6. Cosmic Patriotism: Jane Addams and the Chicago Immigrant’s Cosmopolitan Ethic and Experience

David Östlund

An absurd phrase from an age of cancelled cosmopolitanism

In recent years ‘cosmopolitanism’ has become a hotly discussed topic. Social scientists such as Ulrich Beck and philosophers such as Kwame Anthony Appiah are trying to define an up-to-date version of the concept, and to elaborate on its contemporary relevance.¹ A remarkable feature in such considerations is the effort to strike a balance between seemingly contradicting views and values – to find syntheses, and to avoid falling in the ditch on either side of the road. The background involved here is obviously a matter of experience. The logical and practical consequences of intellectual excesses in opposite directions have posed the challenge of re-examining the questions asked and answered: Is there a kind of ethical universalism possible? One which avoids the implicit ethnocentric absolutism that has been the besetting sin of the Western world, ever since the supposed yardsticks of Christianity or Enlightenment became entangled with colonialist and imperialist

demands of submission? Is a cultural relativism possible? One which pays full respect to difference, to the substantial otherness of others – without falling into a particularistic essentialism by treating real human beings as the prisoners of monolithic and preferably isolated collective identities? The following pages aim to re-introduce a voice from the past into this debate – a voice that carried out a somewhat similar balancing act a century ago, and did so within a dual sociological and philosophical effort to deal with an ultra-modern cosmopolitan experience, as well as attempting to phrase cosmopolitan ethics for an emerging new world. True, there are good reasons to doubt the value of the history of ideas as a kind of storeroom of wisdoms, applied to contemporary problems without further thought of our own. But there is often something to learn from the intellectual efforts of the past, especially if our own aim is to re-examine the presuppositions of established debates, and to re-examine the way to pose our questions.

We are going back to a point in time and space where a modern discussion of cosmopolitanism was usually presented with the reasons for anchoring its starting-point similar to the ancient Greeks: in the city, polis – in urban culture. At this specific juncture in history, the economic forces of the second industrial revolution of the late 19th century had in a very conspicuous way broken the relative cultural particularity of the polis, turning the emerging giant Metropolis into a veritable Cosmopolis. A city like Chicago was not just a hub of contacts transgressing borders: as if by a stroke of magic a small trade station had turned into the hometown of over a million people, most of them having left traditional rural and urban settings on the other side of the ocean in order to find a better future. Such experiences were food for thought a hundred years ago.

---


3 I use the term ‘the second industrial revolution’ in the sense of Alfred D. Chandler, stressing the qualitatively new characteristics of the development which had its breakthrough in the US and Germany in the 1880s, see, e.g., Chandler, The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business (Cambridge, MA & London: Belknap, 1977), and idem, Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism (Cambridge, MA & London: Belknap Press, 1990).
In stark contrast to our time, however, the beginning of the last century was hardly a time when cosmopolitanism was a topic of the day. On the contrary, it was the high tide of essentialist particularisms and hierarchizations, e.g., in terms of ‘race’ and sex, and, of course, in terms of national identities and the nation state. Two ‘cosmopolitan moments’ are said to have occurred in modern intellectual history before the current rediscovery: the late 18th century and the years after World War II. The years in focus here were probably the most ‘non-cosmopolitan’ of all of the years in between. In 1907, for example, the historian Friedrich Meinecke declared the word ‘weltbürgerlich’ to be completely depreciated or ‘cancelled’ (entwertet). Although Meinecke partly attempted to rehabilitate the term, by stressing the positive links between a general notion of Humanitas and sound forms of patriotism, his Cosmopolitanism and the National State nonetheless delineated the developments in the case of German intellectual history from the age of Wieland and Kant to that of Bismarck and von Treitschke – the story which soon, in the wake of the major clash between industrially armed patriotisms in World War I, would end up in the quintessential negation of every imaginable variety of cosmopolitanism in the spirit of the Third Reich.

In the same year as Meinecke’s book was published, one of the most eloquent intellectuals of the era, Jane Addams, was almost at a loss for words. Shrewdly though, she immediately turned her

