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Abstract
In March 1908 the Chicago Police Chief shot Lazarus Averbuch, a young, Russian Jewish immigrant, claiming self-defense against an anarchist plot. Jane Addams refused to join the public’s outcry of support for their chief, declaring that she had the obligation to interpret rather than denounce the incident. Her analysis of Averbuch’s killing, given in her essay, “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest,” provides a focal point for seeing how interpretation functions as a unifying theoretical category for Addams, bringing together her activism, her style of writing, and her philosophy of social change. Addams’s conception of interpretation is multi-faceted and dynamic; the interweaving lines of contrapuntal music give a fitting metaphor. I analyze the essay’s presentation of interpretation in terms of three contrapuntal voice-lines: as dramatization, as mediation-advocacy, and as reconstruction.
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“The constant student of philosophy is merely the professional musician of reflective thought.”
Josiah Royce

President Theodore Roosevelt’s warning mirrored the public’s outrage: “When compared with the suppression of anarchy, every other question sinks into insignificance.”
In March 1908 when Chicago Police Chief George Shippy shot Lazarus Averbuch, claiming self-defense against an anarchist plot, a supporting public filled the air with
denunciations against such lawless traitors. Jane Addams refused to join the outcry, declaring that social settlement houses had the obligation to interpret rather than denounce. While interpretation is recognized as a major intellectual category for some of the classical American pragmatists, principally Peirce and Royce, Addams’s understanding of interpretation has been relatively unexplored. Using Addams’s analysis of Averbuch’s killing as a focal point, I will show in this paper how interpretation functions as a unifying theoretical category for Addams, bringing together her mode of activism, her style of writing, and her philosophy of social change.

On many occasions, Addams identified a social settlement’s function in terms of interpretation. In Twenty Years at Hull-House, describing how Hull House residents helped recent immigrants navigate city and social services, she wrote, “The Settlement is valuable as an information and interpretation bureau.” Recalling how Hull-House’s involvement with unions led some people to associate the settlement with labor violence, Addams commented, “The attempt to interpret opposing forces to each other will long remain a function of the Settlement, unsatisfactory and difficult as the role often becomes.”3 In a 1911 speech Mary Simkhovitch, head resident of settlements in New York, noted that for Addams, interpretation was “the highest function of the settlement.”4 Addams had a reputation for being particularly good at interpretation. Gaylord White, head resident of New York City’s Union Settlement, commented, “This function of the settlement as an interpreter of the life of the crowded sections of our cities has received its finest expression in the genius of Jane Addams.”5

For Addams, interpretation did involve clarifying and making accessible American institutions to immigrants, and in turn, explaining immigrant customs and experiences to non-immigrant Americans. However, Addams’s use of interpretation is richer than this, and more layered. “Contrapuntal” is a helpful metaphor. In “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest,” her 1908 essay on the Averbuch affair, Addams gives an explicit discussion and demonstration of interpretation. Reading the essay is like listening to a contrapuntal composition where the voice lines weave dynamically, their meanings mutually shaped by and shaping each other. I will begin with a brief account of the Averbuch affair, and then analyze the essay’s presentation of interpretation in terms of three voice-lines: as dramatization, as mediation-advocacy, and as reconstruction. Within these voice-lines, contrapuntal sub-voices can also be heard. Addams’s immersion in multiple, interacting streams of local activity, her keen ear for the variegated voices in these streams, and her reflections on all she experienced, bore fruit in her distinctively located theorizing.
The Averbuch Story

