire such other forms of capital as cultural, educational, and marital capital.
for women to cross borders of all types and deal with such persistent, and yet changing, forms of social inequality as class, race/gender, and north/south divisions. At the theoretical level, recognizing women’s participation and protagonism in these global social, economic, and cultural processes becomes part of an academic – and, we would hope, extra-academic – struggle for the recognition of the experiences, subjectivities, and stories of those people – “subjects” – who have entered the world scenario from outside the center. We refer here to what has in fact been a long and hard historical struggle – although largely marginalized by theory – which post-colonial theory has deeply and reflexively narrated. This perspective acquires even greater force when united with feminist scholarship. At the empirical level, we have attempted to put these theoretical resources to work through research on a particular group of women who are today taking part in these processes of global movement and exchange, namely, Brazilian women who have left their country and moved to Spain for diverse reasons and in a variety of circumstances. Both the individual and collective trajectories of these women defy current stereotypes and commonplace notions about who they are, which casts a different light on how they work with the resources available to them in building and re-building their lives.

Anthropologist Adriana Piscitelli has revealed in her work concerning the experience of Brazilian women immigrants in Europe that although the motivation to emigrate is most often linked to strategies for improving the quality and conditions of life, émigrées do not usually come from the most impoverished sectors of Brazilian society. Her informants instead tend to come from situations in which “basic needs” have been taken care of “back home,” although they harbor a desire to better themselves – either financially, or in terms of other types of capital – by living and working abroad for a period of time. Going abroad often presents itself as a promising option in respect to material improvement as well as other types of empowerment for women who regard their current situation in their country of origin as relatively stagnant or simply lacking in prospects for the future. In addressing the specific case of women and travesti sex workers, she points out that the most commonly cited reasons for leaving Brazil – getting money together to build a house, set up a small business, or pay for one’s own or a family member’s studies – are shared with other less stigma-

---

4 The study in question was conducted in Barcelona during 2009 with fellow researchers Dr. Jane Felipe and doctoral candidate Bianca Guizzo from Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Milena Souza, a graduate student in Sociology at Universidade Federal do Paraná, also worked on the project. This article would not have come into being without their generosity, hard work, and companionship.

5 Piscitelli 2008.
tized and more legitimized social groups. But what also emerges here is a methodological and political issue regarding the agency of persons who do not belong to privileged social groups. Furthermore, many stories — both ones we have read and others that emerge from our own fieldwork — indicate that although people from privileged groups, including upper-class women, have been the ones to appear most frequently in the literary genres of travel and adventure, there are a wide range of people, including many from subaltern social groups and categories, who take to the road inspired by a modern social imaginary which suggests that travel, or venturing out into distant lands, can be either a temporary or permanent alternative for constructing a new life and self.

Brazilian Women in Today’s Migratory Circuits

Brazilian emigration to Europe, the United States, and Japan underwent a transformation from being a sporadic occurrence during the 1970s to having emerged as a consolidated phenomenon during the 1990s. It was thus not until the end of the twentieth century that Brazil became a part of the global migratory circuits related to people’s quests for social and economic betterment. Now, over the last two-plus decades, thousands of Brazilians have decided to abandon their places of origin in search of prospects for change for themselves and/or their families and relatives. Although migration has long attracted the attention of social scientists, it is only recently that scholars have begun to address its gendered aspects, revealing, among other things, the fallacious character of the notion that migrant workers are predominantly male and that migratory processes are generally protag- onized by men.

As a result, the lives and choices of Brazilian women have acquired greater visibility in recent years in studies of migration, including the excellent studies by Gláucia de Oliveira Assis, Lúcia Maria Machado Bógus, Bernadete Beserra, and Adriana Piscitelli. As these authors have shown, examining Brazilian women’s foreign migrations leads us through a labyrinth of such issues as prejudice, stereotypes, corporeality, the construc-

---

6 Ehrenreich and Hochschild provide numerous examples that paint a picture which both resembles and differs from the situations and scenarios addressed in the current discussion. In certain parts of the world, such as Sri Lanka and the Philippines, it has become common for women to leave their countries in search of employment while their husbands — often unemployed or underemployed — remain in their countries of origin. Such circumstances tend to have an extremely destabilizing effect on the traditional gender order and family structure.

7 See, for example, Hodgson 2002.

8 See Assis 2003.

tion of global networks of sociability, and the proverbial quest for better living conditions. Furthermore, the latter includes not only the search for economic stability – greater income, higher wages, better jobs, and the like – but also the desire to overcome constraints that these women faced in their country of origin, such as limited independence, a lack of physical and social mobility, and restrictions on personal development. Women can thus be viewed as seeking to make their own choices and decisions in a more unencumbered way, viewing themselves as fully capable of setting their own course in life.

In the pages that follow we present a summary of the preliminary results of research that has been focused primarily on revealing the personal migratory projects of a number of Brazilian women currently living in Barcelona.10 Our field work has utilized a life history method whereby we gather the personal narratives of the women interviewed. Although these women differ greatly from one another in terms of their socio-economic backgrounds, regional origins, and so forth, their life histories shed light on the various logics that co-exist, often in contradictory ways, within immigrant women’s lives in personal, professional, familial, and individual terms. While sociological perspectives enable us to begin to untangle the socio-cultural processes that both make possible and inform personal migratory projects, the perspectives of anthropology and cultural studies permit us to perceive the ways in which our informants also participate as ordinary women in processes of the re-signification of cultures and identities, which in turn are shaped and re-shaped within everyday action and thinking.11 Like other women and men around the world, they develop creative strategies within specific social, cultural, and political contexts for survival, growth, dealing with adversities, making decisions, taking a stance, and reconstructing themselves in relation to the world.

Using a snowball sampling technique, we conducted five initial interviews in Barcelona between April 2009 and January 2010. While our loosely-structured interviews permitted each woman to narrate her history according to her own interpretative framework, we were nevertheless able

10 See Pontes 2004.
11 As the anthropologist Arjun Appadurai has argued, our contemporary world may be characterized by, among other things, the creation of a “diasporic public sphere” that has contributed to erasing the cultural boundaries between “center” and “periphery.” People the world over have acquired resources for “self-imagining as an everyday social project,” and the local and the global fuse together in the configuration of identities and politics. Sociabilities are reconstructed through and throughout this diaspora. Appadurai himself has raised the question of how and to what extent this works in a way that empowers women, which has been dealt with in greater depth and detail by such feminist theorists as Claudia Costa and Adriana Piscitelli. See Appadurai 1996; Piscitelli 2004; Costa 2000.
to elicit information on certain issues important for the purposes of our study. For example, we ensured that informants would touch upon their socio-economic background, community and/or religious affiliation, situation in Brazil before migration, reasons for leaving the country, arrival abroad, first impressions and experiences on terra estrangeira, difficulties concerning labor market insertion, cultural understanding and misunderstanding, family and family dislocation, and opportunities to study and receive training. We also encouraged them to assess the meaning of being a Brazilian woman in respect to differing cultural contexts for sexual and affective relationships in foreign countries, the (re)construction of sociabilities, discrimination, the ways in which they represent their home country, Spain, and the world, as well as their own dreams, illusions, and achievements.

Our interviewees were all relatively young, ranging in age from 28 to 42. All described themselves as heterosexual, but they differed from one another in terms of social class, racial identity, and regional origin, thus reflecting to some degree the diversity that characterizes Brazilian society itself. Nonetheless, their trajectories had unfolded in convergent ways. All placed some type of existential challenge at the center of their narratives, and they gave more importance to symbolic and subjective factors rather than such other types of motivation as financial gain, the desire for social mobility, or romance.

Carla comes from a middle class family in a major city in the more developed southern region of the country, while Ana comes from a poor family in the Brazilian northeast. Elisa is the adopted daughter of an elderly childless couple from the state of São Paulo, whom she portrayed as very religious Evangelical Protestants. Our other two informants are from the northern port city of Salvador da Bahia. Giovanna is the daughter of a lower middle class family who was able to obtain Italian citizenship because of her father's Italian descent. Márcia is a Black woman from a humble family of 11 siblings in which a number of the daughters had been able to acquire a certain social mobility through higher education. Education in fact stands out as a major factor defining the trajectories and opportunities of the women we interviewed – four of the five had finished undergraduate studies before leaving Brazil, while Giovanna and Márcia had emigrated to Spain in connection with plans involving further education.

Giovanna related how she had felt like an outsider overburdened with family responsibilities among rich classmates when she studied architec-

12 All names given here are pseudonyms chosen to preserve the anonymity of those who granted us interviews even though none of them expressed particular concern over revealing their identity.
ture at a public university. She stated that leaving Brazil gave her a chance to move on in life at a time when she felt that both her professional and personal lives were going nowhere.

My job was sucking up all my energy. I hadn't had any vacation during all those years and I was feeling like shit. I was in a really bad relationship that was just eating me alive, I wasn't getting anything in return. And to me, well, it was a vacuum. “I really gotta get out of here... I have to get out.” And I had this family, this really odd family, my family was like the Adams Family.13

Márcia described in her own terms how she saw education as a route to personal and social progress. She remarked that she had

always thought of education as a way to change in our country, I always had that view. That was what got me into working in the field, I thought of it as a way to change our reality, especially in the northeast. So I devoted myself to education, working and trying to do a few things.

But after some years of working in schools, specifically in a project called “SOS Children's Villages,” she found herself in need of another sort of experience. She thought of going to another country both to see a bit of the world, and to continue her education abroad.

Although Carla had a professional life in her hometown that she felt was going relatively well, she was nevertheless not fully satisfied in the field in which she was working, public relations. She had also studied theater and longed to devote herself to music instead. She also dreamt of going abroad – “I always admired those people who left, who spent three or four years living in the United States.” She had the option when she was 26 of getting “a secure position in the market” and finding “a [corporate] job,” but made a different choice instead.

So that was when I thought it would be a good time to take a trip. I didn't really know where. I thought about the United States, but then, since I had a [European Union] passport, I thought that would be, you know, making things unnecessarily difficult. I really wanted to learn English, but [it didn't make much sense] to go to the United States since I had a Spanish passport. And I thought about London, but I'm not too keen on bad weather and the cold. So I thought why not go to Spain first and see what happens from there. I in fact had no set plan. I just wanted to have a chance to find things out for myself. It was kind of on impulse.

13 All translations of the interviews are by the author.
Ana claims she “never liked studying,” but did not intend to let that limit her options. Speaking to us in Portuguese sprinkled with Spanish words and phrases, she described herself as a dynamic and enterprising sort of person – “the most creative one” in a family of six siblings. She spoke of the urge she had had since quite young to leave the small northeastern city where she was born, with its “boring” and “stagnant” environment. She told us that

[I was] the youngest of the kids, but I always had my sights set ahead of all the others. I always wanted to get out of there, get out of where I was living, a really small city. It wasn't a capital city, things never reached there... well, it was always behind other places, and I wanted to go where things were happening, that was what I wanted for myself. And I always said that one day I would get out of Imperatriz... it was no place for me. I always said that to my mom and my sisters. And my sisters would always say, “Huh, how are you gonna get outta here? Getting out ain't that easy... it’s not like you can just say so, just say 'I'm going' and then get out.” They all thought it was just kid's talk, just something a 12 or 13 year old girl would say. But then I grew up, I worked... well, not that much, because, of course, it was a small city and there weren't many job opportunities, but I was always very creative, very resourceful, I always wanted to be in the thick of things.... So I learned how to work throwing parties for children, and I met a lot of people, important people around town who liked me.

So, when the opportunity arose to travel to Portugal and work as a hairdresser, Ana seized the opportunity.

Elisa, who was 39 at the time we interviewed her, surprised us with her story, which she connected to her Evangelical religious convictions and sense of social responsibility. “I was always a dreamer, very idealistic,” she told us. After a period of studying law and journalism, and then suffering political problems brought on by her whistle-blowing activities, she became frustrated and considered changing her career. Some time later, married and living in the Amazon region with her agronomist husband, she obtained a nursing degree. Then, when she was 32 and the mother of three children, her marriage fell apart. In her own words, she was taken by surprise. She had been happy, with a stable middle class life – in love with her family, her children, and her husband – when she was unexpectedly confronted with the need to “begin all over again.”

To have to start all over again, start again, and once again see how the justice system in my country leaves so much to be desired – because in spite of the fact that we had lost all our patrimony, he was in a better situation than I was! Because he just got out, left me with the kids and shunned all his paternal responsibilities, so I had to handle everything on my own, take on
all the responsibilities, every last one of them! To raise the kids by myself, educate them, from that moment on, and I have been on my own now for seven years, bringing up the kids, doing everything myself, paying all the bills, everything!

Elisa made frequent references to her relationship to God as she recounted her efforts in the face of adversity and deceit. She explained that rather than embarking on a battle with her ex-husband over child support, she decided to set out on her own “because the children and I didn’t need him.... I rose to the challenge. God gave me the strength, He sustained me.” She spoke with pride of how she had moved with her children to another city and started a Japanese restaurant, describing this stage of her life as “really hard, tons of work, but I saw the fruits of my labor.... I gave my children the best of everything.” Like Carla, she said that she had always wanted to live abroad. Her dream had been to go to Canada or the United States because of the English language, which I love, I always have. The United States, Canada, completely developed countries, a high quality of life, education, health, everything; I never thought of Europe, it never crossed my mind. And then my children started bringing the matter up: “Mom, let’s get out of here, let’s go away....” Even because of the circumstances, the fact that they didn’t have any contact with their father, although he was geographically close, they had a father who was totally out of the picture.

Elisa rhetorically associated her personal and familial search to religious notions of destiny and providence throughout the interview. “People spoke to me, saying God would get me out of Brazil... like a prophecy. He would remake my life, bring me new fruit, new flowers....” And she replied, “I will go, yes, I will; the best place to be is where God has willed it, nothing is mere coincidence.” Finally, a wealthy man who was a member of her church gave her tickets to Europe. Portugal, her port of entry, proved to be a disappointment – “it was a shock to me because I had another image of Portugal, another idea of it as a European country, I imagined it... like Switzerland!” Dissatisfied with Lisbon, she found an opportunity to give Spain a try through a Brazilian living in Barcelona, an internet friend of one of her daughters. He offered them a place to stay for a while, which became the start of another adventure – one which, as Elisa puts it, had a “happy ending.”

All our interviewees were single when they left Brazil – one was a divorcée with three children, while the other four were single and childless. Although all became involved with European men once they were estab-
lished in Spain, it was only in Ana’s case – the only informant who did not have the cultural capital associated with a university degree – that the relationship with a Spanish man took center stage. In this regard, we discovered themes throughout the five narratives that also appear in research which addresses the typical images that circulate internationally of Brazilian women and of relationships between Brazilian women and European men. For example, being Brazilian seems to add symbolic value to a woman insofar as certain European men believe that Brazilian and other Latin American women possess characteristics that make them optimal girlfriends and wives. Nevertheless, many Latin American women believe that by choosing to be with European men they are entering a context that is more evolved and less sexist than is the case in their home country. This is the fascinating and paradoxical finding that emerges from the research of the Spanish anthropologist Roca i Girona, who points to the surprise and disillusionment that frequently result from expectations that are based more on stereotypes than on the true complexity of human beings and of cultural exchange. But regardless of what informs the expectations of men and women, the fact that their assumptions are linked to how they represent the other to themselves is significant. Furthermore, among the many elements that come together to forge a woman’s personal migratory project, being without a partner may support the decision to travel or emigrate. Not only may the hope of finding a partner from another part of the world be regarded as both understandable and legitimate, it is often nourished by the numerous fantasies of difference that circulate through global as well as local symbolic systems and imaginaries.

Although the women we interviewed were aware of the high value Brazilian women had on the Spanish sexual and marriage markets, they emphatically placed themselves at a distance from the discourse common in Europe that ascribes them particular sexual and affective attributes as Brazilians. From the perspective of their own narratives, our informants in fact appear to identify themselves in terms of femininity and life style much more with characteristics often attributed to Spanish women.

14 Carla was living with her Catalanian boyfriend. Ana was married to an engineer from another part of the country, while Márcia was recently married to (and on her way to being separated from) a Catalanian man who worked as a waiter and with whom she had recently had a child. Giovanna was married to an Italian she had met while living in Barcelona. Elisa reported at the time of our interview that she was involved with a Catalanian engineer who lived and worked in a city some 150 kilometers from Barcelona.

15 See Piscitelli 2009; Roca i Girona 2007.

16 Roca i Girona 2007.

Márcia, as a Black woman, feels that she is seen through a particular lens in Europe.

The idea that a Brazilian woman shows herself nude and has a super active sex life [affects people]... so when you say you are Brazilian, people imagine you in a certain way... Sometimes when I met people through the internet, for example, I had to tell them that that's just not the way things are.... There are women in Brazil who make that kind of choice in life, a "liberated" one, but they can be found in any country.... I would always have to say, "Look, Brazilian women are intelligent, they study, do research, are intellectuals, have important jobs, etc., etc., etc."

One element that was common to all of our informants' narratives, regardless of their differing life stories and circumstances, was the conviction that, as women, they could build and rebuild their lives within a particularly transnational context. It was their desire to grow and change that had in fact led them beyond the borders of their own country far from the communities in which they had been raised. The language they used to tell their stories was evocative of a life pregnant with possibilities. They thus provide us with examples of how certain Brazilian women, of a variety of ages and social origins, have put together what may be termed a project of the self that includes a broadening of horizons at the international level. However, they regard neither themselves, nor the lives they have built, as anything but ordinary. At some point in our interviews each one expressed the feeling of being an ordinary person, of not being fundamentally different from other women – neither wealthy, nor enjoying any particularly privileged social status, but rather hardworking and capable of mobilizing considerable courage. At the same time, they realize that they have acquired new and socially valued resources through their transnational experiences. This constitutes an effective type of social capital that comes from venturing beyond borders, learning a foreign language, and developing the kinds of cosmopolitan competencies that had previously been restricted to more privileged social groups. The women from middle class backgrounds and those who had already acquired social mobility by virtue of education obviously had the opportunity to expand and build upon the cultural capital they had already possessed. Nonetheless, as Ana's story demonstrates, women from other social backgrounds can also find ways to access worlds of knowledge and status that would otherwise have been inaccessible to them, becoming fluent in different cultures and acquiring a type of cultural capital that is typically monopolized by others in their home country.

The issue of work emerges as a key issue in the current literature concerning the feminization of migratory processes, which is in fact quite
abundant. This is especially the case because many people – women as well as men – begin their trajectory as emigrants fueled by economic need and the promise of a better life through the higher wages or salaries they expect to obtain in the receiving country. The migratory projects of two of the women we interviewed, Márcia and Giovanna, had initially been based on education and professional training, and work for them was at first regarded as a means to that end. Giovanna became frustrated in her attempt to have her Brazilian degree in architecture validated and instead found a new profession – although she considered it to be temporary – working with her Italian husband in their own business, an advertising agency. Márcia made ends meet working as a waitress or in other service sector jobs, and Elisa, who also had been a professional in Brazil, accepted lower status work in house cleaning and domestic services while nurturing hopes of putting together more challenging opportunities for herself once the issue of her immigration papers had been resolved.\footnote{ Márcia’s and Eliza’s experiences may thus be viewed in the context of third to first world labor transfer. See Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003 on this issue.} Carla, who began her stay in Europe working as a babysitter, later found employment that put to use her background in public relations in Brazil, a situation that was made possible by the fact that she already had a Spanish passport. Only Ana, who had just a high school diploma, found employment that she regarded as satisfying. She was able to receive vocational training as a hairdresser, which led to a job at a downtown beauty salon, a franchise of a major chain.

Job, vocation, and personal and professional fulfillment now take on a variety of dimensions within life projects insofar as work, employment, and profession play obviously significant roles in the lives of women and men today. For example, although personal fulfillment clearly bore a relationship to professional opportunities, our informants did not regard it as primarily contingent upon the latter. Children were important for the two women who were mothers, but not in the sense that a maternal role was regarded as their major form of being-in-the-world. Vocation was connected to a variety of desires and aspirations that often had very little to do with one’s job or current professional activities. Jobs, in turn, were often engaged with in ways that were more strategic and pragmatic than anything else, while vocation, portrayed as something to be discovered or constructed over the life course of one’s life, was regarded as fluid, often taking one in unexpected directions.

As is clear from Carla’s and Elisa’s previous statements, all of the women we interviewed had such high hopes and expectations when they arrived in Europe that it should perhaps be no surprise that they experienced frustrations and at times rather tense encounters with aspects of Spanish
society and culture. Yet their narratives display largely realistic readings of the world coupled with attempts to re-think their own places within it. Brazil itself is signified in affective, largely positive terms and is associated with family. Márcia's states, for example, that

In Brazil people have something we don't have here – affection... and respect, maybe, as a human being, value placed on feelings you build. I think that in Brazil relationships with other people are lovelier, friendlier, more open. People are more cheerful, they struggle a lot, they show more solidarity. Here it's different, people are colder, they don't help one another as much. So those are the strongest aspects [of Brazil]. I come from a large, beautiful family.