---


6 Modern historical research on Addams began in the 1960s, especially as Christopher Lasch made her the key figure in his still thought-provoking The New Radicalism in America 1889–1963 (New York & London: Knopf, 1965), in parallel with editing a commented anthology of key texts by her, The Social Thought of Jane Addams (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965). In recent years the literature has grown into vast proportions. Concerning Addams’s personal development up to the turn of the 20th century, Louise W. Knight has meritoriously
own uncertainty concerning terminology into a rhetorical tool – challenging her readers to think for themselves. This happened as she was summing up the moral of a pretty strange book of hers. *Newer Ideals of Peace: The Moral Substitutes for War* was obviously intended as a discussion of international relations. It was a treatise on war and peace. But in fact the contents of the book mainly dealt with *social* problems – at a *local* level. And in connection with this it dealt with politics – at the *municipal* level. Basically the book grappled with the depth of the problems, the challenges and also the hopes of the ultra-modern, industrialized big city. Addams more or less explicitly discussed her hometown *Chicago* as a concrete example of the modern metropolis, and as such as a kind of test case regarding general trends of development. What was the connection then, between the dilemmas of local politics and social reform in the modern city on the one hand, and the issues of global relations, war, and peace on the other hand? What was the point of more or less ignoring the level of the nation and the state, jumping from the *local* to the *global* without mediation at a level that was the obsession of most social thinkers of the era – long before anyone had ever heard of ‘glocalization’?

Addams was trying to outline a ‘new internationalism’ which she had found to be developing from local experience in Chicago – the place which due to its completely overwhelming majority of new immigrants was *the* cosmopolitan city. This particular cosmopolitan humanitarianism, as she also called it, was something quite different than the *old* ideals of peace. Those ideals included the purely negative critique of war, based on sentimental pity for the victims (her personal hero Leo Tolstoy was hinted at as one of the examples of this), as well as prudent worries about the waste of

---

returned to the sources in *Citizen: Jane Addams and the Struggle for Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), although Knight’s general pattern of interpretation appears pretty problematic to me (especially with regard to the issue of intellectual continuity or discontinuity 1889–1895). Knight stresses the role of rhetoric in Addam’s thinking. Merits and problems of a quite different nature are to be found in Mary Jo Deegan’s studies concerning Addams’s role in social science: *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School 1892–1918* (New Brunswick & London: Transaction Books, 1988) and *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago: A New Conscience Against Ancient Evils* (Westport: Praeger, 2002).
resources through an arms race and combat. Although she claimed there was ‘something active and tangible in this new internationalism’ she admitted it was rather difficult to make clear. She continued:

… and in our striving for a new word with which to express this new and important sentiment, we are driven to the rather absurd phrase of “cosmic patriotism.” Whatever it may be called, it may yet be strong enough to move masses of men out of their narrow national considerations and cautions into new reaches of human effort and affection.

Addams was toying with something very close to a plain contradiction in terms – ‘cosmic patriotism’. But as in all shrewd rhetoric, the apparent paradox was dependent on the perspective of the reader, and Addams strove, as she always did in her texts, to open up new ways of seeing things for her expected audience – the educated Anglo-Saxon upper- and middle class.

In her role as a figurehead for the left wing of the ‘progressive’ reform movement of her age, Addams had developed a strategy for ushering people with backgrounds similar to her own into seeing things from the point of view of others, who then often learned surprisingly bold lessons as a result. Basically, she placed the privileged within society in school in her texts – which were often elaborations of speeches and lectures given to middle-class audiences – using the underprivileged as their teachers, and herself as an interpreter of the different languages, thought-worlds, and experiences. As an exponent of philosophical pragmatism in American intellectual life who developed her position in mutual exchange with her close friend John Dewey, among others, she used to claim that the ideas, especially the moral concepts in a broad sense, of her own social and ethnic category tended to be outdated. They were no longer adapted to the changed world they were put to use in, and were often not only bad tools for thinking, but also noxious ones. New and adequate concepts were something that developed out of

---

8 Ibid., p. 145.
new experience. And Addams, like Dewey, used the term experience in a very broad and active sense, often interchangeable with a concept of culture.9

Privileged people – the ones who in practice were those in power, even in a formally egalitarian and democratic society such as the United States – lacked the experience from which to develop the intellectual tools needed for dealing with the modern situation especially when it came to ethical ideals. Thus it was important to place the privileged in school, so to speak, making the underprivileged their teachers. This was especially important if the aim was to turn a merely formal democracy into a real democracy – or, as Addams used to phrase the idea, to make democracy social.10 A condition of reaching such a goal was to replace the monologue of the powerful and wealthy with a dialogue in which every experience had its voice. Addams’s informal but subtle sociological analyses were hence strongly connected with her philosophical and political agendas. To fight prejudice, and to make the logic of the life and thinking of those who were identified with ‘the social question’ accessible and understandable, had a moral intent. It was treated as a lever of change. This attitude was not only mirrored in her own texts, but also in much of the work of the early Chicago school of

---

9 For the case of Dewey, see Robert B. Westbrook, John Dewey and American Democracy (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991). The intellectual interplay between Addams and Dewey (whose daughter, by the way, was named after the friend of her parents) has also recently been thematized by Louis Menand in his widely read The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001), Chapter XII. This was also stressed by Christopher Lasch in 1965, who even generalized the point and claimed that ‘[t]he settlement movement and the movement for progressive education ran parallel at every point’ (New Radicalism, p. 158). Dewey was heavily involved in the activities of Hull-House (already before moving to Chicago in 1894), and after 1904 he was associated with the Henry Street Settlement in New York.