Haymarket Square in 1886 and President McKinley’s assassination in 1901 were just the highpoints; as the century turned, the country was terrified of anarchy and anarchism. Whatever the actual threat, the charge of anarchy was effective in mongering fear, selling newspapers, and spreading political propaganda. Chicago was known as the “headquarters of anarchism in the U.S.” On March 2, 1908, an 18-year old, recent immigrant went to the home of Chicago’s police chief, George Shippy. Ten minutes after being admitted to the house, the young man was dead; Shippy, his son, and driver were wounded. In his statement to the press, Shippy claimed that the young man was an anarchist, intent on assassinating him as a public official. City officials accepted Shippy’s account that he had killed the man in self-defense, and declared there would be no an official investigation. The Chicago press was immediately full of sensationalistic stories. When it was established that the young man was Lazarus Averbuch, a recent Russian-Jewish immigrant, xenophobia was added to anti-anarchist hysteria. Two settlement houses quickly became involved, Maxwell Street Settlement, located in a neighborhood of recent Russian-Jewish immigrants, and Hull House, which in addition to working with immigrants of many nationalities, had long-established ties with Chicago’s Jewish communities. These groups were concerned about the level of community tension, and worried that the case was not being given a thorough investigation. Jane Addams, head resident at Hull-House, was contacted by members of the more established German Jewish community, including Julius Rosenwald, board chair of Sears and Roebuck; Julian Mack, a Chicago judge and Zionist leader; and Rabbi Emil Hirsch, a leader of Reform Judaism. They had long established relationships with Addams, and were financial contributors to Hull House. At their request, Addams formed a committee, collected funds, hired attorney Harold Ickes, arranged to have the body exhumed, found a trustworthy pathologist to perform a second autopsy, and facilitated reburial in a Jewish cemetery. In spite of these interventions, Shippy’s account was upheld at the inquest. Yet the case remains unresolved; why Averbuch went to Shippy’s home and what happened there have never been established.

Two months after Averbuch was shot, Addams published “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest,” her analysis of the affair. The essay begins, “Whatever other services the settlement may have endeavored to perform for its community, there is no doubt that it has come to regard that of interpreting foreign colonies to the rest of the city in the light of a professional obligation.” In the essay Addams defends her interventions in terms of carrying out the responsibilities of interpretation. Very little of the essay presents the facts of the case as an investigation or a court would seek to determine them. Interpretation is not
journalism. Regardless of how these facts turned out, Addams thought interpretation, rather than denunciation as the public demanded, was the appropriate response to the public’s fear, hostility, and inability to understand the immigrant community’s perspective.

Voice-Line I. Interpreter as Dramatist

Addams’s motive for writing the essay was to “put forward the spiritual and intellectual conditions of the foreign colony which is thus being made the subject of inaccurate surmises and unjust suspicion.”11 Addams does not assess whether the Russian Jewish community’s reactions were right or wrong, wise or foolish. Instead, she tries to “spiritualize” these immigrants to the general public. Addams and others at the time used “spiritualize” to describe their efforts to present socially despised and marginalized groups in a way that fully reveals their humanity. Du Bois, in Souls of Black Folk, reveals the “spiritual strivings” of African-Americans, so that black and white audiences alike could imagine with specificity the experience of living within the veil.12 In her 1907 book, Newer Ideals of Peace, Addams criticizes the eighteenth-century image of natural man with inalienable rights as sheer abstraction. She writes that this image gives “no method by which to discover men, to spiritualize, to understand, to hold intercourse with aliens and to receive of what they bring.”13 In “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest,” Addams spiritualizes the Russian Jews by giving them voices. Literary scholar Katherine Joslin thinks of Addams as a dramatist, noting, “Her writing blends the voices of ordinary people together with those of sociological, political, philosophical, and literary writers and, by amplifying common voices and setting them into dialogue with established authorities, she creates in print the very world she sought in fact.”14 Joslin places Addams’s writings next to Emile Zola’s call for novelists to temper their free-flowing imaginations with scientific and sociological observation. Addams, in her hybrid texts, Joslin claims, “turned the theory [of literary naturalism] inside out by making social science more like fiction.”15 Addams did this through constructing dialogues and presenting the multiplicity of voices that Bahtkin says characterizes the novel.16 “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest” is a good demonstration of turning literary naturalism upside down. In it, Addams as dramatist creates three contrapuntal roles and juxtaposes herself variably with and among them. First, she brings out the experiential contexts that shaped the moral imaginations of her white, anarchist- and immigrant-fearing readers. Next, she disaggregates and concretizes the voices of the Russian Jewish community. Finally, she identifies her interventions as enacting the American constitutional guarantees of due process.