But Europe, and Spain in particular, was viewed as offering other advantages, especially in respect to public policies, infrastructure, and a lower level of violence. This was in spite of the financial crisis that was still intensifying during the period in which we carried out our interviews.

Márcia had a difficult time following through on her plan for doctoral studies in Spain due to linguistic difficulties and, possibly, problems resulting from shortcomings in her educational background. Later, with an infant to care for and marital problems, she voiced doubts about whether she should return to Brazil or stay in Spain, but felt that her son would probably have a better future if she remained in Europe.

Giovanna was just a few weeks away from returning home at the time of our interview. She would be taking her Italian husband with her, who was experiencing a certain anxiety about the kind of life and job opportunities that awaited him in Brazil. But the thought of going home was still highly appealing to Giovanna, whose narrative emphasized her disappointment with work and study as well as the forms of sociability in Catalonian society.

I saw here that that were limitations on how far I could get as a foreigner, as an immigrant. And my own limits were much higher that the ones they placed on me here. And my family... I saw that things were far from perfect here. And that the economy was a bubble [about to burst], that the real estate sector was extremely speculative, that it was about to blow up, that they don't have their own sources of energy, that it is a land that is probably going to suffer from terrible drought, that there are not enough crops, so there is no self-sufficiency in terms of food, all things that are very serious for a country. So this is not a place for you to live the rest of your life, unless you have your family here. So the moment came [after nine years] to say "I have to go, we have to go."
Carla, on the other hand, expressed contentment with her life in Barcelona, where she is involved in musical studies – she explained that she would not have had this opportunity in Brazil, where she feels musical repertoires are more restrictive. She was quite happy as well with her Catalanian partner, her daily life, and other advantages that she feels her adopted society has to offer. In respect to what each society could furnish, Carla stated that

Porto Alegre is a city with limited resources in the artistic field. We have a very locally-oriented music industry. Barcelona is a city that has other things to provide – better structure, better transportation, better health care, more security.

She made it clear that the plans she had to return to Brazil were based on exclusively familial motives since she could not see herself spending the rest of her life far away from her parents and siblings. Carla also explained that her boyfriend understood this need of hers, saying that it would be up to him to decide whether or not to move to Brazil with her.

The weight – and singularity – of each woman’s personal experiences is palpable. Elisa, who went to Europe after a period of intense sacrifice and personal difficulty in Brazil, reiterated that while loving many things about her homeland, she preferred to think about her life – and her children’s future – in Europe. Only Ana seemed anxious to break the ties that connected her to her place and country of origin, vigorously asserting that her life in Spain was much better than the one she had had in Brazil. She claimed that the only thing she missed was her mother and other members of her family, whom she in fact had helped to support through monthly remittances from her wages as a hairdresser. This assistance had enabled her mother to carry out considerable home improvements and would also make it possible for her nieces to have a private school education. She was quite proud of her role as a provider and of the constant moral and material support of her Spanish husband, who himself would “love to live in Brazil” if the chance – which she would not particularly welcome – were to arise.

Elisa minimized the difficulties she had undergone upon her arrival in Europe. One of her daughters had in fact returned to Brazil to pursue a higher education at the time we interviewed her, while the other was living in France with her Brazilian soccer player boyfriend. Elisa was thus living with only her teenage son when we spoke with her, in an immigrant neighborhood populated with people from all over the world – “you don’t hear Spanish spoken on the streets.” But she nevertheless asserted her desire to continue living abroad. She had worked with poor Amazonian populations during her days in Brazil, and she planned to set up a day care center for immigrant children in Barcelona. She emphasized that she had
always been “concerned with social issues,” again using a language that coded her commitment to the world through religious metaphors.

When I got to Spain, I never imagined it would become my second homeland. I love this place, the people, and I want to make a difference here, with my work and life. When I got here I went to the university hospital to give blood, and I am registered as a bone marrow donor because there is a patient with whom I may be compatible, a cancer patient in California, and I am waiting to see if I can make the donation. So you see, that’s my life, that’s how I want to devote it. I want to make a difference, as God is watching, whether in Spain, Africa, Canada, wherever, I want to make a difference.

A personal search for fulfillment took on strong collective, even political, connotations in the case of two other informants as well. Giovanna, who at the time of our interview was anxiously packing her bags to return to Brazil, expressed this commitment in professional terms regarding her desire to work, as she put it, in “people’s architecture” (a arquitetura popular). Márcia, who had a long history of leftist activism in Brazil, had become involved in Barcelona with a non-partisan group working with issues concerning immigrant rights.

Finally, we should emphasize that all our informants implicitly or explicitly positioned themselves as women who make their own life choices. In one of her most expressive moments, Márcia explained that while, in her opinion, there is a great deal of sexism in both Spain and Brazil, the real cultural difference in gender terms lies not in the attitudes, hearts, and minds of Spanish and Brazilian men, but rather in the more openly combative attitude of Spanish women, who expect more equality and do not hesitate to demand it.

Conclusions

The Indian anthropologist Arjun Appadurai, who has written eloquently on popular cosmopolitanism and the work of the imagination, points to the media and migration as two forces that have contributed to significant changes in contemporary cultural patterns and in the ways in which people and ideas move around the globe in ever more hybrid and intricately interwoven relations. He remarks that, on the one hand, imagination “has entered the logic of ordinary life from which it had largely been successfully sequestered,” adding that “More people than ever before seem to imagine routinely that they or their children will live and work in places other than where they were born.”19 On the other, these processes are marked by the

19 Appadurai 1996, p. 5.
creation of very different kinds of diaspora. These include diasporas of terror and of despair – produced by political strife, war, brutality, and economic crisis – that force people into the world as refugees and exiles. But they also include diasporas of hope, a category to which our informants are fortunate enough to belong. Each of these types of diaspora breeds new interactions and new readings of both local traditions and global realities. In addition to possessing the potential for conflict, they also promote new post-modern understandings of difference – and of the common fate of humanity. Appadurai himself is attuned to the gendered dimensions of such experiences, and how – in the best of circumstances – the resources spawned within this new “popular cosmopolitanism” may encourage a re-signification of inherited gender patterns that is empowering for many women.

Notwithstanding the differing life stories and circumstances of the women we interviewed, the belief that they as women could build and re-build their lives, and do so within a global context, underlie their narratives. They expressed either a desire or a need for growth and change that led them beyond the borders of nations and the boundaries of local communities. They were articulate in describing and giving meaning to these experiences as they told their stories, using a fluid manner of expression that seemed to reflect the fact that they saw their lives as open-ended and full of possibilities. Furthermore, they worked at putting together identities in which the self and the other, the personal and the collective, intermingled. For Carla and Ana this occurred in terms of responsibility to the extended family, while for Giovanna, Márcia, and Elisa it involved a broad commitment to community and social change.

The narratives we recorded provide clear examples of women’s agency, showing how young Brazilian women from different class backgrounds forge broadened horizons for building their lives and seeking alternatives. One of our key findings that merits further exploration deals with how women acquire new, socially valued resources through their transnational experiences. This is a type of effective cultural capital that is established upon learning to move beyond borders, speak other languages, and master skills that until very recently were generally restricted to privileged social groups. Although it may be true that middle class women benefit in particular ways from perfecting existing skills and adding to the cultural capital they already possess – from which they also tend to receive more immediate and obvious returns – poor and working class women are also able to use their new experiences to access a world of knowledge and status previously off limits to them as they become fluent in a kind of cultural experience and status that would have been inaccessible to them in their
home countries. This obviously factors into the equation much more easily in the case of women, such as Elisa and Márcia, who had already been protagonists in a process of social mobility, having begun or completed university studies in Brazil.

As Pontes points out, “identities constructed within the migratory context” are never static, and they can be better apprehended and understood as “processes of identification.”

Our informants not only (re)constructed narratives concerning the meanings of womanhood, but also – and quite vigorously – elaborated what it means today to be a Brazilian or European woman and citizen. While our methodological perspective placed a priority upon the daily processes of human interaction, it also enabled us to examine how the latter have been shaped by a specific historical context and its gendered socio-cultural relations. We have sought to shed light on how a particular group of women are engaged in such interactions within a world in which one of the major challenges facing them – and us – is the difficult task of putting together life projects that are simultaneously collective and individual. Finding a place for ourselves within the complex interplay of “what makes us similar and what makes us different” is clearly one of our greatest existential paradoxes.
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Jane Addams and the Creativity of Helping

Erik Schneiderhan

Introduction

It is indeed an honor to contribute to a discussion that celebrates the work of one of sociology’s greatest thinkers and activists, Jane Addams. She is truly our greatest “public sociologist.” Addams lived alongside the poor at Hull-House in one of the most disadvantaged neighborhoods in Chicago. Insofar as her knowledge about and theory of the world emerged in a true pragmatist fashion from her experiences there, her theoretical statements and practice are inextricably intertwined. To consider one without the other would lead to a misunderstanding, and perhaps even a misrepresentation, of her work.

I will here examine one particular dimension of Addams’ theory and practice of helping others, namely, creativity. I will first address what I mean by creativity, drawing on pragmatism, particularly the work of John Dewey, to construct my theoretical framework. I will then briefly examine Addams’ practice during the early years of Hull-House in the effort to reveal the creativity in her actions. Finally, I will propose how the creative elements in Addams’ work can still inform helping others today.

Creativity and Pragmatism

By creativity I mean something very specific that is grounded in pragmatism and relational sociology. The pragmatists rejected the Cartesian mind-body dualism in favor of the notion that experience is the foundation of knowing – thinking does not float in the sky, so to speak, but rather arises from action.¹ Addams tells us that if we wish our actions – and the thinking and intelligence that emerge from it – to possess “social morality,” we must consider the “moral experiences of the many.”² Addams and other residents of Hull-House exercised such consideration in their experiences

¹ Dewey 2007.
with their neighbors, the result of which was an ethos of “making a difference” in the practical ways they offered them help.

What Addams did at Hull-House, or her experience there, should be understood as a relational process. Pragmatist Mary Parker Follett urges us to think of experience “as an interplay of forces, as the activity of relating leading through fresh relating to a new activity.”\(^3\) In short, we need to focus on the relational, which leads us to an understanding of creative practice. John Dewey argues that the “separation of ‘mind’ from a direct occupation with things emphasizes things at the expense of relations or connections.”\(^4\) Furthermore, the relational approach is more than simply a focus on process — it is rather a commitment to making relations the primary units of analysis. Emirbayer argues in his call for a more relational sociology, stating that

\[
\text{[T]he very terms or units involved in a transaction derive their meaning, significance, and identity from the (changing) functional roles they play within that transaction. The latter, seen as a dynamic, unfolding process, becomes the primary unit of analysis rather than the constituent elements themselves.}\]

The agency and, by extension, the creativity of the social actor thus cannot be understood apart from the situation within which action unfolds.\(^6\) In keeping with the relational approach, Dewey advocates a categorical rejection of the means-ends dualism in social action theory, preferring to think of action as a continual process with no real beginning or end. There is no specific, concrete end towards which one moves by deploying particular means. Dewey instead prefers to think in terms of the “ends-in-view” that emerge from experience itself. “Ends-in-view, as distinct from ends as accomplished results, themselves function as directive means; or, in ordinary language, as plans.”\(^7\) Dewey maintains that “ends are rather ends-in-view or aims. They arise out of natural effects or consequences which in the beginning are hit upon, stumbled upon so far as any purpose is concerned.”\(^8\) Consequently, “in a strict sense an end-in-view is a means in present action; present action is not a means to a remote end.”\(^9\) Furthermore, “We do
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3 Follett 1924, p. 81.
4 Dewey 2007, p. 106.
5 Emirbayer 1997, p. 287.
6 Ibid., p. 294.
9 Ibid., p. 15.
something to the thing and then it does something to us in return: such is the peculiar combination.”

The Deweyan approach to means and ends is part of the pragmatist emphasis on experimentalism and creativity. For example, much of our day-to-day activity is governed by non-reflexive, routine courses of action. But when routines or habits break down, one must then consider the situation, examine what courses of action are possible, and then experiment by trying something and seeing what happens. Dewey characterizes this rupture as a moment when

“there is something the matter,” when there is some “trouble” in an existing situation. When analyzed, this “something the matter” is found to spring from the fact that there is something lacking, wanting, in the existing situation as it stands, an absence that produces conflict in the elements that do exist.11

Stated otherwise, the failure of habit, or the breakdown of what Joas calls “pre-reflected, practical ways,”12 leads the actor to reflect upon the situation and engage in a process of creatively constructing a response, thereby engaging in “creative syncretism.”13 Follett describes such creativity as emerging from what she terms a “mystery moment,”14 which is to say that the impetus for action comes from discovering that something is missing – “the urge is always the lack.”15 Insofar as such action and the experiences associated with it are akin to a “dynamo station” that “generates new energy,” Hull-House can be understood as a dynamo station that created new energy for helping others.16

Follett’s “mystery moment” is akin to Addams’ idea of “perplexity.”17 Addams presents this conception in Democracy and Social Ethics in the form of a question – “Of what use is all this striving and perplexity?” She argues that non-habitual action stems from perplexity, which marks a break with convention and a move towards a new, reconstructed understanding of the situation.18 For Addams, perplexity arises from “the mys-
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10 Dewey 2007, p. 104.
14 Follett 1924, p. xv.
15 Ibid., p. 81.
16 Ibid., pp. 85, 137.
17 Addams 2002, p. 31.
tery and complexity of life” and leads to “the promptings that spring from growing insight.”"^{19} Seigfried maintains that

Addams uses the perplexity that is felt when our preconceptions are called into question by those differently situated as a way to focus attention on the power disparities that, when ignored, undermine the effectiveness of the experimental method."^{20}

The notion of perplexity was in fact central to Addams’ understanding of what Hull-House was about – “a Settlement shares the perplexities of its times and is never too dogmatic concerning the final truth.”"^{21} Dewey elaborates on Addams’ notion of perplexity, pointing out that reconstruction is grounded in experience. He argues that

"[T]hinking takes its departure from specific conflicts in experience that occasion perplexity and trouble. Men do not, in their natural estate, think when they have no troubles to cope with, no difficulties to overcome."^{22}

Perhaps the best current expression of the experiential dimension of the pragmatist program is provided by Hacking, who advocates “taking a look,” by which he means turning to “real life, real knowledge, real expertise.”"^{23}

But this is more than simply trial and error. One must engage in what Dewey calls a “careful survey” involving “examination, inspection, exploration, [and] analysis” of all those things which might help to “define and clarify the problem in hand.”"^{24} It is also important to interrogate such a survey, squaring it with a wider range of facts. Emirbayer and Schneiderhan argue that “what [Dewey] envisioned was that habits could themselves be made more intelligent, indeed, that not only intelligent habits but also habits of intelligence could take root and thrive.”"^{25} To be clear, this process does not and should not exist somewhere “in the sky.” Nor is the process of reflective experience an end in itself insofar as perplexity lays the groundwork for what Dewey terms “growth,” which is itself a process and not an endpoint. Dewey characterizes growth as a “continual process” of “perfecting, maturing, refining.” He maintains that, in this social process,

\[^{19}\text{Addams 1893, pp. 44–45.}\]
\[^{20}\text{Seigfried 2004, p. 191.}\]
\[^{21}\text{Addams 1961, p. 292.}\]
\[^{22}\text{Dewey 1988, pp. 159–160.}\]
\[^{23}\text{Hacking 2007, p. 36.}\]
\[^{24}\text{Dewey 2007, pp. 111–112.}\]
\[^{25}\text{Emirbayer and Schneiderhan 2011.}\]
Improvement and progress, rather than the static outcome and result, becomes the significant thing... the end is no longer a terminus or limit to be reached. It is the active process of transforming the existent situation.26

Consequently, perplexity and experimentation in respect to the pragmatist conceptualization of non-habitual action lead to growth, which in turn fosters new perplexities and new experimentation.

Hull-House residents were experimenters who, above all, needed to be what Addams terms “flexible” in respect to both practices and goals.27 George Herbert Mead observes in this regard that

It is the privilege of the social settlement to be a part of its own immediate community, to approach its conditions with no preconceptions, to be the exponents of no dogma or fixed rules of conduct, but to find out what the problems of this community are and as a part of it to help toward their solution.28

Pragmatism as a process is thus grounded in perplexity, and we can see that Hull-House residents were able to break from convention and strive for a new, reconstructed understanding of the situations they encountered. Perplexity laid the groundwork for growth, which was not in and of itself an endpoint, but rather a process of winnowing ideas for action from experience. If one can speak of a “goal” in this process, it is transformation, and Hull-House was home to such a process of transformation. Perplexity and experimentation led to growth, which in turn fostered new perplexities and new creative experimentation.

Hull-House

Addams was a creator from the beginning. She first got the idea to establish Hull-House after a visit in the spring of 1888 to Toynbee Hall, one of the first settlement houses in England. Inspired by what she saw there, she began planning to found a settlement house in Chicago with her friend Ellen Gates Starr, who also visited Toynbee Hall in the summer of 1888. Addams and Starr began searching for a place to settle during the spring of 1889, surveying a number of what they described as “slums,” and eventually decided on a house on Halsted Street in the Nineteenth Ward of Chicago. This would become their “laboratory” for experimenting with ideas concerning how to help others. Addams and Starr were creators from the start.

28 Mead 1907, p. 110.
— in Jackson’s words, “there was in the earliest undertakings of Hull House [sic] a touch of the artist’s enthusiasm” in their efforts.  

Like anyone moving to a new place, they began by trying to meet their neighbors. A journalist reporting on Hull-House several months before it opened observed that

It is not the design of these toilers to open doors to all comers. The locality is to be canvassed; acquaintances are to be formed; those persons, boys, girls, men and women are to be selected who give some hope to the educator, and of this class is the membership to be composed. Many forlorn homes will thus stand related by a son or a daughter, or by both, to this new and superior house.

Meeting people was not easy since residents of the neighborhood did not understand why these two upper class women would want to live in such a poor neighborhood. Many of the visitors to Hull-House in the first few weeks were children, who did not hold the same suspicions of Addams and Starr as did their older family members.

Addams recounts that “We had no definite theories to start with” – they listened and learned. The data show that they often had no clear idea about what to do and pursued much simpler “ends-in-view,” such as meeting a particular family or making sure a mother had access to laundry facilities. And these interactions were often learning experiences, leading to new ideas about what they might be able to try out – new ends-in-view.

For example, Addams understood full well from her initial relations with her new neighbors that one of the greatest obstacles facing children was hunger and poor nutrition. As a result, she initiated a program whereby mothers with day jobs could purchase meal tickets for their children to eat at Hull-House while they were at work. Addams regarded these meals as performing “the function of a truant officer in keeping them at school, for no school implies no dinner. The House has had the sympathetic and enthusiastic co-operation of the principal of the Polk Street public school.”

The initial focus on children did not mean that Addams and the other residents ignored the needs of the adults in the neighborhood. On the contrary, their connection with children apparently provided Addams and Starr with access to adults since they soon began to visit neighborhood homes during the evenings after it had become obvious that daytime visits were disruptive for women who were either in the midst of housework or

29 Jackson 2001, p. 11.
31 Addams 1894, p. 112.
32 Ibid., p. 107.
away at work. They also tried to bring along a male volunteer because they found that this set the neighborhood men at ease.  

It is likely that they discovered various household needs as well during such visits, for Hull-House began to share its laundry facilities with the women who needed them. However, providing women in the neighborhood with adequate childcare or laundry facilities was not an endpoint or outcome to be measured insofar as it was a redefined situation that brought to light new perplexities in terms of women’s needs. Interactions between Addams and the other residents and neighbors led to new situations, such as the provisioning of skills training classes or the establishing of cooperative living.

Addams and Starr may also have creatively determined that members of the neighborhood needed a social space for talking through their problems and making sense of the community in which they lived. They established a weekly Social Science Club, attended mostly by men, which provided a forum in which one could take up a political or social issue of the day. As Brown observes, “This was to be a place where labor activists, businessmen, civic leaders, and working people could openly debate the merits of capitalism, socialism, the single tax, the tariff, [or] the still lively matter of the Haymarket riot.” There were, in addition, college extension classes for adults during the evenings and, like many of the programs at Hull-House,

[T]he college extension courses grew... from an informal origin. The first class met as guests of the residents. As the classes became larger and more numerous and the object of the newcomers more definitely that of acquisition of some special knowledge the informality of the social relation was necessarily less.

We should note that the need for more education, as well as a program to meet that need, emerged creatively out of the relations between Hull-House residents and their neighbors. The demand for knowledge on the part of neighborhood residents may also have contributed to the idea for a summer program for women at Rockford College, Illinois, Addams’ alma mater, beginning in 1891. This program, held over a period of four weeks, offered a liberal arts curriculum to working-class women who took exten-
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37 Addams 1894, p. 99.
sion classes at Hull-House. Over ninety women attended during the first two weeks, supported by funds raised from Rockford residents.  