10 Locus classicus for this theme in Addams’s writings is the lecture ‘The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlement’ from 1892, which she later integrated in Twenty Years at Hull House (Chapter 6). It was republished together with its tandem lecture from the same occasion in 1892 (‘The Objective Value of a Social Settlement’) by Christopher Lasch in The Social Thought of Jane Addams, and its status as a classic text has, e.g., been confirmed by David A. Hollinger and Charles Capper, who used it in the second volume of The American Intellectual Tradition: A Sourcebook, Second Edition (New York & Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993).
sociology, e.g., George Herbert Mead and William I. Thomas, whose mentor she was in certain respects (very much in tandem with Dewey).  

*Newer Ideals of Peace* was basically a sequel to an earlier book, *Democracy and Social Ethics* from 1902. Addams thus continued to apply a certain style of sociological analysis and reflection in order to, softly but expediently, shake up her readers within their solid and narrow outlook. This time Addams followed the argument from the earlier book to what seemed to her to be its logical conclusion: its application to transnational and global issues. Between the lines she was now addressing an opinion that not only saw Anglo-Saxon middle-class culture (and perhaps the Anglo-Saxon branch of the Aryan tree of races) as the spearhead of civilization, but which also saw war and colonial expansion as a vitalizing force in the internal development of the nation. Addams had been a pacifist in the spirit of Tolstoy since the middle of the 1880s, but it was in connection with the Spanish-American War in 1898 – the debut of the United States in the role of a colonial power in the conventional sense – that she started her public career as an

---


13 This aspect of the argument, compared with the parallel discussion by William James in 1904 when the theme of the subtitle ‘The Moral Substitutes for War’ was introduced, is stressed by Linda Schott, ‘Jane Addams and William James on Alternatives to War’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 54:2 (1993), pp. 241–254.
anti-militarist and anti-imperialist.\textsuperscript{14} Her activities as the unrivalled leader of the women’s international peace movement during and after World War I would later on render her the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931.\textsuperscript{15} In \textit{Newer Ideals of Peace}, seven years before the major European war, she introduced the intellectual code that would remain visible underneath her commitment until her death in 1935. She did so while trying to let the residents of the slums of the modern kosmopolis teach her hubris-stricken fellow members of the privileged strata of American society a lesson in this new moral attitude which she – with a smile on her lips – toyed with calling ‘cosmic patriotism’.

The Hull-House experience: transgressing the front of social war

Before I briefly outline what this lesson was, and in what sense it was supposed to teach a kind of ‘patriotism’, I will include just a few words on the specific position from which Addams spoke – a position which is essential to comprehend in order to understand what she spoke about. At least this was her own view of the matter. In the preface to her most read book, the autobiographical \textit{Twenty Years at Hull House} from 1910, she begged her readers’ pardon because the ‘conclusions of the whole matter’ could be found to be

\textsuperscript{14} Knight, \textit{Citizen}, pp. 394–395. The importance of the Spanish-American War as a background is also mirrored in Schott, ‘Jane Addams and William James on Alternatives to War’.

\textsuperscript{15} Concerning Addams’s highly controversial position during and after World War I, see especially her own writings: \textit{Jane Addams, Emily G. Balch, & Alice Hamilton, Women at the Hague}, [1915] (Amherst, NY, 2003), and \textit{Jane Addams, Peace and Bread in Time of War}, [1922] (Urbana & Chicago, 2002). For the context see, e.g., Leila J. Rupp, ‘Constructing Internationalism: The Case of Transnational Women’s Organizations, 1888–1945’, \textit{The American Historical Review}, 99:5 (1994). Addams was awarded the Nobel Prize together with one of her antipodes in the American political landscape, Nicholas Murray Butler. I have discussed this (among other things) in an unpublished paper for a seminar at the Nobel Museum, Stockholm, February 2006: ‘Fred på rättfärdighetens grund: ömsesidighetsideal från Addams till King’ [Peace Based on Righteousness: Ideals of Mutuality from Addams to King].
very similar to those of her earlier two books, but she claimed that in those texts she had attempted to ‘set forth a thesis supported by experience’, while she in the third volume endeavoured to ‘trace the experiences through which various conclusions were forced upon me’.\textsuperscript{16}