Addams begins the drama by identifying herself with the general public—primarily white, middle-class, and non-immigrant. Using the
first person plural, she writes how “our own ancestors,” cared deeply for freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press. She identifies herself with the audience in terms of their shared immigrant heritage and shared commitment to civil liberties, and points out that recent immigrants share these same commitments, as well.\(^{17}\) Addams then interprets the public’s panicked reaction of “horror and recoil” to charges that Averbuch was an anarchist, not as irrational, but as deeply rooted in human experience. Referring obliquely to widely accepted ethnological theories of “race memory” and “survivals,” Addams links the community reaction back to early days of tribal life, where government’s basic function was military protection against outside attack. It is a short imaginative step to identify the anarchist with the traitor, that is, someone to whom protection had been granted, who then attacks the community from within.\(^{18}\)

In conveying to the audience the effect of their “horror and recoil” on members of the Russian Jewish immigrant community, Addams employs rhetorical devices through which the audience can hear the immigrants’ voices directly and feel the emotional impact that events had on them. She recounts how one Russian Jewish immigrant had said to her, “No one tries so hard as we do, to be Americans. To attach anarchy to us means persecution, plain Jew-baiting and nothing else.”\(^{19}\) She gives a vivid litany of what the community experienced in the wake of the Averbuch’s killing: a promised land sale contract was withdrawn, children in the streets were stoned, college students were forced to withdraw because of persecution from their peers.\(^{20}\) In one long, torrential sentence, Addams lists how Chicago police subjected Averbuch’s sister, Olga, and others to Russian-style police practices—raiding, ransacking, arresting, interrogating harshly, and more.\(^{21}\) Finally, speaking on behalf of constitutional guarantees to due process, Addams appeals back to the general public’s concern for legal order. Because the charge of anarchy is “so hideous an affront” to society’s “most precious of its inherited institutions,” she writes, justice demands that the facts be “carefully ascertained” and that a way of handling the situation “be soberly considered,” before the immigrant colony as a whole is stigmatized as anarchist.\(^{22}\)

Sociological data, painstakingly acquired, buttressed Addams’s rhetorical skills as a dramatist. Scholarship on Addams often discusses her work with immigrants, but rarely are the various immigrant groups disaggregated. Here I describe her extensive engagement with Chicago’s Jewish immigrant communities to show what lay behind her ability to give voice to the Russian Jewish immigrants. The Hull-House neighborhood was located immediately north of the Maxwell Street area, where the largest concentration of Eastern European and Russian Jewish immigrants settled.\(^{23}\) Several authors note how important Hull House was to many of these immigrants. Cutler, who describes the Maxwell Street
neighborhood as a recreated shtetl, estimated that often over half of the participants in many of Hull House’s classes, clubs and lectures were Jewish. Louis Wirth observes that many Jews “flocked to its concerts, lectures, and library.”

Addams had relations of long standing with many prominent Jewish leaders who were active in Chicago’s social reform organizations. In 1893, Addams and Rabbi Emil Hirsch served together on the Chicago Civic Federation. Julian Mack was judge of Chicago’s Juvenile Court and active in the Immigrant Protection League; both agencies were key Hull House projects. Julius Rosenwald was a Hull House board member. Rosenwald, Hirsch, and Addams collaborated with leaders of the African-American community on race relations in Chicago. Addams’s relation with Hannah Solomon spanned four decades. Solomon founded the National Council of Jewish Women in 1893. The Council coordinated the work of a number of Jewish women’s charity organizations with Hull House to provide relief during a recession, and to set up a nursery and kindergarten. In 1933 the National Council of Jewish Women established an office at Hull House to help Jews escape from Germany.

Addams was well acquainted with tensions between the more established German Jewish community, and the more recent Russian Jewish immigrants. Hull House hosted the meeting where German Jews, out of a sense of responsibility to the newly arriving immigrants, established the Maxwell Street Settlement. Addams heard the new immigrants in the audience accuse their benefactors of philanthropic condescension. Many of the unions that Addams and others at Hull House helped form and sustain had heavily Jewish memberships. Bessie Abramowitz, of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, on many occasions worked with Hull House on union and labor issues. Addams was a negotiator in the 1910 garment workers’ strike against Hart, Schaffner, and Marx. In this case, Abramowitz led the workers, primarily Russian Jewish immigrants, against their financially successful Jewish employers.