But creativity does not always lead to positive results — there were creative failures at Hull-House, too. For example, Hull-House closed its doors for the summer in 1890 so that Starr and Addams could visit friends and family and spend the hot months in cooler temperatures, but there was no such luck for the other residents of the neighborhood. Hull-House resembled in this respect the Chicago Relief and Aid Society, which also routinely shut down its operations during the summer months. Another example was the “Diet Kitchen,” also known as the “New England Kitchen,” which was based on the latest East Coast scientific thinking concerning proper diet. It was intended to provide meals for the sick and others in need of good nutrition, but was not successful. As Addams observes,  

We did not reckon, however, with the wide diversity in nationality and inherited tastes, and while we sold a certain amount of the carefully prepared soups and stews in the neighboring factories — a sale which has steadily increased throughout the years — and were also patronized by a few households, perhaps the neighborhood estimate was best summed up by the woman who frankly confessed, that the food was certainly nutritious, but that she didn’t like to eat what was nutritious, that she liked to eat “what she’d ruther.”

In short, nobody liked the food. As a result, the Diet Kitchen was converted with borrowed money into a profitable cafe that provided coffee and hot lunches to neighborhood residents.  

If the dietetics were appreciated but slowly, the social value of the coffee-house and the gymnasium, which were in the same building, were quickly demonstrated. At that time the saloon halls were the only places in the neighborhood where the immigrant could hold his social gatherings.  

How should we describe what had happened? Addams and the other residents had tried to implement a system that they believed would be good for the neighborhood and which was based on current thinking in the field of nutritional science. But they learned from their failure and the perplexity it engendered, which led to the creation of a different venture, the coffee house. This was a success both in terms of providing healthy
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and affordable meals, and in offering a place for socializing, thus promoting community growth. Addams herself explains how such a process of relational experimentalism worked:

All the details were left for the demands of the neighborhood to determine, and each department has grown from a discovery made through natural and reciprocal social relations.\footnote{Addams 1894, p. 99.}

The Diet Kitchen was thus an end-in-view that became a means to another end-in-view, the coffee shop, which was itself a means to a number of other ends-in-view, and so on.

Creativity and experimentation are not teleological – as social processes they frequently lead to unanticipated results. Addams and Starr broke from their existing social reality and placed themselves in new situations that they could not address with their existing habits and vocabularies. Rather than follow strict rules of conduct, they instead developed new habits for helping people not only through a particular method for investigating social problems, but also by embedding themselves in a set of social relations that enabled them to learn from, respond to, and grow with their neighbors. That is to say that Hull-House as an institution was not simply a means Jane Addams deployed in pursuit of the goal of helping others. It was also an emerging social entity that was in a constant state of change, one driven by the fact that its founder and residents continually revised and reconstructed ends-in-view in light of the perplexities that they faced as they tried to help people.

Pragmatist theory, some of it developed by Addams herself, served to provide a certain coherence to the early days of Hull-House. This helps us see how Hull-House residents felt their way through a process of creativity and experimentation based on perplexity, thereby gained a new understanding, and brought that understanding to bear upon new perplexities. This was an ongoing process with no end other than helping others and fostering the growth of the community. In times of perplexity, Addams and her followers rejected existing conventions in the field of social provision and chose to play the game by a different set of rules.

Instead of being constrained by the market-oriented, economistic vocabulary of the time in their efforts to help people in their Chicago neighborhood, the women of Hull-House constructed new conventions through experimentation. They developed new habits, and they did not always know where they were going with their actions. Ends-in-view, like way stations on a journey to an undetermined destination, often emerged out
of relations between Hull-House residents and their neighbors. But the thread that brought together these various ends-in-view – and the accompanying means – was the spirit of creatively helping others purely for its own sake.

Creative Helping Today

At this point the reader might remark “This is a good story, but what can we do with it today?” Pragmatism asks us to take what has been a primarily theoretical and historical enterprise and apply its lessons to present day concerns regarding social provision. One of the essential elements of pragmatist philosophy is the notion of the “cash value” of action. Put in terms of a question, one might ask, following William James, “What’s the difference that makes a difference?” In a similar vein, Robert Lynd asks “knowledge for what?” in respect to the social sciences. Within the context of our current discussion, pragmatism demands that we indicate what contribution, if any, our knowledge makes beyond the theoretical and empirical concerns of those dwelling in ivory towers. At the level of ideas, I hope that this article will contribute to the pragmatist revival now going on in the social sciences through its emphasis on the practical dimensions of pragmatism, which are not yet a significant component of that revival. Perhaps a deeper understanding of the creative dimensions of helping at Hull-House might encourage those who support the pragmatist revival to think not only in terms of studying and composing theoretical and philosophical texts, but also in terms of actual experience and action. The latter is precisely what the classical pragmatists, Addams included, thought was essential to democracy and social ethics.

Hull-House in September of 1889 was a set of half-formed ideas in the heads of two women living in a strange and unfamiliar neighborhood – it was clearly not an organization created by fiat based upon a fully-formed idea. Hull-House gradually emerged as the product of the relations between its residents and their neighbors in the Nineteenth Ward of Chicago. It would be difficult to identify, let alone understand, the logic of practice at Hull-House without paying careful attention to the pragmatist dimensions of the dynamic that obtained between those living at the settlement house and the community of which they were a part.

But I would also argue that Addams’ creative helping at Hull-House has the potential to inform creative practices of helping today. Addams observed that “Each generation has its own test.” Given the challenges

44 Lynd 1967.
45 Addams 2002, p. 5.
arising from the current state of the global economy, perhaps our test is to
discover how we can better and more creatively help each other. Ideas and
talk are not enough, however – it is also necessary, in a pragmatist spirit, to
act. Experience and action are precisely what the classical pragmatists, in-
cluding Addams, considered to be essential to democracy and social ethics.
Addams placed herself in the thick of things, and through experimenta-
tion and action she made her neighborhood a better place.

We should keep in mind Addams' view that

> The identification with the common lot which is the essential idea of De-
mocracy becomes the source and expression of social ethics. It is as though
we thirsted to drink at the great wells of human experience, because we
knew that a daintier or less potent draught would not carry us to the end of
the journey, going forward as we must in the heat and jostle of the crowd.⁴⁶

For the pragmatist thinker, there is no divide between social science and
ethics – there is no chasm between facts and values. One cannot be a
Pragmatist – in the same way one would call oneself a Bourdieuan or a
Marxist – without pursuing community growth and social ethics. Prag-
matists maintain that we have the ability to assess the value of actions –
rather than simply examine them clinically – and determine which ones
we should value the most. It is not enough to simply observe that Addams
and the other residents at Hull-House did things differently from other ac-
tors in the field. Although this point is of a certain interest, the important
question is “what is the difference that makes a difference?”

If one takes up the question of how early Hull-House practices might
inform the way we help people today, a normative agenda emerges, name-
ly, that we should recover creative practice. From this perspective, the
present discussion should be considered an essay in recovery, with the end-
in-view of doing a better job of helping people.

*University of Toronto*

*Department of Sociology*

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 9.
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Urban Imagery, Community and the Future of New Orleans

Mark Hutter

Introduction

Jane Addams’ eloquent conceptualization that “the dependence of classes on each other is reciprocal” served as the intellectual foundation for the Hull-House settlement house. She also regarded this class interdependency as essential for fostering the social function of democracy, and her focus in this regard was on the establishment of settlement houses to help alleviate the sufferings of immigrants and change their living and working environments. Addams was a pivotal figure in such late nineteenth and early twentieth century movements as tenement house reform, workmen’s compensation, the abolition of child labor, and the protection of women and children in industry.

The rapid growth of industrial cities in the United States, which had been driven by mass immigration, led many to the erroneous conclusion that the pervasive poverty in those cities was in fact an immigrant phenomenon. This, in turn, spurred the development of a large number of private and public welfare agencies whose programs were targeted at changing immigrant families themselves, especially the children, as they sought to alleviate the problems of the sick, the poor, the delinquent, and the criminal. The concern of these agencies was to “Americanize” poorly adjusted foreign families into what was regarded as the great American melting pot, in which the cultural variations characteristic of immigrant groups would be altered to conform to the “standard” American way of life.

The settlement house, a type of private social welfare agency, was an example of how some of these practices became articulated in the effort to provide immigrant newcomers with the means to survive in a modern industrial city. Located in the heart of immigrant communities, it sought to help the immigrant families cope with poverty and improve their living standards. Settlement house workers endeavored to teach English, Amer-

---

1 Addams 2002.
ican social customs, and – when necessary – the rudiments of household management, health care, and sanitation. They also encouraged family members to become involved in work and household roles that often conformed to their own middle-class standards of family morality. When successful, as in the case of Jane Addams at Chicago’s Hull-House, they integrated their work without undermining the immigrants’ native culture. Unfortunately, however, settlement house workers much too frequently considered their primary task to be the eradication of “non-American” cultural points of view and family traditions regarding marital roles and parent-child relationships.

In contrast, Addams and her co-workers were of the firm belief that those in positions to help the poor should also benefit from what the poor had to offer them. Addams felt that when people thus worked together for their mutual benefit, the nation as well would benefit, which would help build social democracy.

Many shared Addams belief that the integration of white ethnic immigrants could be accomplished without undermining native cultures. Nevertheless, there were others, including members of the Chicago School of Sociology, who downplayed the significance of the forced segregation of the African-Americans who lived in inner-city ghettos. This was evident from the difficulties that arose in respect to their urban ecological models, notably Burgess’ concentric zone hypothesis. For example, although the continued movement of white ethnic minority populations from inner-city to outer-city areas, particularly after World War II, was in accordance with Burgess’ views, the increased segregation of poor African-Americans in inner city ghettos could not be so readily explained through the use of such models. The scholars who persisted in relying upon them clearly underestimated the power and resiliency of racism and economic discrimination, which not only prevented African-American acculturation and integration throughout the twentieth century, but continues into the present as well.

Addams believed that African-Americans could become fully integrated into the larger American culture and make significant cultural contributions. She observed, however, that “race antagonism” as practiced by the “so-called ‘superior races’” had deprived the majority culture of potential African-Americans contributions, citing as examples their eloquence and rhythm as well as their development of American folksong.2

The history of African-Americans in New Orleans is a case in point. Spatially isolated and relegated to the lower-rungs of that city’s economy, they nevertheless developed a cultural way of life that was so vibrant

and exciting that it was co-opted by the dominant groups, who made it a major driving force in New Orleans’ symbolic economy, which was based on entertainment, music, and food. When Hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans in 2005, it devastated the communities in which African-Americans lived. It is ironic that as the city has sought to rebuild – both economically and culturally – it has virtually ignored the African-Americans who have been so instrumental in creating its unique culture and economy. And doing so may ultimately result in the cultural destruction of the city and its symbolic economy.

People’s impressions of their urban environment change after a major catastrophe, and this has an impact upon their image of urban spaces. For example, few places are desirable to tourists after such a disaster as Hurricane Katrina, but an economy anchored by tourism must immediately remake itself as a tourist destination. This paper will utilize the theoretical approach of the Chicago School, especially the political economic perspectives it provides, in an examination of the commodification and repackaging of the New Orleans urban landscape after it had become marked by tragedy and ecological devastation. Of particular concern is how the resultant new urban imagery affects the people who have suffered the most because of the disaster. What makes their tragedy even more poignant is that they are the very people who helped create and establish the culture and imagery of New Orleans, thereby making it a viable tourist destination.

Urban Imagery and the Chicago School

People’s impressions of a building, street, neighborhood, and indeed an entire city involve more than simply a visual awareness of their surroundings. Impressions, perceptions, experiences, and memories are strongly influenced by a host of psychological and sociological factors. An individual confronts his or her environment through social constructions based upon mental pictures of that environment, and one’s mental map, or image, often overlaps and complements that of another. This is not surprising insofar as a person’s mental map is a product of social interaction, which is to say that the ways in which we perceive space and the environment are socially learned and based upon experience.

The image of a given city is a result of how people perceive that city, and urban imagery has consequences for how city life is shaped. Urban images have a symbolic function, providing strong associations with a place that facilitate interactions between people who share a common environment, while shared images of places and communities promote the development
of strong bonds between people who reside in that setting. The urban social geographer Kevin Lynch has pointed out in this regard that

The landscape plays a social role as well. The named environment, familiar to all, furnishes material for common memories and symbols which bind the group together and allow them to communicate with one another. The landscape serves as a vast mnemonic system for the retention of group history and ideals.\(^3\)

Such a vast collection of memories serves as the foundation for the lived experience that is common to many of the urban dwellers in the city of New Orleans.

Lynch’s perspective echoes that put forward by the Chicago School many years ago. Robert Park, for example, in the opening remarks of his important essay “The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment,” states a basic premise of symbolic interactionist thought concerning the nature of urban imagery and urban identification. He observes that

The city is... a state of mind, a body of customs and traditions, and of the organized attitudes and sentiments that inhere in these customs and are transmitted with the tradition. The city is not, in other words, merely a physical mechanism and an artificial construction. It is involved in the vital processes of the people who compose it.\(^4\)

Park’s statement emphasizes the symbolic and psychological adjustments to the social organization of urban life that are influenced by shared sentiments and values. His work, furthermore, views the city as a product of the participation and communication of its inhabitants, not solely as a physical artifact or a collection of people. In addition, Park’s intellectual interests center on the urban conditions that result in the breakdown of human interaction, the decline of primary group associations, the breakdown of the community, and social disorganization.

R. Richard Wohl and Anselm L. Strauss build upon the ideas of the Chicago School as they extend the analysis of urban imagery.\(^5\) Strauss’ particular concern in his *Images of American Cities* is the examination of American imagery in light of the “spatial and temporal aspects of that imagery” and the “meaning” that a city has for its inhabitants.\(^6\) By “urban imagery”

---

\(^3\) Lynch 1960, p. 126.

\(^4\) Park 1967.

\(^5\) Wohl and Strauss 1958.

Strauss means the symbolization of the city. He and Wohl pick up on the theme articulated by Park that the city is “a state of mind” as they discuss the nature of urban imagery and urban identification, addressing how specific objects of a given city can become symbolically representative of the city as a whole. Moreover, the New York skyline, San Francisco’s Golden Gate Bridge, or the French Quarter of New Orleans can thus not only be symbols that identify the given city, they also serve as sources of personal identification for those who live there. Wohl and Strauss point out how the spatial complexity and social diversity of a city often become integrated through the use of “sentimental” history in selected landscapes, such as the Water Tower in Chicago or Telegraph Hill in San Francisco. They then use this observation as they argue that an invariable characteristic of city life is that people must employ certain stylized and symbolic objects in order to “see” the city.

The city, then, sets problems of meaning. The streets, the people the buildings, the changing scenes do not come already labeled. They require explanation and interpretation.7

Strauss comments that people know best (“see”) those parts of a city in which they are intimately involved – where they go to school, shop, work, and meet friends. In Strauss’ words,

[T]he various kinds of urban perspectives held by the residents of a city are constructed from spatial representations resulting from membership in particular social worlds.8

For Strauss, the images a person has of the city are based on relationships. He also maintains that images can be regarded as a spatial consequence of the different types of social relationships that people have with each other in different places. He goes on the argue that the physical reality of cities is interpreted through the images that people have of them – the feelings that people have concerning cities have a substantial impact on how they perceive and act towards them.

Strauss also locates such images within an historical context, stating that they are a result of how the rapid transformation of rural America into an urban society has been understood. Of essential interest to Strauss was how this social change was observed and felt by its citizens – if we grasp how people “saw” the city, then we gain a better understanding of how they experienced it.

7 Wohl and Strauss 1958, p. 527.
What Americans see and have seen in their towns, and what they say and have said about them, can tell us a great deal about how they lived in them, how they have felt about them, how they have managed to cope with the problems raised by the conditions of life there.\footnote{Strauss 1961, viii.}

However, neither Lynch, Wohl, nor Strauss acknowledge that an image of the city is not based solely on one’s perceptual readings of the urban landscape, but is also influenced by underlying political, economic, and social factors. An examination of Hurricane Katrina’s impact on the City of New Orleans demonstrates the importance of these factors both on that city’s imagery, and on its poorest citizens, who in fact were those chiefly responsible for the creation of that imagery. They also are those who have suffered the most as that city has tried to revitalize that imagery without them.

**Before Hurricane Katrina:**
**Demographics, Urban Imagery, and Culture**

In New Orleans, underprivileged people live in the lower elevations near the swamps, and they always have; the rich, who live by the river, occupy the highest ground. There are thus two New Orleans – one for the tourists and the affluent, the other for the poor. One New Orleans is the French Quarter and Bourbon Street – the home of the Mardi Gras, fine food and drink, jazz and zydeco, Brennan’s, the Café du Monde, late night/early morning beignets and chicory coffee, po’ boys and crawfish, the stately mansions of the Garden District, Audubon Park, Jackson Square, buggy rides and steamboat river cruises, the aquarium, and professional football at the Superdome. The other New Orleans – the invisible New Orleans – is for the poor. This other New Orleans is composed primarily of African-American residents, who account for nearly three-quarters of the total population and reside in cheap, below-sea-level housing. Before Hurricane Katrina, more than a quarter of the population (28 percent) in New Orleans lived in poverty, and nearly all (84 percent) of that poverty-stricken population was black.

Hurricane Katrina, one of the most powerful storms in the history of the United States, hit the Gulf of Mexico coastline at the end of August 2005. Examination of census records of the disaster areas in the three states of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama revealed that nearly 25 percent of those living in the hardest-hit areas were below the poverty line, about...
double the national average.\textsuperscript{10} Significantly, about 60 percent of the people in the three dozen neighborhoods hardest hit by the storm were members of racial minorities, with the low-lying areas of New Orleans, including the Lower 9th Ward and St Bernard’s Parish, experiencing the brunt of the hurricane and its after-effects. The levee system that supposedly protected these areas collapsed, and well more than six meters of floodwater covered many of the area’s small houses (“shotgun” bungalows) and other buildings, resulting in the city’s first mandatory evacuation. The residents affected by these events were poor and working class African-Americans.

John Logan, a sociologist at Brown University, provided the first in-depth demographic analysis of the impact of Hurricane Katrina. His study utilized a comparison of maps from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which documented detailed flood and wind damage, with data from the 2000 United States census in order to determine which people and areas were most affected.\textsuperscript{11} Logan’s study revealed not only that about 650,000 people, more than a third of the region’s population, lived in areas that sustained moderate to catastrophic damage, but that there was also a dramatic demographic disparity between those who lived in undamaged areas and the people hardest hit. While suffering caused by the storm obviously cut across racial and class lines, “the odds of living in a damaged area were clearly much greater for blacks, renters, and poor people. In these respects the most vulnerable residents turned out also to be at greatest risk.”\textsuperscript{12} Logan found that African-Americans comprised nearly half of the population (48.5 percent) in the areas damaged, but less than a third (30.9 percent) elsewhere. Similar figures applied to those living in rental properties.

Consequently, Logan maintained that decisions not to rebuild in heavily flooded areas would disproportionately affect African-American residents. He also believed that New Orleans risks losing as much as 80 percent of its African-American population, who might not return because their neighborhoods will not be rebuilt, because they could not afford the costs of relocation, or because they may have put down roots elsewhere after having been evacuated from their homes.

Little has been done in the years since Hurricane Katrina to alleviate the problems of the devastated low-lying areas and of the people who lived there. The Lower Ninth Ward was virtually leveled except for a few houses that survived the devastation, and only a small number of new ones have

\textsuperscript{10} These issues are discussed in Associated Press articles during the last quarter of 2005.
\textsuperscript{11} Logan 2006.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 7
been built, primarily through Brad Pitts’ *Make It Right* program. Most of the former residents remain scattered elsewhere.

## The Lower Ninth Ward and Adjacent Areas after Hurricane Katrina

Soon after the devastation wrought by Hurricane Katrina, a local resident who had been displaced pleaded her desire to return home: “It’s a great community. We want it back.”¹³ The Lower Ninth Ward and adjacent areas had been inhabited predominantly by African-Americans, who had become ever more impoverished as they experienced the ongoing neglect of municipal services in their neighborhoods, particularly after the disappearance of jobs in post-industrial New Orleans. As crime and poverty became more pervasive, residents were increasingly forced to turn to social network resources and their cultural traditions in efforts to manage their deteriorating social circumstances. Their economic and political marginality fostered the continued development of an already close-knit community that was physically anchored by the high percentage of local home ownership.

A concern repeatedly voiced since Hurricane Katrina is whether resources would become available to rebuild the community in the Lower Ninth Ward. Four months after the destruction caused by the storm, New Orleans mayor C. Ray Nagin urged that New Orleans remain a “chocolate city,” stating that “this city will be a majority African-American city; it’s the way God wants it to be.”¹⁴ Mayor Nagin’s remarks, for which he was soon forced to apologize, were meant to urge African-Americans to return to New Orleans as well as allay fears that they would not.