Being the daughter of a rural small industrialist, Addams had embarked upon her way to fame at the age of 29, with the founding of an institution. In 1889, Hull-House opened in a Chicago slum district as one of the first ‘social settlements’ in the United States. Hull-House immediately became the flagship of the American settlement movement, which soon came to outgrow its slightly older British counterpart. The basic idea of a social settlement was that a group of wealthy and educated people settled in a house or an apartment in a working-class district of a city in order to share everyday life with the people whose distress constituted the substance of ‘the social question’. The settlers certainly came out there to help their new neighbours – and the endeavour was in that sense philanthropic. But more fundamental was the knowledge dimension of the project. The ambition was to let knowledge flow in two directions over the immense social and cultural chasm of the age: the gap between the working class and the bourgeoisie. The aspect of the effort that was connected to popular education on the one hand aimed at democratically distributing the cultural capital that was seen to be the privilege of the rich. The aspect of analyzing the social problems and understanding them ‘from the inside’, on the other hand, aimed at refining the reform zeal – and it was in this context that the settlement movement came to be an important link between the academic social sciences and practical endeavours. Especially in the US many settlements were seen as ‘social laboratories’ with more or less formal links to university departments. In order to achieve this dual transmission of knowledge it was important for the settlement to be an open meeting-place for people of every different walk and view of life. It was not intended to be a missionary station for Christian faith (even if many settlers were believers) or for middle-class culture (although it was essential to

the task that the settlers avoided all pretence of being anything other than they were).

This vision was far from being always consistently applied. In practice, many settlements actually tended to be hubs for spreading middle-class habits and values among the working class. Even Hull-House occasionally showed tendencies towards this direction, and there were ambiguities in the attitudes and statements of Jane Addams as well. But it is safe to say that Hull-House and its leader were among the most consistent exponents of the settlement vision, and thus of a certain way of thinking about the social question, that is, a certain way of perceiving and approaching the overriding tangle of the problems of the day. They embodied a style of thought which I have proposed calling ‘the ideal of mutuality’.\(^\text{17}\) This particular thought-style should basically be seen as a contrast to, and a reaction against, the many contemporary forms of patronizing benevolence, which tended to move top-down from conscientious industrialists and modern philanthropists.\(^\text{18}\)

The contrast was notable in the case of Jane Addams, who seldom missed an opportunity to challenge the priggish paternalism of her own class – in most cases softly, but nevertheless with an edge.\(^\text{19}\) This was particularly obvious in her apologetic analyses of the goals, means, and experiences of the labour movement. She never posed as a spokesperson for it, but acted as an interpreter – translating foreign experience and values into the frames of reference of people of her own kind. A useful resource in doing this was


\(^\text{18}\) I use the term ‘thought-style’ (*Denkstil*) in the sense of Ludwik Fleck; see David Östlund, ‘Our Preeminently Social Activity: Ludwik Fleck and Thought in History’. In *Det sociala kriget* I treated ‘the ideal’ or ‘idealism of mutuality’ with a particular stress on contrasts and similarities with an alternative, but closely related thought-style, viz. that of ‘reform-philanthropy’, which had its centre in the Charity Organization movement.

\(^\text{19}\) See, e.g., the ironic reference to ‘organized charity’s’ terminology of ‘worthy’/‘unworthy’ already in (the earlier mentioned) preface to Addams, *Twenty Years*, p. xxi.
the fact that she was not uncritical. But her criticism did not for a moment consist of concessions to the regular fears of organized labour of her era. On the contrary, she criticized the trade unions for deceiving their democratizing mission by creating new privileged groups out of the skilled, male Anglo-Saxon workers at the cost of female workers, new immigrants, and African-Americans. In this sense, her strictrues were quite close to the ones of many Marxist socialists, although she distanced herself from what in the eyes of the philosophical pragmatist seemed to be a cage of abstract dogmatism on their account, and from what she felt was a mirror image of a repressive militarist society in their attitudes to violence as a means to force change.20

One of the most fascinating aspects of Addams’s radicalism was her way of linking her feminism to her support for the labour movement and its new ethic of internationalism and self-sacrifice for justified collective goals (the latter was, of course, one of her points of reference when she spoke of cosmic patriotism in 1907). She explicitly connected her own experience of actually being part of one underprivileged group in society – women – to her efforts of interpreting the workers’ struggle for justice. In a striking way she paralleled the fatherly paternalism of the ‘family claim’, which chained upper- and middle-class girls to the private sphere, with the paternalism of benevolent employers and philanthropists, who doled out gifts of ‘charity’ or ‘welfare’ in order to receive gratitude and discipline in return.21 It has been claimed that the philosophical

20 A fine example of Addams’s stance with regard to the labour movement, besides the ones in Democracy and Social Ethics and Newer Ideals of Peace, is to be found in Addams, ‘Trade Unions and Public Duty’, The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 4: 4 (1899). This text also exemplifies the use of war-metaphors in social issues, directly connected with the Spanish-American War.