In 1908 a poll by the *Ladies Home Journal* identified Addams as the “foremost American Woman.” Her doings and opinions were widely reported; she was acclimated to both press adulation and press hostility. By the time Jewish leaders asked Addams to intervene on behalf of the accused anarchist, she was well prepared to do so. Hull House was known for welcoming anarchists; Peter Kropotkin had visited, and anarchist ideas were debated there. In 1901 the national and international press widely reported on Addams’s visit to the jailed Abraham Isaak, who was charged as a co-conspirator with Leon Czolgosz, President McKinley’s alleged assassin. The costs to Hull House of Addams’s interventions included rocks through windows, a mailbox full of abusive letters, and loss of financial support.
Many members of the Jewish community appreciated Addams’s essay on the Averbuch affair. Julius Rosenwald wanted it distributed widely across the country. In a letter expressing his appreciation, Rabbi Joseph Stolz of Chicago’s Isaiah Temple wrote that Addams’s “timely, temperate, wise, and courageous statement . . . deserves a place beside Zola’s famous ‘J’accuse.’” Comparing “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest” with accounts from the Chicago Jewish press demonstrates that Addams faithfully represented the concerns of various factions of the Jewish community. Her article and Jewish press accounts both stressed the psychological effects of living through the Russian pogroms. Both explained how, to the Russian Jewish immigrant community, the tactics of the Chicago police seemed to mirror those they had experienced with the Czar’s agents in Russia. Both sources reflected the tensions between the more assimilated German Jews and the newly arrived immigrants. Both raised the suspicion that Russian agents in the U.S. had manipulated the whole affair. Finally, both called for social justice and fellowship as the only cure for terrorism.

Through dramatizing the voices of the Russian Jewish community, Addams created one of the voice-lines of her contrapuntal work of interpretation. Creating that line called on her literary skills, shaped and tempered by her deep knowledge of everyday life of Jewish immigrant communities and organizations in Chicago.

**Voice-Line II: The Interpreter as Mediator-Advocate**

While Addams herself never theorized interpretation in a systematic way, Dorothy Ross, a historian of the social sciences, places interpretation at the heart of Addams’s intellectual methodology. Ross describes Addams’s interpretive sociology as generating a form of social knowledge that was “socially situated, relational, warranted by personal experience, and gendered.” Addams’s interpretive sociology reflected social settlements’ immersion in specific neighborhoods, and demonstrated Addams’s pragmatist understanding of truth as emerging out of and tested by relational interactions of daily life. Like Joslin, Ross also notes Addams’s literary sensibility, saying that she modeled her interpretive sociology on literature’s privileging of subjectivity and intuition as means toward understanding others. Ross contrasts Addams’s method to that of male pragmatists, such as Dewey, who used scientific experimentation as his model of inquiry. Ross reads Addams’s 1902 book, *Democracy and Social Ethics*, as a mature demonstration of her interpretive method. In that text, Ross claims, Addams moves among multiple constituencies, revealing the textures of daily life of her urban, immigrant neighbors to middle-class Americans. The goal of Addams’s interpretive sociology was to enable immigrants and middle-class Americans to work collaboratively toward democratic social reform.
While Ross’s account of interpretation as increasing understanding between two disparate groups is accurate, we should not conflate interpretation with the image of a neutral, even-handed mediator. Addams developed her interpretative sociology in the context of asymmetrical power relations. In this context, a mediator’s alleged neutrality most likely functions to perpetuate the privilege of the more powerful. As a corrective, Addams’s acts of interpretation also included advocacy for the less powerful; her explicit aim was to democratize disparities of economic and political power, and social status. We see this in the Averbuch affair, where Addams’s stated purpose, “to interpret foreign colonies to the rest of the city,” included acting on behalf of the immigrants so as to make the powerful pay attention to their voices.

Addams describes her interventions in terms of bringing “the sober results” of her own and the settlement houses’ long experience to bear on this specific situation. Yes, Hull-House was a busy, multifaceted institution; in 1901, over 7000 people a week used its facilities. To understand interpretation as mediation-advocacy, it is more helpful to think of Hull-House not as an institution in itself, but as a transmission node in Chicago’s vast complex of networks through which social reform, social service, education, and civic activities took place. Addams was a key transmission figure in all this activity. Because of her nearly two decades of experience with multiple Chicago factions, Addams was in a position, after Averbuch’s killing, to manipulate various municipal functions, while working with Jewish organizations, and dealing with the press.