Logan, addressing Mayor Nagin’s comments, was quoted in *The New York Times* as saying that “Certainly Mayor Nagin’s comments reflected a concern on the ground about the future of the city. My report shows that there is a basis for that concern.” He concluded that

The analysis in this report suggests that if the future city were limited to the population previously living in zones undamaged by Katrina it would risk losing about 50 percent of its white residents but more than 80% of its black population. This is why the continuing question about the hurricane is this: whose city will be rebuilt?¹⁵

---

¹³ As quoted in Landphair 2007.
¹⁴ Dao 2006.
¹⁵ Logan 2006, p. 16.
Logan’s pessimism seems well founded given the fact that few government resources have been put into rebuilding the devastated low-lying areas. In April 2006 the same Mayor Nagin announced a recovery plan for the city that laid much of the responsibility for reconstructing neighborhoods on the residents themselves. Insofar as this recovery plan essentially ignored the fact that many residents do not have the financial resources needed for this purpose, their efforts to rebuild their former neighborhoods and reestablish social networks still face overwhelming obstacles. Despite their wish to do so, they consequently cannot return home.

Personal accounts of the experiences of dislocated residents document in a most vivid manner how their current circumstances shape their images and memories of their lost communities. This holds true both for those who did return, and for those who did not and are now in the process of establishing new social networks in their new communities.

A powerful film, Still Waiting: Life after Katrina, strikingly illustrates how the processes of collective memory of family and of a community destroyed by Hurricane Katrina are shaped by post-Katrina government policies that have an impact on the rebuilding of homes and neighborhoods. The film chronicles the experiences of a multi-generational family from St. Bernard’s Parish who were forced, along with more than 60,000 other residents, to evacuate – they were displaced from their homes and not permitted to return for many months afterward. The film deals with how their memories have been shaped by their reinterpretations of the past and by their attempts to restore hope and rebuild their homes and communities in light of failed government actions – and governmental non-actions as well.

Kevin Fox Gotham pointed out in his review of Still Waiting that the women interviewed all expressed strong positive memories of their devastated community. Their memories were not of the physical neighborhood and of the houses where they had lived, but rather of their community identity and their social relationships. St. Bernard’s Parish was thus not simply a physical space for them, but rather a place where generations of families were linked through the historical development of intertwined social networks and friendships. Heather Nicholson observed in her review of the film that “It is home to familiar sights, sounds, and smells.” Memories of the role of the church, the shared Creole heritage, and participation in community events such as musical gatherings are recalled with great fondness. Gatherings of displaced residents over “hot pots of seafood gumbo and boiled crabs” serve to reinforce their shared collective memories and provide new bases of social solidarity.

The narratives reveal a strong attachment to place and home, and these people’s sense of “displacement” involves the “loss of a shared culture and cherished heritage.” Gotham concluded that “In *Still Waiting* we see the commitment to home as a powerful source of meaning and resilience for the family members, creating and reaffirming a sense of community, identity, and solidarity in the face of the chaos of disaster and recovery.” Such shared memories helped generate the desire to return and rebuild their communities. “The longing to return home speaks to their desire to return to their culture, rightful heritage, and of course to go ‘back to the way things were.’”

Both reviewers pointed out that, for some residents who have moved back, the painful realization that government policies have failed may affect their hope about whether or not their community can ever be rebuilt and viable networks of social relationships ever be reestablished. They may either hope that others return, too, so that all can work together to rebuild the community, or simply decide to seek a new life elsewhere. For others, the thought of returning to an area that was devastated, with homes, churches, schools, and businesses lost and core family structures dispersed, only brings feelings of regret and despair.

The film concludes with a pessimistic view of the future which follows upon the realization that the government may not fulfill promises to rebuild communities and provide vital economic support. The initial feeling of elation upon returning home to rebuild soon turned to bitter resentment and frustration as promises went unmet. African-American residents felt little solace in living in mobile homes in the face of racist employment practices and the absence of jobs. They had returned home with the will, spirit, and commitment to work towards bettering their lives and their community only to become dejected by the government’s failure to adequately respond to their needs.

---

17 Gotham 2009, p. 65.
18 Ibid., p. 66.
Disaster tourism, Politics and the Reshaping of New Orleans

In an attempt to redevelop New Orleans’ urban image and restore the city’s economic vitality, the “re-branding” of the city’s tourist economy has ironically incorporated the disaster landscape into its imagery. At the same time, systematic government inaction is preventing, for all practical purposes, those people who had been instrumental in developing the imagery of New Orleans to return home. Emotionally charged places that have collective memories of death and destruction, such as the Lower Ninth Ward, have instead been assembled into a package sold as a complete Disney-style tour experience of the city. The resulting reconfigured and re-branded tourist landscape supposedly assists both residents and tourists to mentally organize impressions, joining old customs with new images of the city in order to create a new symbolic economy. New Orleans is thus now sold as a “come back city” – rich in culture and heritage – a city on the rebound.

It is evident that those in political power control this new urban imagery of the city and the role it plays in the rebuilding of New Orleans. The physical space of New Orleans that had been dominated by its unique culture is now being redefined in terms of a tourist “place” by those in positions of power and economic control. Insofar as the tourist industry saw an opportunity in the immediate aftermath of Hurricane Katrina to benefit from the devastated landscape by incorporating it into “disaster tours,” tourist buses have now become an ubiquitous presence in such neighborhoods as the Lower Ninth Ward and adjacent areas. These tours function as a

means to experience the shock and awe in a voyeuristic reality-style manner through a packed tour bus – complete with cameras flashing and souvenirs for those seeking to get as close to the “real” experience as they can.

The buses continue to run even as the area has been largely cleared and only a few scattered new buildings have appeared, largely through private efforts. Although it is conceivable that tourism will become re-focused in the long term on the traditional sites of the French Quarter, the Garden District, Audubon Park, and so forth, disaster tourism constitutes evidence of the importance of the symbolic economy as defined by those in power for the future of New Orleans.

---

22 Hutter and Miller 2009.
Many cities have used tourism as a strategy for urban redevelopment and revitalization, forcing local governments and the tourist industry to forge close institutional and fiscal ties in order to “sell” the city. Kevin Fox Gotham at Tulane University, a leading scholar on the history of New Orleans, including its current situation, observed prior to Hurricane Katrina that such alliances also held true for New Orleans – government and business interests marketed its environment by using imagery and themes, usually positively, to influence the economy by capitalizing on its cultural aspects.\textsuperscript{24} After Katrina, however, the loss of the culture that had been indicative of New Orleans has become one of the primary concerns of the city’s residents. The traditional culture of the city is significant to the survivors because it shaped a sense of place and attachment to place. But with the new emphasis on disaster tourism and on the outside workers that have come to come to the city for this reason, how significant will the renewal of New Orleans culture be to the traditional residents? Although there is no doubt that the surviving material components and festive aspects of New Orleans’ culture will be significant to the workers who will flock to the city for employment opportunities in the tourist industry, the city’s economic revival as now planned resides upon the commodification of the “traditional New Orleans experience” – complete with jazz, food, and fun – as opposed to its cultural value per se.

Gotham maintains that the “concept of commodification refers to the dominance of commodity exchange-value over use-value and implies the development of a consumer society where market relations subsume and dominate social life.”\textsuperscript{25} Hutter and Miller proceed from this perspective as they argue that selling the city’s culture, sense of place, local customs, rituals, festivals, and ethnic arts as tourist attractions to be performed on cue for the sake of tourist entertainment devalues them in the eyes of traditional practitioners.\textsuperscript{26} Traditional events become trivialized in this manner and give way to more financially motivated activities that can be packaged and sold as “culture on demand.” Local concerns about the necessity of establishing a dominant tourist sector are in fact undercut by a more commodified tourist industry centered on activities that are less culturally significant than those rooted in and connected with the landscape.

In the pursuit of economic success, the city and private businesses are attempting to exploit the city’s image, but this may well have a detrimental effect on the city’s culture in the long-term. Because culture will serve as

\textsuperscript{24} Gotham 2002.

\textsuperscript{25} Gotham 2002, p. 1737.

\textsuperscript{26} Hutter and Miller 2009. See also Gotham 2002, 2007.
an economic stimulus – and possibly become the most relied upon sector in the region – business and city planners face the threat of what Gotham refers to as Disneyfication.

The transformation of public spaces into privatized “consumption” spaces and the latest attempts by tourism entrepreneurs and other economic elites to provide a package of shopping, dining, and entertainment within a themed and controlled environment – (is) a development that scholars have called the “Disneyfication” of urban space.27

Gotham adds that local traditions, famous buildings and landmarks, and other heritage sights and events become “hyper-real” with the occurrence of such Disneyfication, causing people to lose the ability to distinguish between the “real” and the “illusion,”28 or between original culture and marketing-manufactured culture.

Harvey and Holcomb both argue that, with the expansion of the tourist industry into a dominant sector, place promotion no longer concerns itself with informing or promoting in the ordinary sense.29 In the case of New Orleans, this means no longer selling the original cultural characteristics of New Orleans because the emphasis has instead been placed upon manipulating desires and tastes through imagery that may have little to do with the product supposedly being sold (New Orleans culture).30 In essence, the tourist industry has ceased “selling” the authentic or “true” culture of New Orleans – city leaders are instead manufacturing a New New Orleans by adapting, reshaping, and manipulating images to remake a sense of place for visitors from afar that is far from the truth of what New Orleans was.

Conclusion

As New Orleans’ culture functions within this environment of economic advantage and power, both it and the city’s demographics are subject to change under the influence of the market forces of tourism. Moreover, as Gotham has noted, a shift towards tourist-dominated economics in an urban setting has historically coincided with population decline, white flight to the suburbs, racial segregation, inner-city poverty, and a host of other social problems, including crime, fiscal austerity, poor schools, and decaying infrastructure, all of which were in fact observable in New Orleans

28 Gotham 2002.
prior to Katrina. Consequently, although the expansion of the service sector may aid the economic redevelopment of New Orleans in the short-term, the cultural significance, sense of place, and attachment to place that so many residents held for New Orleans prior to the storm, particularly the poor who had inhabited the devastated low lying areas, will be lost in the long term. This loss will most likely be accompanied by the substitution of a social and cultural caricature for what had been the authentic New Orleans.

In summary, the political and economic power elite of New Orleans continue to pursue rebuilding the city after the destruction wrought by Hurricane Katrina. However, the rebranding of New Orleans now underway runs a strong risk of failure as it builds an “inauthentic” city that owes more to Disneyfication than to its vibrant cultural past and the citizens who created it – who have been forced to leave their communities and move elsewhere in the United States. New Orleans instead needs to find a way – in the spirit of Jane Addams’ ideals of political and social democracy – to benefit from people of all cultural and class backgrounds in the city on the basis of mutual respect. Not only will this help restore its economy, it will also restore the creative and cultural soul of the city. Unfortunately, Hurricane Katrina’s destruction of the African-American communities of the Lower Ninth Ward and Saint Bernard’s Parish, coupled with the failure to rebuild those communities, demonstrates the folly of what can happen when such ideals are ignored. Because of the failure to rebuild these communities and the subsequent banishing of those who had helped create the city, New Orleans is in jeopardy of bringing about its own destruction in a more devastating way than a hurricane could ever do.
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Jane Addams and the Birth of Microsociology as a Science and a Social Enterprise

Vessela Misheva

Introduction

There does not yet seem to be a widely accepted opinion concerning who Jane Addams really was and to which domain her professional interests and contributions belonged. It is evident, however, that there has been a consistent tendency to interpret her intellectual endeavors, agency, and life in general in respect to identities that are unsupported by her own statements. Addams lives on today in the popular mind above all as a woman who “devoted her life to helping the poor,” “promoting world peace,” and serving “needy immigrants in Chicago,” where she founded one of the first settlement houses in North America.1 But devoting one’s life to serving some noble human cause is not by itself a scholarly or sociological merit. Her published works are in fact often regarded as no more than the autobiographical records and notes of a public intellectual that have some value as an historical account concerning how educated middle-class women, who were eager to begin careers at a time when they still had no right to vote and no legitimate place in the social realm outside the home, succeeded in entering public life and making themselves “useful.” Nevertheless, a number of Addams’s written statements raise doubts as to whether the existing popular interpretations of her life’s work, along with the unique character of her Hull-House project that makes it distinct from other settlements, have been adequately and correctly understood.2

Addams referred to herself as a sociologist, wrote for sociological audiences, and actively participated in the efforts of the scholarly community at the end of the nineteenth century to institutionalize sociology in the United States as a science.3 Her sociological credentials include being a charter member of the American Sociological Society (1905), an invited speaker at various of its meetings, the first woman to publish a sociological article
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in the newly established *American Journal of Sociology*,\(^4\) as well as the first woman-sociologist to receive an honorary doctor’s degree from Yale University (1909). Moreover, we can learn from a most reliable biographical source that her experience and knowledge “were as specific as any sociologist in the country possessed,”\(^5\) and that at the time of her death “much of what she has written [was] ‘source material’ for research by students in the departments of sociology everywhere.”\(^6\) A good example is her *Democracy and Social Ethics*, which she herself conceived of “as a sort of textbook on sociology”\(^7\) and, as the rest of her twelve books, was concerned with most pressing social problems of the time. It is indeed surprising that although her published works later came to be regarded as highly reliable in respect to the penetrating observations they present, including the reflections of an “old-time progressive” and “pioneer social worker” with a “seasoned eye,” they were not acknowledged to be important sociological texts that contain both original sociological thought and true knowledge about social reality that was produced through the application of legitimate sociological methods.\(^8\)

Near the end of a century marked by the belief that sociology emerged and grew from the efforts of a small number of founding “fathers,” feminist sociologist Mary Jo Deegan drew the attention of the sociological community to the fact that Jane Addams from Hull-House made an important contribution to the classical foundation of the discipline. Deegan claimed in her celebrated book *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School* (1988) that Addams was a “leader,” “founder,” “social theorist of major proportions,” and a sociologist, and that her Hull-House was important for sociology as a “center for empirical analysis, study and debate,” but that these facts were overlooked in the history of the discipline as reconstructed by twentieth-century sociologists.\(^9\) This history, Deegan argued, was written with a gender-biased pen, resulting in women sociologists who helped establish sociology as a science being excluded from historical annals.
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“Coming In” and “Coming Out”

The questions that Deegan raised concerning the contributions of women sociologists and the need to engage seriously with their sociological work apparently found a much greater resonance in feminist studies, social work, public administration, and political science than in sociology itself. It is ironic, however, that some of these disciplinary analyses of Addams’ work have played a controversial role in further obscuring its essence. They often leave the impression that their efforts to recover Addams were comprised of a search for new perspectives from which to criticize her work for its alleged shortcomings, which in effect justified its neglect. The unintended outcome of this type of engagement with Addams’ thought is evident in how it has lent support to the popular view that while Addams was engaged in many trades, she was not really a master of any of them – which discouraged further exploration. The motivation to revisit her work seems to have had much deeper roots in some sense of solidarity and in a desire for political correctness, rather than in the conviction that a contemporary interpretation of Addams’ intellectual heritage could prove useful for the social sciences today. In addition, encouragement to find “inspiration in her writing and activism” is accompanied by warnings to always remain alert to the danger of appropriating her thinking, which some feminist interpretations of Addams’ intellectual heritage have described as a “minefield.”

The incentive to investigate her thought is thus reduced – at best – to giving recognition to her efforts or to taking advantage of the possible gains that might be obtained by learning from her scholarly mistakes, even though her day has passed once and for all. The tendency is to shift the emphasis from the need for new interpretations of her thought to the supposedly safer ground of her widely acknowledged activism. It has been suggested, for example, that Addams could be useful for “publicly engaged scholars” who “would do well to consult Addams as they work toward new political narratives” – but only on condition that they do not come to share her “heady optimism” or her vision, which remain equally unacceptable today, but instead somehow “grasp how to learn from the past without trying merely to recapture it.” It is also ironic that Deegan’s work continues to be misinterpreted as yet another attempt on the part of American sociological feminists “to assimilate feminist concerns into existing sociological theory (that is, functionalism, conflict theory, sociological psychoanalysis, symbolic interactionism, rational choice),” even though, as noted above,
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Deegan was explicitly concerned with Addams as “a theorist of major proportions” and a founder of sociology in her own right, not as a possible contributor to already established sociological projects.

Nevertheless, Addams’ name has recently entered introductory sociological textbooks, being mentioned among the “Fifty Key Sociologists” and “Formative Theorists,” together with other “forgotten” sociologists, as a member of the new and extended canon. In other instances she is counted among those educated women “who had been doing sociological research and theorizing in the nineteenth century” in Europe and North America, including members of social reform movements, the abolition and suffrage movements, and philanthropic and social policy groups, although they allegedly cannot be regarded as sociologists in the strict sense. The most obvious obstacle to granting women like Addams full membership in the sociological profession supposedly was their involvement with “community issues, social injustices, individual and group needs, and social trends,” which required not only “study” and “exposure,” but also “action.”

A recent textbook on classical sociological theory lists Addams among the “Other Voices in Sociological Theorizing” as it seeks to illuminate the margins of the discipline. A place is found for her in twenty-first century sociology under “nontraditional perspectives, theory and methodology,” alongside the “sociology of nonhuman animals and societies,” “critical sociology,” and “feminist theories,” as a type of “humanist sociology” that stands somewhat in opposition to what is regarded as “mainstream” sociology. Addams is spoken of in this regard as a leader among “activist sociologists,” but the main feature that marks her sociological perspective as “nontraditional” is its rejection of “the value-free scientific approach to understanding human behavior.”

One may thus remain with the impression that the sociology which was forgotten consists of the contributions of those sociologists who were once forgotten, but have now been invited to “come in” and be granted a legitimate, although unequal, status – on the margins of the discipline. At the same time, however, this is tantamount to an act of “coming out” on the part of sociology and announcing to the world what everyone already knew, namely, that sociology has never been committed to any single universal perspective or worldview, and that it has all along been a different “species” of science, having more than one legitimate scientific perspective.
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The question of whether or not sociology should be value neutral dates back to its classical age, particularly to Weber’s famous lecture “Science as a Vocation.” The claims put forward in this lecture, together with Weber’s key concepts, have been repeatedly revisited in recent decades in respect to both their historical limitations, and their current relevance to sociological thought and practice. One of the obvious reasons for this is the fact that Weber’s understanding of what sociology should be appears to be dramatically different from the views that dominated the classical age of sociology in North America. It was then the norm – not the exception – that sociologists should contribute to efforts to ameliorate the ills of society; play important roles in policy making; utilize scientific methods, the application of knowledge, and the collection of data to “reinforce their policy recommendations”; create sociologically relevant methodologies; and employ humanistic and ecological approaches to the study of society and social life.\textsuperscript{18}

If this type of sociology had endured and succeeded in establishing a sociological canon, chances are that value-free Weberian sociology would have been at the margins of the discipline today unless the existence of two different canons, with equally central positions, were recognized. It is then understandable why the positions of modern sociologists are so diverse. On the one hand, there are those who are convinced that reclaiming the ideas of the forgotten sociologists in general, and Addams in particular, is important for the “full recovery of the discipline” because it comprises an uncovering of its “historical roots in a sociology committed to social justice.”\textsuperscript{19} At the other extreme, however, such ideas are viewed as being of a low, scientifically embarrassing quality, and critics are glad that they are gone for good.

The idea that classical sociology in America represented an immature stage in the development of sociology, and that it did not survive because it was “unfit” as a science and was replaced by a sociology which, being more scientific and philosophically sound, succeeded in growing to maturity, continues to be popular even today. Nonetheless, this may well not be the only plausible interpretation. For example, it is possible to regard both the “pre-modern” and “modern” sociologies as equally legitimate alternatives, bound to opposite but complementary philosophies and sociological worldviews, that were produced under similar, but yet very different, social conditions. As such, they could not have emerged and become institutionalized in the same place and at the same time, and could not have been
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accommodated at the foundation of one and the same scientific institution. The relationship between them might then be described as being of such a nature that accepting the one necessarily means suppressing and marginalizing the other. That is to say that although the “forgotten sociology” might have been overpowered and marginalized, that does not render it less scientific than the version of sociology that came to be identified as “the mainstream.” It was in fact not dead even though it was suppressed, and it has continued to exist in somewhat obscure forms in various social science traditions. Stated otherwise, it has become a mature “marginal” sociology that has in fact been “inside” the whole while, which is why it creates the impression of entering without knocking. For example, Ellwood’s idea of sociology as a humanitarian science that is concerned with social ethics, committed to the diffusion of its results to the public, and works for the rational good appears to have been recently rediscovered as part and parcel of the current discussion about public sociology.\textsuperscript{20} The idea itself was not lost, although it would be difficult to imagine how it could be picked up again today if, as Stephen Turner claims, the historical conditions have changed in such a way that sociology’s public or receptive audience in the classical age was lost once and for all, without a replacement.\textsuperscript{21}

That the efforts of the social sciences and humanities have so far not produced any compelling results that could have reinforced the view that Addams indeed made an important contribution to sociology as a science does not necessarily mean that we may give up seeking to find new meaning in her work. On the contrary, this fact itself may indicate that the neglect of an important element of the classical foundation of sociology has hampered its development and affected its ability for self-reflection and perception. One sign of this may in fact be the so-called “loss of identity” or “identity crisis” that has frequently been a matter of concern in sociological self-reflections since at least the second half of the last century.\textsuperscript{22} It is also possible in this respect to discuss sociology as a science which, in order to become professionalized as a social science, acquired the “false-consciousness” of a “disinterested” social science with a single standpoint or observation position typical for the natural sciences.