21 The key text in this respect, and thus in Addams’s writings generally, is the essay ‘A Modern Lear’, which was written in the wake of the Pullman conflict of 1894 (a drama in which she played an active role), but never published until 1912, when it appeared in The Survey, 2 November – although the main contents had been delivered orally in many contexts before that. It was also reprinted in Lasch (ed.), The Social Thought of Jane Addams. For an analysis of the text with focus on the issue of industrial paternalism, see Östlund, Det sociala kriget, pp. 73–83. For an analysis of Addams’s experience of, and role in, the dramatic events in Chicago 1894-95, see Knight, Citizen, Chapter 13-14. Knight also elucidates the relation between the argument in ‘Lear’ and the development of
pragmatism of Jane Addams – with its stress on the need to replace the monologue of the privileged with a dialogue between different experiences – thus became a precursor of the feminist standpoint theory of the late 20th century.22

A telling characteristic of the style of thought embodied in the most consistent manifestations of the settlement movement, aside from the anti-paternalist stance, was its overlaps with the zeal for peace of the era. Strikingly many of the settlement activists and sympathizers were pugnacious critics of militarism and armaments, and were prominent advocates of solving international conflicts through the means of negotiations and international law.23 In this sense they were often somewhat the heirs of the cosmopolitanism of Kant’s Perpetual Peace. Underlying this was a quite simple parallel. The state of affairs in the industrialized world was seen as a state of war between labour and capital: a war between the two paramount forces of the current historical development, each mobilizing resources of power in order to confront the other in the big clash of interests of the modern world. Occasionally the latent war manifested itself in labour conflicts – strikes and lockouts – which frequently threatened to degenerate into literal violence. Many ad-

Addams’s feminist analysis in terms of ‘the family claim’ vs. ‘the social claim’. At the same time as she wrote ‘Lear’ she was, e.g., prepared to discuss this in explicit terms of power, using terms connected with her anti-militarism: women were not entering politics and public life, she claimed, because ‘…they have been chained down by a military code whose penalty for violation is far worse than the court martial’. Knight, Citizen, p. 350. Knight has not observed though that the themes from ‘Lear’ also reappeared in Democracy and Social Ethics, although the analogy with the classic tragedy in this context had become reserved for the issue of young women and ‘the family claim’, while the Pullman conflict was discussed separately and without singling out names, i.e., without the provocative image of George Pullman in the role of Shakespeare’s mad old father/king. Addams’s ‘A Modern Lear’ has also recently been discussed in relation to Dewey’s Chicago experience in Menand, The Metaphysical Club, pp. 289–316. (Cf., Westbrook, John Dewey and American Democracy, pp. 86–104, and Lasch, New Radicalism, p. 158, as well.)


23 Addams is the most obvious case, but Herbert Stead (William Stead’s brother) in Britain and Nathanael Beskow in Sweden offer a pair of instructive and probably quite disparate European examples.
herents of the ‘ideal of mutuality’ made an explicit point of the analogy between their stance towards this war and other kinds of war. In each case the goal was to substitute the logic of the right of might with dialogue aiming at justice. True and lasting peace could not be the result of one party conquering its adversary and unilaterally determining the conditions; it had to be the outcome of a process in which all parties concerned were heard, and all claims were seriously taken into account. With regard to the ‘social war’ of industrial capitalism, this attitude included a broad range of more or less radical visions of social justice and real democracy, envisioning a future societal condition in which no one longer had a justified interest in changing the basic rules of the game, especially as the fruits of modern industrialism and its amazing potential capacity of satisfying human needs actually would serve all.

This was, of course, also a major theme in Jane Addams’s Newer Ideals of Peace. The book ended with a solemn appeal to found ‘the cause of peace upon the cause of righteousness’, and a vision of a future in which, ‘under an enlightened industrialism, peace would no longer be an absence of war, but the unfolding of worldwide processes making for the nurture of human life’. 24 She also applied the theme in more specific contexts, for example, when criticizing the contemporary United States for responding with militarist repression – with police and troops – when organized labour challenged the petrified 18th century principles of individualism and private property with their new ideals of collective solidarity and demands for equality with regard to power and resources. She also quite provocatively mocked the US, the supposed model of democracy, for actually lagging behind the German Empire – the quintessential militaristically authoritarian state – in terms of making headway towards essential elements of real egalitarian democracy by means of social policies and legislation. 25 A key problem was the American ruling elite’s comparative lack of perception and intellectual flexibility in a changed world: it kept on meeting the challenges of the 20th century with the conceptual tools of the age of the Founding Fathers. Notions such as the abso-

24 Addams, Newer Ideals, p. 145.
25 Ibid., pp. 53–55.
lute sanctity of private property were implemented against the legitimate interests of labour through court decisions and legal violence.

Solidarity among strangers: the immigrants’ exposure and ethics

In making her most distinctive argument for a new, positive, active, and creative ideal of peace, however, Addams actually left the analogy between international conflicts and the state of war between labour and capital out of the picture. In the pivotal parts of *Newer Ideals of Peace* she returned to a theme she had dealt with in *Democracy and Social Ethics* as well. This was the problem of *power* in connection with city reform in a modern cosmopolis like Chicago, where the overwhelming majority of the population were ‘new’ immigrants – mainly of the kind which English-speaking ‘old’ Americans regarded as ‘the scum of Europe’. In the eyes of the establishment these ‘hyphens’ (Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Jewish-Americans, etc.) were the main objects of *Americanization*, if not of eugenic measures and restricted immigration laws. They were targets of the seemingly hopeless task of turning them into reliable American patriots with modern habits and values – that is to say, Anglo-Saxon habits and values. In her earlier book, Addams had shocked her audience by celebrating the relative virtues of the corrupt city district boss in comparison to the morally unassailable reformer from the opposite corner of the city. The difference was that the ordinary ward boss – as a model she actually used an Irishman she had personally been fighting against for years – was familiar with the complex conditions and problems of the area as the local people saw them. He knew this

---

26 Addams opened Chapter 3 in *Newer Ideals*, ‘Failure to Utilize Immigrants in City Government’, the key chapter from our point of view, with mentioning the phrase ‘the scum of Europe’ as an example of ‘loose talking in regard to American immigration’. Characteristically she used the inclusive ‘we’ form in order to open communication with her target audience (‘we do much loose talking…’, ‘we use the phrase…’).

27 Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics*, Chapter VII (‘Political Reform’).
well enough to use it in his own interest and also managed to serve a certain minimum of his voters’ interests, thus gaining their confidence. The progressive reformer, on the other hand, which they refrained from voting for, never had the slightest clue, and his calls for change were thus viewed as irrelevant and patronizing, without regard to how obvious they may have seemed from his own point of view, i.e., from the perspective of his own corner of the city.

The moral of this story – an instructive example of Addams’s peculiar style of sociological analysis – was that leaving room for *self-government* among the people of the district was essential in order to really make life better for those who lived there. A wise reformer had to listen and understand in order to *assist* people in making changes under conditions decided by those who knew best, viz. those concerned. True democracy was not the same as forcing the new immigrants to live and think like the established citizens of the democratic republic. Real democracy showed respect for people’s different experiences, accepting and appreciating the various and continually changing *cultures* people lived with. Genuine democracy offered them a chance to form their own destinies.

In *Newer Ideals of Peace* this conspicuously local theme was expanded, and was given significance in regards to transnational relations. In doing this, Addams fell back on her highly personal readings of a pair of European thinkers from the preceding century. Far from being a Comtean positivist, she had nevertheless in her youth been fascinated by Auguste Comte’s vision of a future religion of humanity, fostering universal ‘altruism’. In 1907, she implicitly hinted at a more specific aspect of this line of thought: the reconstruction of historical developments according to which a vanishing military-aristocratic society once had been kept together by its peculiar code of ethics – including the military ethic of self-sacrifice for the sake of the group, destroying its enemies. In the eyes of the philosophical pragmatist, such values had been functional (in the Darwinian sense) in an earlier stage of social evolution. The society in which such sentiments thus had made sense in modern times had left room for an industrial society. Now this new social formation (in line with the main plot in Comte’s scheme) needed its own functional code of ethics: a similarly active, poten-
tially self-sacrificing, but also constructive social ethic aimed at serving human needs – in Addams’s terminology for ‘the nurture of human life’, rather than killing human life in order to secure the survival of a particular group (a family, a tribe, a nation).

She combined this idea with a more explicit reference to the radical national ideals of Giuseppe Mazzini. Mazzini was a quite significant figure in Addams’s world. In *Twenty Years at Hull-House* she recurred to ‘that greatest of all democrats’ in two contexts. On the one hand, in connection with her settlement’s interaction with the many Italian-Americans living in the neighbourhood, e.g., the Chicago branch of the Society of Young Italy, which presented Hull-House with a ‘heroic bust’ of him [Giuseppe Mazzini] during the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of his birth in 1905.28 On the other hand, Mazzini’s name came up in connection with her own personal development, specifically, her reading as a young woman and her experience as a child. Mazzini was closely associated with the two foremost American embodiments of the ideals of democracy and republican virtue in her personal imagination, Abraham Lincoln and her own father. Her father’s tears at the news of Mazzini’s death in 1872 had made her ashamed, she claimed, for her own ‘meager notion of patriotism’, as for the first time she realized that it was possible to share hopes and desires over national borders – even across an ocean – and that there were parallels between efforts like ‘trying to abolish slavery in America’ and ‘[throwing] off Hapsburg oppression in Italy’. As a result of her father’s grief over the Italian revolutionary, ‘impersonal and international relations’ were shown to be ‘actual facts and not mere phrases’.29