The persistent question of sociology’s identity is also associated with the “marginality of the sociology of knowledge,” which, as some sociologists maintain, can readily be explained “in terms of the historical development of sociological theory” in the United States.\textsuperscript{23} As Berger notes, identity “is
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always identity within a specific, socially constructed world.”

This implies that if questions concerning sociology’s identity have been so puzzling and unsolvable, the problem most probably lies in what has been taken for granted – namely, that classical sociology in America was no more than a replica of classical European sociology. It thus allegedly emerged, was located in, and derived its “European” identity from virtually the same post-traditional world that had existed in Europe and was somehow reproduced in America. One may conclude in this regard that if today there is no specifically acknowledged “American” contribution to the emergence of sociology, it is because of the assumption that the “specific” social construction of modernity took place solely in Europe.

Why Should There Be Two Sociologies Instead of One?
The notion of “two sociologies” and the continuous reproduction of dichotomous thinking in sociology are nothing new. The question is not whether there is only one sociology, or whether there can instead be a number of different (national or indigenous) sociologies. This is above all an epistemological issue that pertains to the sociology of knowledge since the question comes down to whether a single observation position is sufficient for the production of true knowledge about the social world as a whole. There has never been any doubt that the idea of sociology was born in Europe and was associated with Comte’s work, including his coining the term sociology – this at times is taken to be sufficient for regarding him as the Father of Sociology. But although at least one part of his work – his positive philosophy – has been enormously influential in sociology, nothing of what Comte wrote was ever considered to be a sociological classic, and he consequently has not been admitted to the sociological canon. The question then becomes whether the idea of sociology, even if born from the mind of a scholarly genius, could in principle have been conceived and institutionalized as a modern science at the university with no intervention on the part of the non-academic world, and whether its growth and development into a recognized scientific discipline could have been a purely scientific affair.

The underdeveloped sociology of knowledge should perhaps be blamed for leaving unchallenged what may be termed a “Big Bang” theory of scientific development that traces the emergence of all the sciences to a single philosophical root. This theory obscures the nature of the social sciences by treating them as merely a new development of philosophical thought within the academic traditions that were harbored at European univer-
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sities. This perspective has persisted, even though maintaining this view requires one to ignore inconvenient historical facts that cannot be accurately explained by the theory that the emergence of sociology had a single source. For example, the fact that Marx, and even Simmel to a great extent, were sociologists outside academia has not yet been meaningfully interpreted, although this might have been of some importance for Parsons’s judgement that neither of them was worthy of inclusion in the sociological canon. However, sociology as the science not only of society as a non-living structure, but also of society as a social process and life, is not simply another, more modern offspring of philosophy alongside the nobler and older natural sciences. It is rather a modern science whose emergence, if all historical facts are taken into account, must be traced to social actors and scholarly movements outside academia – only later was it introduced into the university, where the idea of sociology grew and took shape as an academic discipline.

It is generally accepted that sociology emerged as a result of the efforts of “those caught up in the initial series of changes brought about by the ‘two great revolutions’ in Europe [the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution – V.M.] to understand the conditions of their emergence and the likely consequences.” The classical sociologists, in this instance, were those concerned not only with the study of society in the past, or with the future of sociology as a science, but above all with the description and analysis of the social changes and social problems that mark, on the one hand, modern industrialized societies and, on the other, the essence of these two revolutions, their emergence, driving forces, and technologies. It is necessary to add, however, that such knowledge cannot be acquired from a comfortable position in an armchair looking through the window of a university office.

Parsons, for reasons which are not fully clear and need to be investigated further, surprisingly ignored the classical age of sociology in America, claiming that it was imitative and barren, and he instead supplied sociology with a purely European sociological canon that focused on the relevant work of Durkheim and Weber, both of whom were employed as university professors and had academic careers. Consequently, no place was left in that canon for the “indigenous” American sociological thought that owed much more to Comte, Spencer, Darwin, Toynbee, Tarde, Smith, and even Simmel, than to Weber and Durkheim. It also took more philosophical inspiration from the works of such “indigenous” philosophers as Charles Sanders Peirce and William James than from the acknowledged European
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giants of philosophical thought, particularly Hegel and Kant. Nevertheless, Parsons promoted a history of sociology that began with Weber and Durkheim, about whom the early sociologists in America knew nothing. He judged their works to have been on a superior level that was inaccessible not only to such “essayistic” and non-scientific sociologists as Simmel, but also to Mead, Cooley, and W. I. Thomas – all of whom had university positions.

The creation story normally used in the induction of students into the discipline of sociology implies that insofar as sociology emerged in Europe, its classical foundation is also to be found there, which then justifies the borrowing of a classical sociological foundation from the old continent. There is a need, however, for a more serious exploration of how successful this transference in fact was and whether the Weber-Durkheim sociological tradition could ever grow roots in American soil. The fact that neither of Parsons' two most prominent students – Harold Garfinkel and Robert Merton – followed in his footsteps and continued his grand theorizing, together with his view that, in spite of its originality, symbolic interactionism was not on the same level as the enduring European sociological tradition, leads one to speculate that his canon did not succeed in providing the exemplars for all subsequent sociological work in America. The main pathos of Marx's sociology also remained quite alien to classical American sociological thought, and the two can hardly be regarded as committed to one and the same worldview. Although ideas and sociological masterpieces can obviously be carried from one continent to another, and can be translated from one language into another, they will nevertheless hardly give impetus to a new self-producing sociological interaction to the extent that they are born out of reflections upon a different social reality. They would thus fail to address the urgent needs and problems that were consequences of a specific social construction of modernization characteristic of America which, as such, could not be observed elsewhere in the world.

Arguably, it was no coincidence that the location where classical American sociology took form, including the most famous American settlement and the first university department of sociology, was Chicago. Addams regarded Chicago as "a great city," whose exceptionality resided upon, among other things, the very large immigrant population consisting of those who had sought to escape the dramatic social and economic changes consequent to the Industrial Revolution in Europe. Although moving from the countryside to a large town in Europe as countries industrialized might well have caused unprecedented changes in social conditions that shook the entire fabric of society, this can be compared neither with the social changes brought about by the Second Industrial Revolution in the
American continent, nor with the human drama of the European peasants and workers who immigrated to the new world in the second half of the nineteenth century. They left their homes, severed their bonds with relatives, friends, and communities, fled in large numbers to America’s “gilded shores,” and became the labor force of the American Industrial Revolution, building “the prosperity of this new urban-corporate world” while “huddling together in the urban slums and ghettos.”

The social problems connected with the living and working conditions of these immigrants, who came from more than fourteen nations in Addams’ neighborhood alone, with differing languages, cultures, religions, mentalities, and skills, cannot be subsumed under the typified problems of the working class in England as presented in the works of Engels and Marx.

These unique aspects of the composition of the labor force of the Second Industrial Revolution, as well as the “rationality” of the new technology, organization of work, and environment for technological change, are all factors that not only made a great impact upon life in the large American industrial city of Chicago, but also created specific new premises for the emergence of sociology in the United States during the classical period. What needs to be explored is the significance of the fact that industrialization in America was brought about by a Civil War, not a social revolution. One could say, for example, that sociology was born in America during a time of social conflict, not so much between two different classes, but between two different groups of citizens with conflicting interests. These consisted, on the one hand, of the business interests of “the captains of industry,” who in the last decades of the nineteenth century “continued to welcome and encourage immigration because they believed it kept wages down and retarded unionization,” and, on the other, the interests of “most old-stock Americans,” who were “frankly appalled at the growing evils of industrialization, immigration and urbanization” and longed for social change and reform.

But this latter group, who came to be associated with the social reform movement in America, were also of two types. One consisted of those so-called reformers who “developed a violent nativism and anti-Semitism,”
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while the other comprised those “following the lead of Jane Addams,” who had “discovered the slums” of Chicago and began working to alleviate the most important social ills there, including “prostitution, disease, crime, political bossism and grinding poverty.”\(^{31}\) This casts light on why social amelioration, and not revolution, became “the central core and thrust of the early Chicago School.”\(^{32}\) One cannot help but surmise that an important reason for why sociologists after 1920 interpreted this “devotion to society and its liberation” as “an embarrassing mistake” is associated with the paucity of historico-sociological analysis and self-reflection concerning the specific character of the social conditions that facilitated the institutionalization of sociology in America, that is, conditions that were not present in Europe at that time.

A good understanding of the differences in the conditions that brought sociology into being in Europe and America can be acquired from Small and Vincent’s sociology textbook. The two Chicago sociologists acknowledged that sociology was indebted for its emergence to European influences and to contributions from political economy, the philosophy of history, and even socialism. However, they ranked “the theory and practice of modern charity” and the “organized philanthropy” as “prime” factors in the development of the discipline that “directly and indirectly promoted scientific Sociology.”\(^{33}\) The modernization and industrialization of Europe that gave impetus to sociology did not include any such generic relation between the development of science and extra-scientific social forces and social movements with humanistic concerns. It is also evident that the function which classical sociology in America ascribed to itself – finding answers to such questions as How is it possible to develop “an effective policy of rational sociability which shall include the largest possible number of men in the fellowship of reciprocally helpful cooperation”?\(^{34}\) – can hardly be ascribed with their full weight to classical sociology in Europe. In light of the substantially distinct self-descriptions of classical sociology on the European and American continents, one can argue that they pertain to two incompatible types of sociology with separate emphases and irreconcilable observation positions that appear, at least from a certain position, light years apart.

Nedelmann and Sztompka define sociology as a “form of reflexive self-awareness of society” that mirrors its concrete, particular experiences as well as its unique history, specific culture, and local traditions. They
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consequently argue that it makes a great deal of sense to speak about a “European sociology” that possesses its own specificity and is thereby distinct from sociologies in other parts of the world. One could then argue in a similar vein that there is in fact more than one form of classical sociology, or that sociology took shape in at least two major and radically different sites located on two different continents. However, what may be termed “American classical sociology,” which emerged at about the same time as classical sociology in Europe but under different intellectual influences, is still not regarded as an important counterpart of European classical sociology – it has instead remained a “pre-history” of sociology in America, whose classical foundation was supposedly to be found in Europe.

For such reasons, if one wishes to regard the meaning and the significance of Addams’ work as classical sociology, then her work cannot be measured against the background of classical sociology in Europe, which is tailored to reflect the particularities of the European case. Her intellectual heritage and contributions should rather be discussed within the framework of American classical sociology, taken as a sociology in its own right that emerged as a response to different revolutions and specific social conditions. It is in respect to this classical sociology that Addams’ possible role as a founder is yet to be revealed. Furthermore, in order to reveal the particular character of this type of sociology as a product of the efforts of educated men and women in late nineteenth-century America, one must first take into account the fact that “the initial series of changes” in which they were “caught up” were conditioned by two “great revolutions” and one war – the American Revolution, the American Civil War, and the American Industrial Revolution. And although the latter is frequently referred to as the Second Industrial Revolution, a closer look reveals that it is a markedly different species from a sociological perspective, and that its unique character has been downplayed or ignored in sociological conceptions.

In Search of Identity for Addams’ Sociology
The Comtean model of a sociology that presided over all the sciences, replacing the dream of a “philosopher king” with that of a “sociologist queen,” came to be rejected in the first decades of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, the idea that sociology had attained social legitimacy, was a capable guide in the formation of social policy, produced knowledge relevant to such policy formation, and was explicitly directed towards social change, still persisted in what came to be known as “applied sociology.” Weinstein has reminded us that in Comte’s proto-sociological work we find the most
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articulated idea of the central place of science in a democratic society, where science comes to “guide human affairs” and “serve the people in determining their own fate.” The positive science of society would thus be necessary in order to “coordinate the other sciences to maximize their value to society” and play the role of “final arbiter in determining the true path to progress.”

Weinstein in fact questioned whether academic sociologists would still feel “compelled to dissociate themselves from Comte” if he had referred to those with expertise in his “doctrine of society, democracy, and sociology as ‘Sociological Practitioners’” insofar as his vision still constitutes the foundation of the field.

Weinstein argued in his grand narrative concerning the roots of applied sociology that sociology was born or “invented on three different occasions” and in three different locations on the map of Europe – Great Britain, France, and Germany. He regarded the first birth of sociology as associated with the efforts on the part of such founders of social science as Adam Smith, John Millar, Adam Ferguson, and Thomas R. Malthus to grasp the meaning of the Industrial age; the second, with attempts to understand the age of democracy by such “French Fathers” of sociology as Henri de Saint-Simon and Auguste Comte; while the aim of the “Marxist” birth of sociology was to comprehend social revolution. Weinstein apparently did not consider the possibility that there could be a sociology that did not belong to any of these types born in Europe. Nevertheless, Addams can clearly be viewed as the founder of a distinct type of sociology that comprised an alternative to all three and, consequently, to the European macrosociological tradition in classical sociology as a whole. Addams did not endorse “the prophet of political economy” Adam Smith’s economic conception of the efficiency of competition and the liberal idea of laissez-faire consumer capitalism with which it was entangled; she rejected the application of Comte’s positivism in efforts to gain an understanding of social life; and she openly disapproved of the “revolutionary contribution to applied sociology” and the Marxist path to social change, giving preference to peaceful social change and reform.

Although sociology might have been three times born in Europe, it would have remained only a partial and one-sided science if these events have not been coupled with the birth of yet another sociology, which was radically different even though it had quite similar concerns. While the latter based its critical stance towards the European sociological tradition
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from a point of view that resided upon social experience that had been accumulated in the private realm, it came to settle in the public realm, where it brought to light and discussion the view from “the other side,” or everyday life. One must first understand the form and essence of this type of sociology before being in a position to argue that Addams was its founder.

“Applied sociology” has often been viewed as the science that furnished Addams with her sociological identity. Deegan observed, however, that the difference between the theoretical and applied areas of sociology ran along gender lines in Chicago, which renders Addams’ identification as an applied sociologist an obstacle for her identification as “a theorist of major proportions” as well. Social reform nevertheless served as a goal that united both sexes, and its central role in defining American sociology as it emerged serves to explain how applied sociology was an “integral part of the profession.” But the diminished concern with social reform after the beginning of World War I dramatically changed the status of applied sociology, leading the Chicago School to refocus its interests and efforts on “academic” sociology. The concern “with the plight of the poor and working class,” along with “popular speaking, adult education, and administrative skills,” came to be increasingly associated more with the former type of sociology than the latter. This was particularly the case when sociology at the University of Chicago became more of a “male discipline” while “applied sociology as affiliated with social work” acquired the status of a “female discipline.” One may also argue that the public status of sociology and its relevance to public policy declined with the downturn in the activities of the settlement sociologists at Hull-House. The problem in this respect is that while Hull-House might indeed be identified as a center of applied sociological work for both its residents and external collaborators, and even as the center of an early form of public sociology, Addams’ identity as a sociologist cannot be determined solely by her place of residence and activity at Hull-House. Her sociological identity should be such that it also accounts for her less-known work away from Hull-House, when she wrote her books and took part in the scholarly life of the sociological community as a lecturer and conference participant. In order to accommodate both of these aspects of her work, it is necessary to conceive of a more complex sociological identity that is derived, as it were, from a science-whole prior
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to any division, in which the applied, theoretical, and public profiles of sociology were mutually and inseparably interwoven.

There was a relatively lively sociological discussion throughout the twentieth century concerning the nature of applied sociology and its place in both science and society. Some views of sociology implied that applied sociologists should be defined as “practical sociologists” and, with some inspiration from German economists, even as the primary engineers of a “social technology.” The latter was intended to lead the implementation of those “modifications of society which are brought about by the social will, equipped with adequate knowledge, using appropriate means, and striving toward an intelligently conceived goal.” Other reflections called upon applied sociology to contribute to the objective description and understanding of social problems, the creation of an “objective attitude” towards them, and the identification of “effective ways and points of remedial procedure” that responded to the needs of society as a whole for social planning and social control. This involved, not least of all, “a direct and opportunist function… in aiding the establishment of sociology,” which at the time had not been fully completed.

This particular model of applied sociology was eventually defined as social engineering, which came to be criticized for its mindless adoption of “the definition of the client.” However, the notion in the discourse about applied sociology that the applied sociologist works outside universities with clients, and that one’s professionalism is measured by the ability to pose appropriate questions to any given client, is incompatible with the principles of Addams’s sociology. Furthermore, this involves more than an ethical issue. Addams had neighbors, not clients, and there appears to be unanimous agreement among her expositors that this fact is significant. Addams did not investigate her neighbors in order to correct their behavior – she spoke with them, not about them, and they were thereby participants in an interaction system in which social problems were identified and discussed. For Addams, these were the problems that comprised the objects to be studied sociologically, not human beings themselves. Social problems were not simply “facts” or “things.” They rather concerned subjectively experienced human conditions that needed to be articulated and defined in social interaction with what were constructed as objective conditions, external to subjects and individual bodies.
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Addams’ method for acquiring knowledge about social problems is well known – the best way in which to learn about social conditions is to place yourself in the middle of them, begin an interaction with those who suffer from them, adopt their position, and try to understand their attitudes towards those conditions and what they take to be their nature. Conditions are thus separated from bodies, and the object is separated from the subject with the help of all those involved. It was poverty that was the problem, not the poor; prostitution, not the prostitute; education, not the student; working conditions, not the industrial worker; filial relations, not the daughters; disease, not those who were sick. Democratic principles were thereby applied to the organization of the production of sociological truth, which is too complex to originate in the mind of some individual genius – unlike philosophical truths, sociological truths can never be accessed from one single and self-sufficient observation position.

Addams presents an outline of her conception of the function of the settlement in a text she wrote at the request of the Academy of Political and Social Science upon her return from a visit to Oxford, where she was impressed by the Oxford philosophers’ interpretations of such minds as Abraham Lincoln and Arnold Toynbee, who were “perpetually disturbed over the apparent inequalities of mankind.” Addams identified applying secular knowledge as the main function of the settlement. with the term “applied knowledge” being used “in a broader sense,” and she argued for the application of knowledge capable of directing human life without being led by commercial interests or necessarily leading to “commercial influences.” But while “application” is thus taken “quite aside from its commercial or professional sense,” Addams still somewhat unusually insisted in describing it as a type of “business” that “cannot be measured by its money-making value.” The essence of this non-commercial “business of application” that she had in mind, to which the settlement is committed as its priority, is to accumulate expertise concerning “what to select and what to eliminate in the business of life”; “make experience continuous beyond the individual”; and challenge and test, in accordance with the standards of moral democracy, whether “those good things which before were partial and remote” can be universalized and made a common possession.
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Stated otherwise, what Addams considered to be the essence of this business is what today, a century later, has become the *sine qua non* of social science research policies – viewing the dissemination of good practices and project results as the important end-stage of all research.

Identifying Addams as an “applied sociologist” in this sense does not dismiss the question about how to identify her sociology and her sociological project, the results of which she was committed to publicize. As her early work on the function of the settlement clearly states, “application” cannot be the concern of an autonomous branch of sociology that is specialized in disseminating the results of a type of sociology that exists for its own sake, whose representatives are reluctant to dirty their hands with social life, from which they keep a healthy distance as external “objective” observers. Application is in fact the social function of all science, including the social sciences, and it can never be separated from sociology because it is that, above all else, which justifies its institutionalization as a new modern science. Louis Menand mentions Addams in this regard as a major first-generation pragmatist, and not only does he include her article “A Function of the Social Settlement” in his reader on pragmatism, he also notes that she may have partly formulated the argumentation in her “close friend” John Dewey’s *The School and Society*, which he refers to as “one of the most important educational treatises ever written.”

It is noteworthy that Addams stands out among the early American pragmatists both as the only sociologist, and as the only woman recognized as an author of a classical pragmatist text.

Albion Small and George Vincent wrote in their *Introduction to the Study of Society* – the first sociology textbook – that a science such as sociology, which is in its “formative period,” “to a certain extent must be unsympathetic towards immediate practice.” On the one hand, the sociologist should pursue “the ultimate application of his science to serviceable art”; on the other, however, the “application of immature science would embarrass rather than assist.” But they also argued that “familiarity with the practice” develops knowledge and provides “technical expertise,” which helps avoid the confusion that the “premature introduction of hypothetical principles” may create. This latter description corresponds to the strategy that Addams herself adopted when she came to Hull-House “without any preconceived social theories or economic views” and, consequently, with no knowledge ready to be applied since the “new science of sociology had
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not yet defined its field."\textsuperscript{57} She also described her social settlement as a place where one comes to learn and acquire knowledge of life from life itself. It would then appear that Addams’ “applied sociology” was much more than an application of already available knowledge, although it eventually came to be identified as the “applied” counterpart of “pure” university-based sociology.\textsuperscript{58}

Small and Vincent also claimed that although sociology in America came into existence “less from choice than from necessity,”\textsuperscript{59} and out of concern about society and its problems, this does not define it as a science specializing in the identification and mediation of social pathology. Insofar as sociology, according to this view, was a science of society as it is comprised of “competent and willing men” who “cooperate to the largest individual and social advantage,”\textsuperscript{60} one may conclude that the type of sociology endorsed at the University of Chicago was aimed at “the development of social health, not the curing of social disease.”\textsuperscript{61} While Small and Vincent acknowledged that sociology has responsibilities in respect to all human beings, including “unsocial elements,” and develops “ameliorative and preventive divisions” in order to provide “the best possible service toward the latter,” its main function was not the “repair of damages.”\textsuperscript{62} A major concern with Small and Vincent’s presentation of sociology thus appears to be their dissociation of sociology from its origins and the designation of academic sociology, located at the university and interested in “social health,” as the expression of sociology’s true essence. It goes without saying that so-called “philanthropic sociology,” which was located in settlements and had a pronounced focus on “social disease” or, perhaps more pertinently, social problems, was thereby ascribed a subordinate status. It appears to have been regarded more as a “scaffolding” that once had been useful for the emergence and institutionalization of sociology as a science, but became no longer necessary and consequently was to be abandoned. It was decidedly not considered to be a different type of sociology that viewed the social world through a different lens and was committed to a different ethos.

A clearer understanding has emerged in recent decades that those who may call themselves sociologists can be engaged and employed in both
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academic and non-academic work places. They may “apply sociology in nontraditional occupations and practice settings” and be members of a variety of sociological associations as well, including the Society for Applied Sociology and the Sociology Practice Association, while valuing “applied sociological research and training” and acknowledging the existence of an “inextricable link between the science of sociology and effective intervention at all levels of social organization.”

Applied sociology has in fact recently undergone a vigorous development, coming to be recognized as the common denominator of a number of such new forms of nontraditional sociology as “public sociology,” “clinical sociology,” and “translational sociology.” This may be regarded as a revival of interest in a figure who was long a little discussed classical sociologist – Lester Ward – and his more than a century-old conception of “dynamic” or “applied sociology.”

Historico-sociological analysis reveals that applied sociology underwent a sharp decline from the 1970s to the beginning of the new millennium, marking a period when it lost many supporters within the professional sociological community. Its most prestigious branches, including demography, criminology, medical sociology, and the sociology of education, also lost much of their previous popularity and were reduced to marginal sociological fields. Recent sociological analysis has also revealed a deeply rooted and persistent tendency to restrict not only applied sociology, but sociology as a whole to the margins of both science and social life. As a result, sociologists and sociological perspectives are markedly absent from the most important areas of social life, where economics and psychology continue to enjoy respectable applied functions. The reasons for this still remain an enigma and have not yet been sufficiently explored.

Scholars have identified at least three different interpretations of the history of sociology in respect to the relationship between sociology and social work. The one that seems most plausible from the perspective of the present discussion regards the settlement as the birthplace of both professions. But Addams’ sociology did not share the philosophy of either of these two sciences to the degree that it could be identified with one or the other. It was rather the type of sociology that remained at Hull-House when social workers focused on “disease,” as well as those sociologists focused on social “health,” left for the university.
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The hypothesis that best fits the factual material in support of a plausible genesis story is that Hull-House was the home of a basic type of sociology that eventually gave birth to both academic sociology and social work. It is significant that a similar hypothesis can also be found in creation stories that linger in the footnotes of contemporary historico-sociological works dealing with the origins of sociology, coded, as it were, almost as a myth from Greek mythology.\textsuperscript{68}

To the union of social-mindedness and social sympathy, two children were born. The older one, a daughter, became “outgoing” in her emotional adjustment and insisted on doing something about it; the second, a son, developed into an “ingoing” child, and its introjective behavior took the form of scientific analysis. The daughter was called social work; the son rejoiced in the name of sociologist.\textsuperscript{69}

This metaphor, which points to a type of “primordial unity” of “social mindedness and social sympathy” found both at Hull-House and in Addams’ works, reflects the existence of a classical sociology that had natal bonds with both academic sociology and social work. However, the concept of “applied sociology” does not appear capable of accounting for the complex relationships within which sociological knowledge is both produced and applied. Addams was obviously involved in applying knowledge, but the latter was understood in a very broad sense as combining knowledge acquired from experience, knowledge collectively produced in interactions at Hull-House, and knowledge produced by various sciences that are capable of contributing to the resolution of social problems and the improvement of social life – and it had to be put to the test. Moreover, insofar as she did not view “application” as restricted to sociological knowledge, she cannot simply be identified as an “applied sociologist,” particularly when this identity normally implies an indifference to theoretical or “pure” sociology. In addition, it presumes the role of a follower rather than a leader in sociology, whose original sociological thought was of importance for the development of the discipline.

\textsuperscript{68} The form of a myth may have been deliberately chosen not so much for poetic purposes, but, as is the case with all myths, to ensure that its message would be capable of traveling through time and reaching the future.

\textsuperscript{69} Bossard 1934, p. 204.
Addams’ Commitments at Hull-House

It has been claimed that efforts to rehabilitate Addams challenge the model of scientific development that is based upon the narrative of “‘science,’ cumulation, and theory.” Stephen Turner thus states that “Addams, unlike the leading male sociologists of the era, had no special vision for the future of sociology, and no methodological program to get it there, nor was she concerned with sociology as a discipline.” However, the issue does not have to reside upon discovering what Addams did not possess in comparison with those sociologists who were not ignored – it may equally well involve establishing what her sociology did in fact possess and what classical sociology in Europe lacked. Her contributions in this regard should not be expected to have taken precisely the same form as those of the sociologists who are “remembered” and comprise the canon, whose works provide a solid foundation for what has been termed “mainstream” sociology. Addams did not seek to compete for a leading role in an already existing game from which women were excluded, in which men set the rules and were traditionally the best players. She was rather the architect of a new social game, in which women, who were equally involved with men, could apply their previously unacknowledged and untapped skills that had been acquired in experience – skills that Addams found to be particularly relevant to the social roles in that new game.

It is impossible to write about Addams’ identity as a sociologist and analyze her sociological work without at the same time talking about the identity of Hull-House and its specific character as a location. Indeed, Addams’s entire career involved activities carried out from Hull-House, and she always presented herself in her public appearances as “Addams from Hull-House.” Some of Addams’ most devoted expositors have argued that Addams and Hull-House should not be separated in research, but the dominant view continues to view them as separate issues.

However, the latter position makes it possible to discuss Hull-House as being of historical importance for the development of a given social science without mentioning Addams at all, or even acknowledging that she belonged to the corresponding scholarly community. For example, one could then recognize that Hull-House was a “part of the social and intellectual
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fabric of early Chicago sociology,” and even claim that it figured “integral-
ly in late nineteenth century sociology,” and yet not regard its founder
and director, Jane Addams, as a classical sociologist of importance to the
discipline. Neither Addams's thought and work, nor the settlement and
“settlement sociology” would then be integral elements of sociology; nor
could they be considered as of any significance for its institutionalization.
Addams has instead been perceived as being indirectly important for soci-
ology by virtue of the fact that she was one of the women “affiliated with
the social settlement movement,” whose experience was “paradigmatic for
women reformers in the Progressive Era generally.”

Furthermore, “both Hull House specifically and the settlement move-
ment more generally have been claimed primarily for histories of social
work.” But while social workers acknowledge Hull-House as the birth-
place of their discipline and Addams as “the architect of the Settlement
House Movement,” and although they take some pride in identifying
themselves with Addams as a professional icon, they nevertheless find her
settlement philosophy to be alien to that of their own profession. Addams
is respected as one of “the two most influential figures in the history of so-
cial work,” and is also referred to as “the mother of social work,” but is not
really regarded as one of its founders or leaders. She played an important
role in the institutionalization of social work, which was harbored at Hull-
House, where its conception and philosophy emerged and matured, yet it
was Mary Richmond, the Hull-House resident and “presiding matriarch of
the Charity Organization Society philosophy,” who wrote books specifical-
ly for social workers (Social Diagnosis and What is Social Casework?), iden-
tified herself as one, and became their theoretical and practical leader.
For such reasons, the credit of being the founder of social work went to
Richmond, whose ideas about the essence and the future of the profession
are normally viewed in the literature as opposed to those of Addams on a
number of important issues.

One of the points of disagreement between Addams and Richmond
concerned the attitudes of social workers towards social reform – a ques-
tion of central importance for American sociology before the beginning
of the First World War. Richmond was unconcerned with “broad issues
of social melioration,” and she advised social workers to stay on that “safe
middle ground which recognizes that character is at the very center of
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social problems” and not “permit themselves to be swept away by enthusiastic advocates of social reform.”

It has also been noted that Richmond viewed social work as closer to medicine and psychology than to sociology, and regarded the social worker as a person more interested in issues associated with individual personality development than social selves. In accordance with the professional ideology to which she adhered, social workers did not have to take “the man in his social aspects.” They were rather to “help people,” but not “study the conditions under which they lived,” and perfect “the techniques of casework,” not opt for “environmental reform,” as Addams instead maintained.

In addition, Richmond emphasized practical experience in the education of social workers, and argued that practice, such as working for the Red Cross Home Service, was far more important for a social worker than academic training or involvement in the peace movement, which was Addams’ contradictory position. The tendency within the professional ideology of social work to take a distance from Addams’ views, and its eventual separation from sociology and departure from Hull-House, became a basic trend within the profession itself, which “abandoned its quest to change society.” Deegan characterized this transformation in terms of social workers becoming “administrative bureaucrats” working “for the government instead of becoming its leaders and voice of reason and dissent.”

Addams was opposed to the transformation of social work into an organized profession with strict working hours, explicit job characteristics, and specific duties and responsibilities. She was known to not “fully respect younger social workers, for whom service meant an eight-hour day and a home far from the slums.” It thus seems safe to assume that Addams had in mind a different type of “social service” – one performed by trained sociologists working outside the academy, who did not regard the healing of social ills as a type of business opportunity. They instead possessed an insider’s view of the problems of the particular life-world they were investigating, and had an “interest in the human beings whose lives were being studied” as human beings and neighbors, not as “research objects,” “things,” ”clients,” or “cases.”
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Social work entered the university to become a separate discipline and profession at the beginning of the twentieth century, having acquired its scientific inspiration from business, entrepreneurial ideas, and an involvement in the public distribution of relief, while undergoing practical training and developing an institutional connection through experience in social settlements. Although its origins are connected with the English Poor Laws of the 1600s, the modern representatives of the profession acknowledge Hull-House as their institutional home, where social work lived alongside Addams’ settlement sociology under the same roof. Gross maintains that since Addams wrote about the “subjective necessity” and educational value for young men and women to be connected with the “vital forces of their age,” the creation of Hull-House was “no impersonal act of reform.” He thus recognized the tension that existed and remained hesitant to reach any conclusion concerning whether her activities belonged to traditional charity or to philanthropy.\(^5\)

Instead of assuming that there are apparent inconsistencies in Addams’ commitments, most likely due to her lack of a true commitment to either cause, it is better to assume that both were social roles that Addams played, and that neither had the character of a true calling or profession for her. This implies that Addams’ professional engagement with Hull-House was such that it could involve the acceptance of a variety of tasks, but not their corresponding identities. While one cannot claim that Addams was committed to charity or social work, and although she was critical of their “scientific methods,” principles, and business attitude, she was still supportive of their activities.\(^6\) This should not be surprising since they were nevertheless enterprises with social goals, capable of producing social value that could be assessed in terms of individual and social wellbeing, although they were apparently different from the social enterprise with which Addams could identify.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this exploration is that it is not possible to make a sound case that Addams was either a devoted philanthropist, or a charity worker, or a social worker. Her settlement sociology can be equated neither with any form of “philanthropy,” nor with “charity sociology,” although she was involved with both in one form or another. Her published works instead reveal that she adopted a “third position” external to both from which she criticized them both, above all for their deficient social ethics. This would appear to render problematic the identification of Hull-House as Addams’s home and thus a home for settlement

\(^5\) Gross 2002.
sociology, on the one hand, and the home of social work, on the other, if this is taken as an either/or issue.

“The Other” Sociology
It is incomprehensible how and why the particular sociological value of Addams’ work has been overlooked when there is hardly any richer sociological record and analysis of the life of the working class in the overlapping ages of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration in the United States, where these mutually reinforcing social processes took unique forms on a much larger and more rapidly changing scale than was the case in any European country. It was only to be expected that the sociological emphasis in Addams’ published works was radically different from those of her European colleagues, who were working to lay the foundation of a sociology that was preoccupied with the nature and consequences of the industrial revolution taking place in Europe, which they regarded as universally valid. A particularly important issue that was left unaddressed in classical European sociology, as discussed above, was the phenomenon of industrial immigration that was unique to the United States, whereby a multinational and multilingual labor force living together in working class neighborhoods was a distinctive determinant of American social life around the turn of the twentieth century. America would thus appear to be entitled to have her own classical sociologists and her own Marx and Engels, so to speak, who would never be identified if their achievements were measured against European indicators.

Historians of sociology have never yet taken into consideration the possibility that sociology might be a more complex science than others, and that it may require at least two different and perhaps even opposing perspectives which, as such, cannot be launched from one and the same observation position or successfully harbored in one and the same mind. Lester Ward’s Dynamic Sociology contains one of the most profound analyses of the limits of Comte’s positivistic approach. It points to the need for another type of sociology specialized in the study of social institutions and everyday life, which Comte identified but was unable to analyze in a meaningful, sociological, systematic, and positivistic manner. Ward described Comte as “a great general in the army of thinkers; but when he descends, as he continually does, to meddle with the brigades, regiments, and platoons, he throws them into confusion by the undue severity and amazing stupidity of his commands.”87 Although it may be obvious that a single sociology can never simultaneously have two different identities
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subordinated to one and the same principle and launched from one and the same observation position, it is nevertheless possible to conceive of sociology as a modern science – which in systems terms means a science with increased complexity. Its particular character in this regard is connected with the specificity of its objects of study, which include both living and non-living social forms that are mutually interwoven. One may then assume that there is a need for at least two different sub-types or sub-species of sociology with relevant expertise and specialization, neither of which can be explained or judged in terms of the other. They share one disadvantage, however – each is able to produce only one-sided sociological truths and is thus inadequate for defining sociological progress by itself.

Against this background, one may conclude that the forgotten classical sociology that emerged in late nineteenth-century America was not some philosophically unsound and inferior stage of the development of sociology that needed to be abandoned on the way to professionalization, but rather a different type of sociology that understood itself as a humanistic science and what Small and Vincent termed a new type of philosophy – “the philosophy of human welfare.”

88 Although the roots of this new “philosophy” are not to be found in the works of Weber and Durkheim, it is not without roots in sociology. They must be sought, however, in that period of the history of sociology that has been forgotten, a fact that has become an obstacle to sociology’s future development and the source of its constant identity crisis.

My contention is that the idea of sociology as possessing a dual nature has not yet received sufficient attention, regardless of the overwhelming evidence that sociology has never been one, because the source of the micro-macro difference as a significant epistemological issue has never been made an object of serious historico-sociological exploration. Stated otherwise, since this idea remains disconnected from the history of sociology, it has no sociological reality in either the present, or the future. And although Addams’ sociology enjoyed a reality in the past, it also was disconnected from the subsequent history of sociology, with similar consequences.

Parsons excluded Simmel as well as the American symbolic interactionists from his canon on the grounds that, as microsociologists and essayists, their work was not on a sufficiently high theoretical level. We may thus assume, relying upon the accuracy of Parsons’ own sociological judgment, that the forgotten sociologists whom he neglected were in fact microsociologists, whose works he regarded as not quite belonging to science. This
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is all the more the case insofar as macrosociology was promoted while microsociology was pushed to the margins of the discipline, a fact well known during the second half of the twentieth century, with the consequences of this development becoming prominent in sociological discussions in terms of “sociological corpuscularism,” an “overintegrated” conception of society, and an “oversocialized” conception of man.  

Although there is no evidence that Addams’s sociology ever succeeded in attracting Parsons’ attention, and, to my knowledge, she has never been referred to in the sociological literature as a microsociologist, the possibility that her work belongs to this sociological tradition is worth exploring. Moreover, since she has at times been referred to in the literature as a pragmatist and symbolic interactionist, the latter often discussed as microsociologists as well, it is through these identities that she can also be identified as a microsociologist. This will indeed be a very fitting identity for Addams, particularly in light of the fact that none of those who have been referred to as microsociologists in the literature have ever been included, or even seriously considered, for inclusion in the canon. The answer to the question “Why is classical theory classical?” is – because it was macrosociological. Microsociology either has no classics, or is the sociology that was neglected and marginalized as “inferior,” with its founders, contributors, and promoters forgotten.

It has been claimed that the micro-macro theme was introduced into sociology from the realm of the philosophical and political debates at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, and that it was reproduced there in the form of a more empirically-oriented discourse in terms of micro-macro dichotomies and sociological opposition. However, the term microsociology emerged from Georges Gurvitch’s courses and articles concerning “Forms of Sociability” between 1934 and 1937. It was then conceptualized as a counterpart to the macrosociology of Comte, Marx, and Sumner that is interested in the “primary atomic structures of human relations” as they are regarded as the “preliminary and indispensable groundwork to most macrosociological investigations.” The expectation that it would become a form of empirical sociology based upon quantitative measurements, with sociometry coming to be regarded as its true method, was particularly pronounced. It is significant that the concept of microsociology was formulated at about the same time as that of symbolic interactionism. But while the former was associated above all
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with the works of Charles Horton Cooley and his notions of “sociability,” “collective consciousness,” and “we,” symbolic interactionism was launched as a concept articulated primarily in Mead’s work, with other contributors to its intellectual foundation, including Dewey and Cooley, being considered to be of secondary importance. But while the career of the term itself has been very successful, the place of microsociology within sociology has been controversial from the beginning, coming to be known as “the micro-macro” problem in sociology. For the greater part of the twentieth century microsociology has been regarded as comprising a minority “militant” camp who fought against everyone else in sociology – “macrosociologists, exchange theorists, life course theorists, and so on.”