But Mazzini had made a more indirect but crucial impact on a very peculiar trait in her thought as well, although never mentioned in *Twenty Years* in connection with her reading of his *Duties of*

28 Addams, *Twenty Years*, p. 279 (‘greatest of all democrats’) and pp. 169–170 (hundredth anniversary). The bust seems to have been a token of gratitude to Addams for teaching a group of Italian men a course on Mazzini’s *Duties of Man* (apparently in part given as a course in English, free from ‘Americanization’ in the conventional sense). Knight, *Citizen*, pp. 205–206.
29 Ibid., p. 14; for Addams’s early reading see ibid., p. 50.
Man in the 1880s. This link is of interest in order to understand the argument in *Newer Ideals of Peace*. Mazzini had namely contrasted the individual citizen’s private, egoistic duties to himself and his family with his *social duties* to the nation, hence forming a better future for a unity beyond the limits of self-interest, and stressing the relative importance of the latter in relation to the former. This theme had actually been an important springboard in Addams’s articulation of a non-essentialist variety of feminism. She had begun to state that ‘the social claim’ in a very broad sense (she discarded the term ‘duty’ in this context) was just as urging for *female citizens* as it was for male ones, and that young women who gave priority to this claim at the cost of ‘the family claim’ hardly could be accused of being egoistic – although this was the established middle-class view of the question. It was a democratic right as well as a duty, for men and women alike, to participate in the creation of a good life for a larger group than oneself and one’s own kith and kin. The question for the philosophical pragmatist may then have been how the destructive dimension of such a patriotic call from the 19th century – the outdated form of self-sacrificing virtues of fighting other nations for the sake of one’s own – could be dropped on the rubbish heap of history. But Mazzini was a fitting thinker to take as a starting point in this respect. Quite consistently he had treated the national project as a step towards a socially and politically democratic world, analogous with the step from the duties to one’s own family to national responsibility, and hence a world wherein the freedom of the people of each nation was dependent on the freedom of other peoples. In *Twenty Years* Addams thus spoke of ‘this man who, with all his devotion to his country was still more devoted to humanity and who dedicated to the workingmen of Italy an appeal so philosophical, so filled

---

30 Knight, *Citizen*, pp. 142–143, 256.
31 For an analysis of those aspects of Mazzini’s (in a certain sense ‘anti-nationalist’) thinking that were particularly relevant to Addams’s notion of ‘cosmopolitan humanitarianism’, see Nadia Urbinati, ‘“A Common Law of Nations”: Giuseppe Mazzini’s Democratic Nationality’, *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 1:2 (1996), pp. 197–222. (I am grateful to Ann-Cathrine Jungar for drawing my attention to this article.)
with a yearning for righteousness, that it transcended all national boundaries and became a bugle call for “The Duties of Men”’.

In short, patriotism in the spirit of Mazzini had more to do with an active, forceful (indeed revolutionary) and practical readiness to sacrifice narrow personal interests for the sake of the interest of strangers – ultimately for all of mankind – than with a collective egoism directed against ‘others’ of one or the other definition. Later on, Addams would be given reason to reflect on two distinct faces of the phenomenon of national fervour. In the immediate wake of World War I she would travel around in Europe (among other things presiding over the founding congress of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, which probably issued the first analysis claiming the Treaty of Versailles to be a disaster). Comparing her experience of the 1880s with that of 1919, she noted that the radical, positive, and constructive variety of patriotism that she had often met east of the Atlantic in her youth now had been completely substituted by the embittered, hateful, and collectively egoistic patriotism that bore the obvious contours of rising Fascism and Nazism already in her text from 1922. But in 1907 it was still possible for her to toy with naming the new internationalism or humanitarian cosmopolitanism which she vindicated cosmic patriotism. This was the kind of global social ethic required to take the good out of industrialism while leaving the bad behind. This was the ideal of peace that in her mind was positive, active, constructive, and even aggressive.