Certain scholars view the meanings of the terms micro and macro as so obvious that they hardly regard it as necessary to inquire into the methodological and theoretical implications they entail. The protracted debates about micro and macro in theoretical sociology may thus seem insignificant if the distinction is used merely to designate research preferences for large- or small-scale social processes. In other cases, the suggested understanding of the difference between them turns upon the belief that macrosociology deals with wholes or “total social structures,” while microsociology is “associated with the study of parts, fragments, and elements of total social structures,” “without explicit reference to the contextual whole.” But regardless of persistent disagreements, the tendencies have been to equate either “micro with individual and macro with collective level events,” or “macro with ‘quantitative’ and micro with ‘qualitative’ sociology.” At certain times, the issue is viewed in terms of the relations between large- and small-scale theories; at others, in respect to the differences between sociological theorists and sociological practitioners. What precisely sociologists study, whether “social structures, formal organizations and societies” or, alternatively, “situational encounters, definitions of the situation and selves,” has also been regarded as both a reliable marker of the difference as well as an explanatory ground for the mutual charges that macro- and microsociology level against each other. Microsociologists charge macrosociologists with a “loss of humanistic perspective and unreflexive methodology,” while the latter reproach the former for a “lack of conceptual clarity and experimental rigor.” In reviewing the achievements of both sides, Denzin notes the lack of real interaction as well as a typical misreading of the oth-
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er’s theory, which does not contribute to the “the development of sociology as an empirical discipline.” It rather lends itself to what may be characterized as a “search for power,” or “hegemony and control of a theoretical paradigm that would speak for all of sociology,” in which are entangled issues concerning “individual careers, prestige, publications, and the power to determine what passes as knowledge within a discipline.”100 But it is important to note that the micro-macro sociological debate has not been as barren as it sometimes seems. As Alexander and Giesen have emphasized, the debate had one “distinctive accomplishment in its most recent phase” – its attempt to conceptualize the micro-macro theme as a “distinction between different levels of empirical reality” – a distinction that proves to be important within the context of the current discussion.101

It should be emphasized, however, that the present work is interested in the retrieval of classical microsociology and the resolution of the difficulties that have prevented it from being recognized as a type of sociology in its own right that is distinct from the mainstream macrosociology. The question of micro-macro linkage as “a standard rhetoric of sociological theorizing,” as Fine put it, is secondary to my primary concern.102

The term microsociology has been an object of constant elaboration and redefinition ever since its inception. During the final decades of twentieth century, microsociology and the problem of its relation to macrosociology became a focus of attention in the works of some of the most influential interactionist theorists in sociology, such as Collins, Scheff and Fine.103 But as Huber remarked, it is necessary to take into account the fact that “most scholars conceptualize the problem only along one direction, from micro to macro or from macro to micro,” she herself preferring the latter approach.104

Collins argued for the significance and equal importance of microsociology as a distinct sociological level of analysis, and for the benefit of linking macrosociology with it, although he assumed that “each level can proceed well enough without the other.”105 But since he endorsed the primacy of the larger macrostructure “in shaping microencounters,” he can be identified as a proponent of the macrosociological approach, which ascribes the primary role to social structure in sociological analysis.106

Collins also maintained that microsociology should not be viewed merely as “a trivial addition to the academic scene,” but should rather be regarded as an important counterpart to macrosociology, which “cannot go on studying the world system, the structure of the state, or any of the macrotopics without using micro research methods and invoking microtheory.”\textsuperscript{107} He directed the attention of sociologists to the fact that the microfoundation of macrosociology forms the empirical basis of all other sociological constructions, and he proposed that macrosociological abstractions can be provided with content by grounding them “in a sample of the typical micro-events that make them up.”\textsuperscript{108} He thus encouraged the microtranslation of social structures because of the microsituational nature of the social patterns, institutions, and organizations that are abstracted from the microbehaviors of individuals in time and space. Collins convincingly demonstrates that the acquisition of an understanding of the continuity and change of social systems and structures thus involves a study of the microbehaviors of the individuals that comprise them. In addition, his theory concerning interaction ritual chains resides upon the assumption that structural social change does not devolve from systems decisions made on a top level that are handed down to the lower level of social organization, that is, not from systems decisions to take a new course of action. It is rather the case that the individuals who participate in them cease repeating their microbehaviors, adopt new behavior, transform that behavior by means of repetition into new behavioral patterns, and develop shared orientations that no longer support the old structures.\textsuperscript{109}

In contrast, Fine conceives of the complex relation of micro- and macrosociology as one of mutual dependence and determination, arguing that microsociology has a macrofoundation that must also be explored. The underlying idea is that action is not free, but is instead constrained from both within and without — not only by “perceived boundaries on action,” but also by the influence of societal infrastructure and forces external to the individual, which implies real consequences.\textsuperscript{110} However, microsociology can be charged with emphasizing “microcultures over national culture, self over demography,” “performance over norms and practices over cultural logics.”\textsuperscript{111} Fine thus criticizes microsociology for taking its “macro” foundation for granted, and for being no less biased when it ignores structure than
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macrosociology when it brackets agency. The microsociological ambition is to cast light on the big through the small, analyze large-scale social forces by means of the systematic investigation of small-scale processes and events, extrapolate large-scale social processes and social forces by investigating small-scale or microlevel phenomena, and link organizations and structural realities to individuals’ personal experiences and interactional conditions. In particular, microsociology provides the interpretative framework for “grounded, action-oriented structural analysis,” which comes to suggest that the “hinge” which Fine proposes to “connect the micro and the macro in a way that does justice to each” is necessarily of a micro-macro sociological cast.

An interesting question in this regard concerns whether micro- and macrosociology are products of the internal differentiation of sociology, or were instead two autonomous sociologies that later came to develop a relationship of mutual interdependence. To what extent can “(t)he micro/macro link” merely be a “a slogan for a popular ‘line’” and a fashionable rhetoric that necessarily “shall pass”? Is it not rather the case that sociology has never been one, and that there have always been two sociologies right from the start? Can it be the case that the dramatic difference between Comte’s early work on *Positive Philosophy* and his later work on *Positive Polity* was produced by a mind that was challenged by the impossible task of theorizing the two sides of a difference from one and the same observation position, in one and the same terms? Has not sociology always been entangled in the interaction of opposite views and approaches – those of Weber and Simmel, Durkheim and Tarde, Cooley and Mead, Blumer and Parsons, Habermas and Luhmann – regardless of where it was formulated and developed? And is not the interaction between these alternative sociological views the very essence of sociology as a science that studies the unity of differences – including subjects and objects, interaction and action, agencies and structures, living and non-living systems?

My contention is that the division within the sociological community between different camps was not an unknown phenomenon for the early sociologists. After the quest has begun to recover forgotten sociologists and sociologies, it can no longer be taken for granted that those sociologists who have been “remembered” represent all the scientific sociology that there has been. A much deeper exploration into the history of sociology
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than that usually undertaken provides the evidence necessary to challenge the claim that “the occupational politics and division of labor of American sociology of a certain era, not the theoretical tasks themselves, have divided the classical sociological theorists into rival camps based on level of analysis.” The “external” factors that have influenced the development of sociology after it already emerged are important, but they do not dismiss the question about the source of sociology’s inherent duality.

My claim is that microsociology emerged as a type of sociology in its own right at about the same time as macrosociology, if not actually preceding it, and although it can be discerned in the works of Simmel and Tarde, it was Jane Addams who, above all others, laid the foundations of the microsociological approach. Two things are of particular importance in this regard. First, Cooley spoke of Addams as a philanthropist and writer whose works were a must reading for sociologists at the time, which makes Addams a source of his microsociological inspiration. Second, Addams alone, unlike all other pioneers of microsociology, had a plan for how to institutionalize microsociology by grounding it in a social enterprise at Hull-House.

Fine has remarked that it is implicit in the works of all the sociological “Fathers,” including Durkheim, Weber, Parsons and even Mead, that such a sharp micro/macro divide in sociology is misleading. But this does not mean that it did not exist. It only means that they did not take it seriously, and deprecated microsociology as an immature and confused pseudoscience that had the laughable ambition to combine scientific objectivity with moral subjectivity, even speaking of the poets, such as Goethe, as authorities in (micro)sociological matters and their closest kin.

The present discussion addresses the difference between micro and macrosociologies in two different respects. First, it is defined in terms of the sociology of knowledge as the difference between micro- and macrosociological observation positions. Parsons took comfort in Durkheim’s methodological position and sociological rules, which stipulated that “it is with society that the sociologist must begin.” The sociologist would then be encouraged to proceed further in his explorations by taking an ever greater distance from man in order to eventually “return to him and succeed in understanding him better” since “man is a product of society” and

117 Ibid., p. 163. Italics in the original.
118 This is a paraphrase of Blumer’s justification for declaring Mead to be the founder of symbolic interactionism. See Blumer 1986, p. 1.
119 Cooley 1930.
120 Fine 1991, p. 162.
“it is through society that man can be explained.”\textsuperscript{121} Durkheim here reveals his Comtean bias. Microsociology sets off from the other pole, however, as is clearly exhibited in Simmel’s “formal” sociology.\textsuperscript{122} But it does not take social structures for granted, striving to understand man in everyday life as a living being who has been born into social life. It rather proceeds further in order to understand the social forms and structures that human beings have created in interaction with each other, thereby understanding life on its own terms while seeking to attain a better understanding of society than that acquired by observing life from a distance or interpreting it in terms of macrosociological constructions.\textsuperscript{123}

Second, microsociology is particularly concerned with the social as something alive, that is, as a process that cannot be stopped or frozen in order to be studied. In contrast, macrosociology attempts to study the social as an object or thing from which all life has been abstracted – microsociology in its highest form is a grand theory of non-living social systems.\textsuperscript{124} But avoiding Comte’s methodological mistake of attempting to utilize a macrosociological approach in explaining social life does not mean that sociology should give up trying to acquire knowledge about man and everyday life, abandon its sense of mission, and forgo efforts to improve social conditions – at least not in America. Sociology in America took notice of Comte’s good intentions, but went its own way and developed its own ethically “sensitive” scientific methods and strategies for studying life without killing or harming it – it sought neither to follow in Comte’s footsteps, nor to abandon him altogether.

During the classical period of sociology, no sociologist understood this peculiarity of the sociological enterprise better than Addams, and no other sociologist had a plan for how to create the conditions necessary for acquiring knowledge about life. The latter involved locating the microsociologist’s own life in the middle of the social life she wanted to know and comprehend. Addams’ firm belief that this is the only ethically admissible method that sociology can use in the study of life, by which the sociolo-
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gist can attain a better knowledge of society than that possessed by any other science or social sphere, constitutes a sound reason for why she did not accept the academic positions she was offered and never moved to the university.

Scheff’s Microsociology is perhaps the first significant effort to articulate the basic ideas as well as the methodological and theoretical specificity of what he termed “a new kind of sociology,” which was the opposite of a type of sociology that utilizes approaches “based on theoretical and methodological individualism.”\textsuperscript{125} His Goffman Unbound may be considered to be an effort not simply to understand Goffman, but rather, on the one hand, to retrieve the microsociological roots of modern microsociology as grounded in Cooley’s work\textsuperscript{126} and, on the other, to confirm that Goffman is “the leading figure in the microsociology of our time.”\textsuperscript{127} While the central idea of Scheff’s new kind of sociology was apparently inspired by reading Cooley and, under his influence, Goethe as well, its value resides in moving Cooley’s theory forward and in providing the first outline of a grand theory of microsociology, where we can find the first conceptualization of the unusual construction of the microworld in systems terms.

From a systems point of view, Scheff’s microsociological theory may be regarded as a counterpart to Luhmann’s macrosociology. While Luhmann’s grand sociological theory focuses on “closed social systems” as \textit{non-living}, self-producing systems, Scheff’s focus is on “living culture,” which, as a living system, is capable of producing something other than itself. In Scheff’s definition, microsociology is a new science that deals with living wholes and studies the microworld as “an open system” – a vast collection of small parts, each having meaning only in relationship to the other and to the whole.\textsuperscript{128} In addition, he viewed the elements of this open system as similar to “holograms” such that “each stands for the whole, just as the whole is made up by the parts and their relationships” – one can discern here the further development of Cooley’s paradigmatic statement that the individual and society are one. A point of particular interest for further exploration in this regard is without doubt the connection between Scheff’s microworld and Luhmann’s systems \textit{medium}, particular since the latter could never come to focus within Luhmann’s telescopic observational field.

Both Scheff and Luhmann identified the goals towards which they were working as sociologists as related to a most pressing scholarly task, namely, supplying sociology with a \textit{paradigm} – although the paths they chose
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differed greatly. While Scheff approached this goal as a microsociologist working in the tradition of Cooley and Goffman, Luhmann did so as a macrosociologist working in the tradition of Parsons. Stated otherwise, their observation positions were located at the two opposing poles that Durkheim had defined, and the results of their theorizing were radically different. Luhmann proposed a macrosociological system/environment paradigm that sought to explain the social world as a closed, non-living system, and Scheff, in contrast, put forward a microsociological part/whole paradigm that endeavored to explain society as an open, living system, which he found implied in Goethe's scientific works.129 A further exploration of the difference between the two paradigms proposed by Luhmann and Scheff in systems terms may lead to other interesting results as well. For example, while Luhmann's macrosociological perspective is concerned with closed social systems that are self-producing (auto-poietic) and thus egoistic by their very nature, Scheff's microsociological perspective focuses on social systems of a contrasting type – systems whose openness permits them to be other-producing (poietic).130

Microsociology is normally associated in sociology with agency, subjectivity, interaction, everyday life, small-scale theories, social psychological approaches, and such related issues as emotions, close encounters, personal experiences, selves, and self-identities. Macrosociology, in contrast, is associated with objectivity, distant observations, large-scale theories, social structures, social systems, and such more general social forms as organizations, institutions, and cultures, with the dominant understanding of the micro/macro difference being related to size, level, or abstractness.131 However, there appears to be as yet no unchallenged and generally accepted definition in this respect, and the nature of relationship between micro and macro – whether it involves inclusion, interpenetration, or opposition – is far from clear. This nevertheless does not mean that this duality may be dismissed as unhelpful since those who question the need to provide a micro-macro sociological distinction have in fact failed to produce a theory that lacks one or the other bias.

For example, the fact that a given sociologist speaks of self-identity and social selves, and examines how they are influenced by changes in the social structures and institutions of modern society, does not make him a microsociologist, for he remains a macrosociologist who speaks from a macrosociological perspective about microsociological issues. An analogous
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situation holds true for a microsociologist, who sets off from the study of everyday life and a theory of social selves and then proceeds to theorize about cultures and social institutions without ever attaining recognition as a macrosociologist. In addition, neither systems theorizing, nor abstraction can be associated solely with macrosociology in that systems theoretical thinking exists in microsociology as well. The point in this regard is that an examination of microsociological systems theory from Cooley to Scheff, which closer theoretical scrutiny reveals to be a counterpart to Luhmann’s grand sociological systems theory, may lead to a dramatic advance in our knowledge of the social as a whole. It is no less important that it may also counter the more than century-long efforts to muddle the sociological difference between micro- and macrosociology, including the existence of two persistent, distinct, and somewhat “gendered” theoretical and methodological approaches grounded in differing experiences with living and non-living social matters.

From the perspective of the present work, the suppression of microsociology and the denial of its existence as a type of sociology in its own right – including its ability to produce a new type of knowledge and work “together in a dynamic, interrelated way” with its counterpart macrosociology\(^\text{132}\) – has much to do with the so-called “sociological amnesia” whereby sociology repressed an essential element of its classical foundation. Those who were forgotten, albeit to varying degrees, were the first generation of *micro-sociologists*, regardless of their gender, class, ethnicity, or race. This is why the “minor gallery” of forgotten sociologists today includes not only Addams and all the early women sociologists, but also Simmel, Tarde, DuBois, and Cooley – although the case of the early-women-sociologists in both America and Europe is much more extreme in that gender is a master-sociological index that represents a very complex ground for discrimination since it can be combined with, and often involves, all other grounds without exception.

The conviction that began growing during the process of this work was that micro- and macrosociology – each of which is grounded in different philosophical traditions and emerged under generally similar but very specific social conditions – not only were born on different continents and in the midst of distinct Industrial Revolutions, but were also brought into being by different social forces. Furthermore, one may conclude that these forces were gendered, and not simply because of the gender difference between the residents of Toynbee Hall and Hull-House. More importantly,
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the gender difference in question is associated with the dramatic difference between the experiences of handling living and non-living social matter.

Identifying Addams as a sociologist does not imply having to identify the sociology to which she belonged, but rather identifying the sociology of which she became the founder. The view presented here is that a more profound analysis of her sociological heritage reveals her to be a founder and leader of microsociology. Her microsociology, unlike “loyal” symbolic interactionism, can best be defined as critical sociology, which targeted the theoretical and methodological individualism that challenged Scheff to embark upon his microsociological project. Addams' microsociology was both a social and a humanistic science that combined the features of the four types of sociology that Burawoy has identified — it was theoretical, it was critical, it was policy, and it was public, thereby involving all the types that pertained to sociology in general. It was thus nothing less than an equal “other” of macrosociology — its counterpart and interaction partner. Indeed, when Blumer excluded Addams from the group of pragmatists who contributed most to symbolic interactionism, he excluded no less than its microsociological foundation, assigning all credit for symbolic interactionism's sociological content to the philosopher Mead. This neglect of Addams's pioneering microsociological work, which had provided the indispensable foundation for Mead’s philosophical work, weakened symbolic interactionism’s critical power and dulled its critical edge. Moreover, the type of sociology that withdrew from social life and Hull-House and retreated to the university lost not only its public and the possibility to engage its audience in interaction, it also underwent a radical change by virtue of interrupting a professionally important pattern of microbehavior and developing a new one that involved activities away from the slums.

One could then say that Addams’ microsociology declined for quite understandable social reasons that cannot be attributed solely to the biases of individual actors. In Fine's terms, the microsociological behaviors that supported Addams sociology, settled at Hull-House, encountered boundaries or “constraints” on further action and appeared unsuited to the new situation. At the same time, microsociologists failed to take into consideration or make sense of the real effects of the social infrastructure (“exteriory”), including the fact that action is consequential. More concretely, my position in the present work is that the immediate cause for the decline of Addams' microsociology was that the microbehaviors that supported it ceased, the social enterprise in which it was embedded was discontinued,
and the production of sociological truth through the application of ethical and democratic principles, which she endorsed, came to an end.

It should thus only be expected that retrieving Addams’ lost sociological heritage, which is inseparable from the sociological microbehaviors at Hull-House, may shed new light on the reasons for sociology’s notorious identity crisis. One of the most important reasons why it is difficult today to accommodate Addams’ sociology within sociology departments is that it belongs with both the humanities and the social sciences if its true nature is taken into account, although sociology is classified as only a social science in many parts of the world. This will provide a new perspective on sociology’s identity crisis as caused by the fact that it simultaneously belongs to two characteristically different groups of sciences.

Classical sociology, when taken as a whole comprised of both macro- and microsociologies, did not have only Fathers, and did not have a single birthplace in Europe. It was rather born at roughly the same time on two different continents, had both Fathers and Mothers, was both a social and a humanist science, and developed two different, but equally scientific, methodologies so that society could be observed as a whole, from both within and without. It was thus comprised of two poles that are attracted to each other as opposites – each having what the other does not have, each starting from one particular point of departure and striving to arrive at the other pole.

Addams’ Microsociology: A Science and a Social Enterprise

The term settlement sociology has often been used as a description of Addams’ sociology and of the sociological research carried out by residents of American settlements around the turn of the twentieth century, who strove to combine theory and practice in their work. This was the type of sociology that was eventually marginalized in both academic sociology and social work, with its representatives not being included in either – in the former case because they were “too practical” or “applied,” and in the latter because they were “too theoretical.”134 As such, it can be identified neither with what is regarded today as a version of sociology engaged “in activities designed to reform society,” nor with its counterpart that is committed to “pure science” and the acquisition of knowledge about “how the social world operates” – not with how it can be changed.135 However, settlement sociology is a no less inappropriate term than applied sociology
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since it not only implies a clear opposition to academic sociology, which is defined as theoretical, but also emphasizes the settings in which its activity should take place, not the differing theoretical and methodological biases involved.

There are clear alternatives to the claim that early twentieth-century sociology, as it was progressing towards becoming an accepted science, threw overboard the ballast that consisted of the unoriginal, amateurish efforts of self-proclaimed “sociologists” to do science. Much more plausible is the view, which is implicit in critical sociological self-reflection, that sociology initially had a much broader foundation as a science, as well as a much richer and more complex identity profile, both of which were suppressed in the unfavorable social conditions that emerged after the beginning of World War I. Sociology in its original form then came to be replaced by a version that was tailored to the individual interests and demands that had newly become dominant, which gave preference to what Addams referred to as individual ethics.  

The fact that sociology originally emerged as a response to the unbearable social conditions subsequent to the Second Industrial Revolution which demanded amelioration indicates that it is a science that is particularly sensitive to the conditions of life. However, this does not mean that the response comes automatically, regardless of the existing economic and political conditions. The latter were apparently especially favorable in America for the emergence of microsociology, and their absence in Europe to any comparable degree can be justifiably taken as a reason why the sociology that emerged there had a macro bias and was harbored at the university. Chief among such uniquely American conditions was organized philanthropy, as noted above, which was practiced by women and men who were committed to the promotion of social reforms and public service agendas. Addams’ work contains sufficient evidence to support the hypothesis that her Hull-House would have been impossible without philanthropic
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137 Women’s “special gift for charity,” whereby they are “uniquely qualified to administer to the needs of the poor and sick,” has long been known and hardly ever challenged (Cohen 2002, p. 406). What remains obscure, however, is their role as philanthropists, which many of them embraced when inheriting their fathers’ or husbands’ fortunes. The organized activity of women philanthropists, with Addams herself often being counted among their numbers, has often been confused with their charity role. Although an exploration of these issues is beyond the scope of the present discussion, it should nonetheless be noted that this confusion is closely associated with the persistent misunderstanding of Addams’ social thought and action. Even women themselves have often regarded charity, which was known during the Victorian era as “social” or “civic maternalism,” as “a natural extension of their role as wife and mother” (Cohen 2002, 406). However, this natural “urge to personal service” (Gross 2002, p. 48) has nothing to do with the philanthropy of American middle-class women during the second half
support, some of which, as is clear from her records, was provided by women. Insofar as Addams’ microsociology was thus created with and dependent upon assistance provided by philanthropic donors, an important reason for why it declined was the development of an unfavorable social climate, the changing winds of public opinion, and the withdrawal of such support, following the outbreak of war, for the type of social service Hull-House provided and for her pacifism, including the drive to disengage from the war effort. Sensitivity to political and economic conditions may also have been one of the reasons why Chicago sociology withdrew from public life and took shelter behind the doors of the university.

This type of phenomenon may be defined as an instance of the “finalization of science,” a term that became popular in the social studies of science during the 1980s. The “finalization of sociology,” interpreted in socio-psychological terms, would then mean a “re-socialization” of sociology, which had been conditioned by the suppression of its original identity and its replacement by an alternative identity that marked the turning away of sociology from its humanist aspirations, social mission, and public role. Since the problem from this perspective concerns what may be referred to as sociological amnesia, and not the particular identity of individuals who were forgotten, the healing process may involve nothing less than a grand historical reconstruction of sociology’s original and complex identity, scientific role, social function, and mission.

Addams’s sociology had a major feature that was not merely evident in her published works, but also imbedded in the very design of Hull-House. Key in this regard was her insistence upon being a sociologist outside the university, where she believed that the sociology she had in mind should reside. Moreover, being a middle-class woman who had moved to the slums made it possible for Addams to acquire a unique inside-outside observation position. It is noteworthy that modern sociological systems theory claims that modernity can be observed as a whole only from such an inside-outside observation position, which, as Luhmann established, is inaccessible not only to macrosociology, but also to Meadean symbolic interactionism. This means that since the accepted works in the sociological canon have all been launched from one particular perspective, and are thereby unable to know how things look from the other side, they

---

138 For a presentation of this concept, see Schäfer 1983.
139 Law and Lybeck 2015.
140 Luhmann 1998.
are also unable to gain an understanding of any living social whole. But Luhmann did not extend his inquiry to the margins of sociology, where the forgotten sociologists, including Addams and Cooley, could have provided him with the evidence that an observation of the social from the “other side” is possible. The conundrum that he encountered concerning the impossibility of observing society as a whole may thus in fact have a sociological solution. What is necessary is the employment of two different sociological perspectives which, in their complementarity, mutual interaction, and intersection, will render modernity observable and knowable as a whole. While this issue must be addressed in greater detail elsewhere, it should be noted that a model for such relationships, with which Luhmann himself agreed, was developed by the Norwegian sociologist Stein Bråten. His “third-position” model comprises perhaps the most promising systems solution for the problem of the observation of modern society that Luhmann encountered.142

Addams’ microsociology is important evidence of the fact that at least one type of classical sociology had humanistic roots from its very inception and was not value neutral. The emphasis in Addams’ work on social ethics makes it clear that those who resided in the settlement did not come to the slums as “colonizers,” and that co-habitation with the neighbors was deliberately intended to be of mutual benefit, for it was an enterprise not only with the scholarly sociological mission of acquiring knowledge and writing books, but also with the social mission of working for the community of neighbors and for the common good.

The model of professional sociological behavior that Addams established implied a form of social mobility that allowed for overcoming the distance between the researcher and her object of study. This issue has never been a problem for the natural sciences, where keeping a distance from the object of study has always been regarded as both an advantage and a guarantee of “scienticity” and “objectivity.” Addams was apparently the first sociologist who questioned the relationship between truth and objectivity. Her strong objections to calling Hull-House a “sociological laboratory” makes it clear that she understood the methodological implications of imposing this type of identity upon an enterprise that was supposed to produce sociological knowledge from subjectively experienced truths. By locating her sociological enterprise in the slums at Hull-House, Addams showed a much deeper understanding than any of her contemporary sociologists of the main obstacle to institutionalizing a science that had the
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ambition of comprehending social life – something that is impossible if social life is observed only from the outside.

Addams’ emphasis upon qualitative methods also provides an indication that while she understood the necessity of quantitative methods and their suitability for collecting the facts needed in the study of social organizations and structures, she nevertheless found them to be too insensitive for the study of social life and the production of true knowledge about it. Her methodology was in some sense a modified “anthropology at home” that was based upon the mobility of the researcher and her belonging to two different homes – that of self and that of the other.

There is little doubt that Hull-House was Addams’ home, but her expositors perhaps went too far by not acknowledging the fact that she used to retreat from Hull-House to another house and home far from the slums to write her books – “to the northern suburb of Waukegan, or to Mackinac Island, or still later to Bar Harbor and Hot Springs.” Far from forming “an irony” at the heart of her books about the great city, this fact reveals that Addams was a sociologist of a type quite similar to the anthropologist, and yet something new. Her professional role was comprised of two different but interdependent roles – that of a neighbor, settler, and social entrepreneur when “at home” in Hull-House, and that of a sociologist who writes her sociological books only when taking a distance from life, that is, when “away” from Hull-House and back home in the world from which she had come. This dual role model based upon mobility appears to have been especially designed by Addams for the role of a microsociologist like her. Here there is yet another essential difference between micro and macrosociologies. While the role of the macrosociologist can best be played when seated in a chair in a university office, where being still comprises an advantage, the microsociologist can never play her role if tied to one particular standpoint or location – mobility is a precondition for good microsociological work.

Hull-House as a Prototype of a Social Enterprise

Addams regarded microsociology as both a science and a social enterprise. Consequently, her idea of creating an alternative enterprise would capitalize upon the advantages of an economic enterprise, but employ a different ethics. In *Democracy and Social Ethics* she drew a distinction between two types of ethics – *individual* and *social ethics* – arguing that the ills of democracy could be healed only by more democracy, which is inseparable
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from social ethics. While Addams’ primary goal was to demonstrate the dehumanizing consequences of the introduction of individual ethics in all spheres of private and public social life, she did not go further to declare a “war” on capitalist society, which promoted individual and discouraged social ethics. And although she did not approve of laissez-faire and understood that the non-interference of the state in individual affairs could well lead to an intolerable increase in inequality and the polarization of society, as a true democrat she could not support restrictions on the freedom of individual conduct and action. Democracy thus had to be “socialized” by its own means, through the improvement or humanization of existing economic practices and forms.

That Addams would arrive at the radically novel idea of socializing the most successful form of capitalism – the enterprise – should be no surprise insofar as she herself had been exposed since childhood to the conflicting natures and dilemmas of capitalism, industrialism, and democracy. Addams was the daughter of a passionate democrat, abolitionist, and successful entrepreneur, who was not only involved in helping his community undertake collective efforts to improve the conditions of local life, but also assisted individuals in beginning their own enterprises. Her biographies provide evidence that she was encouraged by such an example to begin thinking about the possibilities of creating alternative enterprises that would be as successful in producing social good as they were in producing individual wealth.

Addams successfully combined the role of a social entrepreneur with that of a sociologist, becoming an innovator who developed the idea of grounding microsociological work in a social enterprise. While her Hull-House can thereby be defined as the prototype of a social enterprise in which her innovative idea was given a material form and put to the test, her sociology comprised an empirical science that produced knowledge capable of serving as a basis for social enterprise. Her idea of the fruitful symbiosis of sociology and social enterprise is unparalleled in the history of the social sciences, and it transforms Hull-House into the first sociological institution. She noted that since “the settlements had antedated by three years the first sociological departments in the universities and by ten years the establishment of the first Foundation,” the settlement sociologists “were the actual pioneers in field research.”

This innovative conception of sociology as both a science and a social enterprise was designed from the beginning as “an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions
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of life” in the city.\textsuperscript{146} Addams’ project of founding sociology thus preceded the institutionalization of sociology at the University of Chicago, where sociology gradually abandoned its micro-concern and took a distance both from its social entrepreneurial role, and from its public.

Addams did not believe in the possibility of social amelioration unsupported by a direct knowledge of social life, and she consequently expressed throughout her works the doubt that improvement in social conditions could be left in the hands of politicians and brought about by political measures. In Addams’ time, there was no solid sociological knowledge that could have been applied, no sociological institutions and research programs – no solid ground upon which one could have built a castle for Comte’s Queen.

Addams was a self-made sociologist, inspired primarily by Comte’s sociological goal of improving social conditions, with which she had become familiar while traveling in Europe.\textsuperscript{147} However, she did not accept his positivistic methodology, which she thought inappropriate for the study of social life, and did not endeavor to develop an abstract theory of human order and progress. Addams apparently assumed that it was the latter that had led to the failure of Comte’s grand sociological project of a theory of society as a positive polity. She instead sought to test a new concept and method for producing knowledge about social life from interaction with the very people who were living in the conditions that needed to be changed. This knowledge would then be the basis for gaining an understanding of how society operates and serve as a basis for introducing improvements in people’s daily lives. Her commitment to qualitative methodology, which was significant in this regard, was intended to make success possible where Comte’s positivistic methodology had failed.

Hull-House was a daring and risky endeavor that involved leaving a safe, well-organized social world and a comfortable home in a middle-class neighborhood and settling in another world in the Chicago slums, the outcome of which could not have been known in advance, as is the case with entrepreneurship in general. Addams’ aim was to construct, test, and demonstrate the validity of a new sociological concept that could not have been derived from some existing sociological theory or simply be regarded as the creative application of an already developed conception. From this point of view, Hull-House was not established in order to apply sociology, but rather was the prototype of a social technology that had to be tested in practice in respect to its ability to produce knowledge of social life and

\textsuperscript{146} Addams 2002a.
\textsuperscript{147} Addams 1911, p. 83.
help alleviate the troubled conditions within a society that had been torn apart by a rampant process of industrialization and modernization.

Addams was also a self-made social entrepreneur. She evidently possessed the remarkable entrepreneurial skill of “combining,” which involves detecting opportunities and bringing together the most diverse forces in a cooperative effort to realize ideas and attain commonly defined social goals. She opened Hull-House as a social enterprise that offered an occupation to social scientists whose profit for doing socially useful sociological work would be evident above all in the acquisition of a modern self, the superiority of which is obvious in its being more than itself since it also includes the other. This subject-object self would later be theoretically articulated in symbolic interactionism. We should also note that viewing Addams as a social entrepreneur resolves some of the problems in Addams scholarship that concern her “multiple identities,” for, as a social entrepreneur, she initiated the institutionalization of new sciences and enterprises, which she then left on their own to take the form that their own social practice dictated.

It is known from the literature on entrepreneurship that the ability to combine is an important entrepreneurial virtue. Schumpeter, for example, referred to the principle underlying the “enterprise as such and the productive conditions of the whole economic system” as “combination.” This idea appears to persist even in some of the most influential approaches to entrepreneurship today, whereby an enterprise is defined as “the carrying out of new combinations, such as activities related to producing and delivering new goods and services, developing new production methods, opening new markets, discovering new sources of raw materials, and so forth.” It is little known, however, that Addams had an understanding of the essence of the capitalist enterprise much earlier than writers in Europe began to theorize about it. She observes in a work from 1895, “The Settlement as a Factor in the Labor Movement,” that she and the other residents at Hull-House well understood the essence of the enterprise and the source of its power – the “power to combine” – stating that

They [residents at Hull-House – V.M.] would doubtless have said that the discovery of the power to combine was the distinguishing discovery of our time; that we are using this force somewhat awkwardly, as men use that which is newly discovered. In social and political affairs the power to combine often works harm; but it is already operating to such an extent in com-

mercial affairs, that the manufacturer who does not combine with others of his branch is in constant danger of failure.\textsuperscript{150}

Addams herself occasionally compared Hull-House to a social enterprise that resembles, from an outsider’s perspective, “a cumbrous plant of manifold industries,” but “needs no endowment, no roll of salaried officials.” She added that

[Viewed as a business enterprise it is not costly, for from this industry are eliminated two great items of expense – the cost of superintendence and the cost of distribution. All the management and teaching are voluntary and unpaid, and the consumers – to continue the commercial phraseology – are at the door and deliver the goods themselves.\textsuperscript{151}

I take this statement to be the earliest description of what today is termed a not-for-profit social enterprise. It appears possible to subsume all types of not-for-profit enterprise under the term “social enterprise,” but not all “social enterprises” are not-for-profit since some do not exclude a degree of profit, however limited and controlled.

Addams was an expert at bringing about seamless combinations, and her own professional profile was a combination of sociology as a calling and social enterprise as a mission. She thus established Hull-House as a place where educated young people could be further trained to become social entrepreneurs who produce social value and improve sociological knowledge about social life. One can conclude from both her private records and published works that an important skill to be acquired through such training was the ability to take the other’s position and view social facts and events from no less than two points of view – those of the self and the other. Addams regarded taking the position of the other as an expression of social ethics, and her disapproval of the business attitude of social workers at Hull-House, discussed above, should be understood in terms of her conviction that sociology must be an ethical science if it is to be the science of society and social life. Her commitment was rather to another ideal of social service, one that was not regarded by the professionals engaged in such service “steadily from the business point of view.” This ideal was not associated with the “psychology of the business world” and for-profit entrepreneurship, but rather expressed the not-for-profit attitude.\textsuperscript{152}

From this perspective, however, Hull-House emerges as a radically different type of settlement than Toynbee Hall, although both were equally
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motivated by general social concerns about the deterioration of the human condition that had been brought about by industrialization and capitalist enterprise, marked by the waste of human life, psychic suffering, and physical misery. Toynbee Hall was by its very design an extension of the university and a “research laboratory for social reform,” and it thereby comprised an effort to realize a different ideal of social service than Hull-House. The settlers at settlements like Toynbee Hall were not altruists. They were rather Cambridge and Oxford students engaged in social work who participated in university settlements as a “useful preparation for political, bureaucratic or journalistic careers.” Such settlements were in fact considered to be “colonies’ of self-training social workers,” whose mission comprised “attempts to extend the social reach of the Ancient Universities and to broaden their function.” Hull-House was not a colony, and the settlers there were no “colonizers.” Addams’ resistance to referring to Hull-House as a “research laboratory” must thus be regarded as an expression of resistance to the efforts of university men to transform Hull-House into a replica of Toynbee Hall.

The creation of a prototype is often considered to be the first step in any enterprise. It first emerges as an idea in the head of a thinker, but must then be materialized and developed further, shaped by various interests and social forces that have control functions and come to be equally involved in defining the form the enterprise will take. Addams’ Hull-House was an innovative concept that broke new ground – it did not “expand or repeat” existing settlement models, such as Toynbee Hall. Nor did it resemble in any way something like “opening a new Italian restaurant in a neighborhood that did not have one.” The career of Hull-House, from its inception to its decline, was that of a prototype based upon a well thought-through sociological conception. Addams had no name for this prototype, as she acknowledged in her Newer Ideals of Peace. However, there is a clear disadvantage associated with continuing to use the term “settlement” – doing so will keep Hull-House and Toynbee Hall categorized together and prevent their differences from coming into focus.
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Microsociology Needs what the Social Enterprise Has: A Public

Modern sociology is a social science that tore itself away from its humanistic roots on the way to its so-called professionalization, which gave rise to a problem that has been described as sociology no longer being public. However, the difficulties encountered in trying to imagine how sociology today might once again assume its public role and recover what it once had been are themselves revealing in respect to what was lost. Stephen Turner has proposed that what sociology lost was its public. He claims in this regard that the existence of an “intellectually inclined Christian community” was important for the creation and maintenance of public sociology, adding that this “sociological public” was lost when the Christian community shrank throughout the world.156

However, this view possesses an inherent externalist bias which implies that classical sociology was a type of sociology without agency, whose development was entirely determined by external forces and conditions. Stated otherwise, this position maintains that the existence of “receptive audiences” is a necessary pre-condition without which sociology supposedly cannot become “public” since there would then be no interaction partner with whom sociologists could engage in the discussion of public issues. Jonathan Turner, Leonard Beeghley, and Charles Powers’ sociological interpretation of Comte’s career “from promising brilliance to intellectual isolation” promotes a different understanding of the relationship of sociology to publics, however. They assert that after Comte’s *Positive Polity* was published – in which “his science had taken a backseat to his advocacy” – he became desperate to find an audience. And since he was not successful, he “was reduced to lecturing to a ragtag collection of workers and other interested parties,” thereby loosing “the respect of the scientific, academic, and intellectual community.”157 In other words, Comte lost his academic colleagues and scientific admirers as an audience and was forced to search for a substitute audience beyond academia.

From a symbolic interactionist perspective, the public that sociology needs in order to become public sociology has no inherently objective existence, being neither an object, nor a “thing.” It has to be created through interaction and be assigned the role of an interaction partner. For this purpose, the sociologist must first extend a gesture in order to address a disinterested mass of people whom she would like to engage in mutual symbolic exchange. The public then emerges as comprised of those who

157 J. Turner et al. 2007, p. 11.
understood that they were being addressed by the gesture and responded, thereby acquiring the consciousness of a public.

Inquiring into how a public for sociology can be created and how it might be lost is an issue that clearly leads us back to the beginning of public sociology and to Addams, who has indisputably and consistently been acknowledged as a master of an indispensable sociological trade—talking-with-a-public. Having settled in a problem area of a great town and gaining first-hand experience of the difficulties that beset the human condition, Addams acquired the knowledge and interaction skills that gave her the authority to address and create a large public—comprising people from all walks of life, regardless of nationality, class, race, age, education, or religion—who became both her receptive audience and her interaction partners. Addams defined the settlement as “an institution attempting to learn from life itself” that was committed to efforts “to interpret the contemporaneous situation and to make it usable,” adding that this “demanded an ever-widening public who should have a sympathetic understanding of those social problems which are of such moment to all of us.”

Life itself is an important teacher in Addams’ school of microsociology. A related issue is another of microsociology’s specificities—“having experience with” or “having been there” is an important source of knowledge and a complement to any formal education, while possessing such personal properties in macrosociology is no merit and makes little difference.

What can be learned today from Addams, and what so far cannot be found in the social entrepreneurship literature, dominated as it is by economic and psychological approaches, is that creating one’s own public is an essential prerequisite for the success of any social enterprise. This invites the conclusion that sociology is no longer public because it has detached itself from its foundation and lost certain basic sociological skills, which hopefully continue to exist in various marginal and “nontraditional” sociological fields.

Concluding Remarks
When Addams showed her nephew James Weber Linn the “truckload” of files with her records from Hull-House that were to be used as material for the biography that he was entrusted to write after her death, Linn stated that he intended to give them to “the Jane Addams School of Social Service at the University of Chicago, when they call it that.” Addams objected that this school would someday be called “the Abbott School” after
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Edith and Grace Abbott, her admired collaborators at Hull-House. She was proved right. The School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago has indeed acknowledged the two Abbotts as “founding mothers” held in high esteem for their contributions to professional education in social work, social services in Chicago, and research concerning social problems.

Linn expressed the opinion that although Addams played an indispensable role both for the “growth of scholastic interest in sociology,” and “for developing the profession of social service,” her contribution was such that she would never receive recognition for her efforts, nor be given credit for making the emergence of these disciplines possible. He wrote in his “Introduction” to Addams’ biography – apparently with her consent – that he would leave the task of interpreting her intellectual heritage and scholarly contribution to the sociologists of the future.

Linn also stated that Addams “did not go to live on Halsted Street either as a ‘social worker’ or as a student,” which can be taken as a reference to what distinguished Hull-House from Toynbee Hall. The present discussion argues that Addams instead settled at Hull-House to test her ideas regarding a social technology capable of producing a wealth of sociological knowledge that could be employed for improving social conditions and enhancing society’s ability to change and thus, in its turn, produce social value. Hull-House was thus a project that had both a sociological and a social agenda from its very beginning.

Addams was the founder and pioneering leader of a science which, as a unity of theory and practice, can be defined neither as social service, nor as social work. The School of Social Service Administration had from its inception the goal of educating social workers with the skills needed to make a difference in individual lives. If it instead had aimed to educate change-makers capable of applying sociological knowledge to the organization of social enterprises that change society through the production of social value, then it would have discovered the contemporary social value of Addams’ classical sociological heritage. Social entrepreneurship is only one among the many important concepts included in strategic management courses today, with the most important educational programs in the field being found at business schools, where Addams’ name is hardly mentioned. But if a school of social entrepreneurship is established someday at a university under the auspices of sociology, then the best choice
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would arguably be to name it after her – The Jane Addams School of Social Entrepreneurship.

Designating a given phenomenon by a different term in order to better come to grips with it is a well-known research strategy in science. In the present case, defining settlements in terms of social enterprises creates new possibilities for distinguishing between not only two types of sociologies – micro and macro – but two types of social enterprise as well. The one is the European model of for-profit social entrepreneurship, represented by Toynbee Hall, that has a strong affiliation with charity philosophy; the other is the American prototype of not-for-profit social entrepreneurship, represented by Addams’ Hull-House, that is closely associated with the philosophy of philanthropy. Speaking of settlements in this way makes possible new advances in a number of sociological fields, not least the sociology and social psychology of entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship.

It may suffice to note that when students of social entrepreneurship turn to Addams’ sociological heritage, they will find nothing less than a rare sociological treasure comprising 40 years of pioneering ethnographic research presented in the form of a rich auto-ethnographic record, with a wealth of insights into the work of the social entrepreneur – from seeing an opportunity and the birth of an idea, to the creation of a prototype and its testing in life. While some may regard Addams' project at Hull-House as not having withstood the test of time, there nevertheless is more than one good reason to revisit her sociological legacy. What leads sociologists today back to her work is not merely the ambition to retrieve a forgotten sociological identity and illuminate an obscure part of the discipline's classical foundation. They are also driven by the imperative that sociology make its long overdue contribution to the joint efforts of the social sciences to create a sociologically meaningful theory of the nature of the “social” in social entrepreneurship and provide a rigorous definition of the latter's true essence.

Students of sociology may have even greater reasons to turn to Addams’ works. They will find there the lost classical foundation of microsociology, which aspired not only to bring enlightenment and improve the social condition, but also to propose a solution to the most intractable of all sociological problems – finding a moral alternative to war.
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