But, returning to the distinctive argument of 1907: In what sense were the immigrants of Chicago suited to teach this attitude, when Addams now attempted to place the privileged of her era in school? In what way did the neighbours of Hull-House, in her eyes, appear to make it possible to discuss international relations in terms of local conditions, without paying much regard to the level of the state and the nation? The precious resource of the people of the districts around Hull-House was their experience. According to the philosophical pragmatist, new and adequate concepts, suitable tools to think with, were something that developed out of new experi-

32 Addams, Twenty Years, p. 169.
33 Addams, Peace and Bread, pp. 98–99.
ence, and the Chicago immigrants had this asset in abundance. In most cases they had been leaving a rural life in their old home countries behind, with fears and hopes – hopes which, to a large extent, were crushed – and been forced to live their everyday lives close together, in spite of the huge contrasts in terms of world-views, habits and values. This had hardly made these people more peaceful than anyone else. If they shouted for anything it was war rather than peace, she claimed, as their hatred of an unjust society grew in strength.\footnote{See especially the key passage in Addams, \textit{Newer Ideals}, pp. 9–10.} But they had learned to live with each other, to accept the differences and respect them, although they didn’t understand them. And out of this shared experience a new social ethic, a new humanitarianism, which was also founded in the experience of what was universally human – basic needs for food, shelter, safety and company – was growing. In spite of cultural and social gaps, the people of the modern multi-ethnic city slum were prepared to show a remarkable degree of altruism, or, as Addams preferred to say, \textit{plain human kindness}. Confronted with a shared exposure to adversity and injustice (shared ‘risks’, Ulrich Beck would possibly say), the immigrants of the modern cosmopolis had up to a notable degree developed a positive way of dealing with their exposure to strangers, i.e., to each other.

This kind of readiness to take responsibility for the needs of others than one’s own had nothing to do with the philanthropic benevolence of the upper and middle class, because – and this was probably the main point of Addams’s rhetorical deed – it was far beyond their range of experience. Which employer dedicated to ‘welfare programs’ or which lady of a charity organization would ever be prepared to let a perfect stranger with peculiar habits and views sleep over on the couch for a few weeks in times of need? Would they be prepared to do this, even if they were unable to even imagine what it would be like to have only one crowded room without water or a latrine for their families? The example of practical unselfishness, with no thought of reward, among people from the old, increasingly antagonistic nations of Europe, who had their patriotic feelings in the conventional sense divided between their old and new countries, was the true source of hope in the eyes of
Jane Addams in 1907. Her rhetorical challenge to prevalent attitudes certainly contributed to the development of new ways of seeing the issues of conflict and coexistence between states and nations. The prominent role she was given among the counterforces during the spree of militant patriotism in World War I testifies to that. But in 1907 it was quite strange to make such an argument without using the state and the nation as the starting point, instead boldly jumping from the local to the global. Even Addams’s friend George Herbert Mead had to admit, in his long and enthusiastic review for *The American Journal of Sociology*, that he had a problem with the ‘logical organization’ in *Newer Ideals of Peace*, although he fully appreciated the analyses and the moral per se.35 Perhaps her jump is less strange a century later?

* 

The same year as *Newer Ideals of Peace* was published, the African-American sociologist, pan-Africanist, and civil rights leader W. E. B. Du Bois paid one of his many visits to Hull-House. His links with the network of reformers and social analysts around Jane Addams were manifold and important. Soon afterwards, for example, a group dominated by settlement activists, among them Addams, took up the thread from Du Bois’s Niagara Movement and created the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in order to fight the most obvious of all deviations from real egalitarian democracy in the United States of the time, the Jim Crow system of apartheid. (This was a deviation that very few people were interested in challenging at that time.) This project would soon present Du Bois with a regular public platform, as for the next few decades he would be the editor of its periodical *The Crisis*.36


Juxtaposing the spirit of Hull-House in 1907 with the ‘colder, scenter curiousness’ which he sensed at the University of Chicago, he chose to characterize its atmosphere in terms of ‘cosmopolitan catholicity’. 37

Obviously this had nothing to do with ethnic diversity among the residents. Few of those who lived at Hull-House were anything else than the children of the Anglo-Saxon social elite. Harriet Rice, the African-American physician who lived there for some years in the 1890s, had been one of the few who left because they did not feel totally at home (although she returned periodically in the following decades). 38 Rather, Du Bois was probably referring to the atmosphere created by the neighbours of every background who filled the house at all hours, and of the unusual openness the residents apparently showed for listening to these people and learning from their experience. Perhaps the vision of an emerging cosmic patriotism was a bit naïve, although it was far from as naïve as it may seem at first glance. (New readers of Democracy and Social Ethics as well as Newer Ideals of Peace obviously have to judge for themselves.) But I suppose that our era, that of armed democracy fighting Muslims from Iraq and the French suburbs (and doing so in a strikingly naïve way), has something to learn from this peculiar atmosphere of ‘cosmopolitan catholicity’, with its attempt to strike a delicate

---


37 Deegan, Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago, p. 3.
38 Knight, Citizen, pp. 289, 346, 351, 387–388; Ibid., p. 38.
balance between an ethics of universal responsibility and a pronounced respect for the genuine otherness of others as well as an interest in understanding and being enriched by it, but especially by its eagerness to replace the monologues of the privileged with dialogues including all.
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