Embeddedness in networks of relations makes responsive action possible; it also generates obligations to act. Think of Addams’s interventions—forming the fund-raising committee, acquiring permits to exhume the body and perform the second autopsy, and so on—as notes in contrapuntal lines, or as micro-actions within the intersecting lines of activity and commitment that make up human relationships. These responsibilities at times conflict, and when acting, one does not control all the variables that determine outcomes. The embeddedness in human relations that makes both knowledge and action possible also renders action morally ambiguous. Addams acknowledges “the sickening sense of compromise” attendant on action. The most difficult choices are between incompatible goods, with each alternative impure.

These ambiguities are evident in Addams’s interventions leading to Averbuch’s reburial. Some of the immigrants wanted to call a massive protest demonstration, timed to coincide with Averbuch’s reburial. Others thought this would only enflame the situation, and wanted at all costs to avoid the demonstration, while still giving the body a proper Jewish burial. Addams sided with the latter group whom she identifies as the “older and more conservative members,” and against the former,
whom she labeled “younger and more radical” and “hot-headed”.\textsuperscript{44} Averbuch’s body was exhumed, autopsied a second time, and reburied in just three hours. The matter was completed quietly just before the papers’ noon editions hit the newsstands, which was to have been the demonstrators’ signal to march.\textsuperscript{45}

One might assess Addams’s judgment and actions as wise; given Chicago politics, a mass demonstration might have increased police repression and inflamed public animosity. Alternatively, one might judge her as siding with the Jewish establishment, rather than standing in solidarity with those calling for radical, liberatory change. The point, though, is that for Addams’s understanding of interpretation as mediation-advocacy, neutrality is a mirage and an abdication of responsibility. At times one must choose in the face of uneliminable risk and uncertainty. Addams’s enactment of interpretation in the Averbuch affair reflected that awareness.\textsuperscript{46}

**Voice-Line III: Interpretation as Reconstruction**

Addams often used her reflections on current events as occasions for theorizing about the meaning of democracy, the sensibilities needed for social justice, and more broadly, about patterns of thought and human relationships. At these times, Royce’s epigraph is illustrative: “the professional musician of reflective thought” aptly describes Addams’s theorizing. The analysis of interpretation given thus far, with the images of dramatist and mediator-advocate, is only a partial account. These two images do not sufficiently locate the event to be interpreted within longer arcs of experience that intersect in a particular event. In the Averbuch case, these arcs included the life histories of Russian Jewish immigrants; Addams’s decades of work on social reform; the settlement house movement itself; and local, national, and even international politics. By placing the Averbuch affair within these longer arcs of experience, we can understand interpretation as engagement in dynamic, long-term reconstruction of selves, community, and shared meanings. Martin Luther King’s well-known adaptation of Theodore Parker’s words is suggestive: “The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.”\textsuperscript{47} Addams’s interventions in the Averbuch affair were points within her lifelong efforts to bend multiple arcs of experience toward justice.

Reconstruction is a central theme for classical American pragmatists. Eschewing foundationalism, pragmatists understand reality, truth, and knowledge as products of interactions between organisms and the environment. As interaction is ongoing, reconstruction of these fundamental philosophical categories is also continuous. Human individual selves and communities are likewise in constant interaction with physical, social, and cultural environments, and hence, selves, communities, and meanings are also continually being reconstructed. Through interpreta-
tion Addams attempted to bend three experiential arcs, thereby directing their reconstruction toward justice. These included the experiential arcs of the interpreter’s self, of the community, and of meanings of citizenship. To bring out these reconstructive dimensions of interpretation, I place George Herbert Mead’s theorizing on self and society and Charles Horton Cooley’s conception of the social self in contrapuntal interaction with Addams’s reflections in “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest.”

Interpretation and Reconstructing the Interpreter’s Self

George Herbert Mead was active in civic and social reform movements in Chicago. He worked closely with settlement workers, and from 1908–1922, served on the Board of Directors of the University of Chicago Settlement. He heard Addams present a version of “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest” at the University of Chicago’s Quadrangle Club on April 11, 1908. The next day he wrote her,

I presume that you could not know how deep an impression you made last night by your very remarkable paper. My consciousness was . . . completely filled with the multitude of impressions which you succeeded in making, and the human responses which you called out from so many unexpected points of view. . . . I want to express my own very profound appreciation of the human document you read to us.

We can understand why Mead was so struck by Addams’s approach. Mead regarded personality, and not imposed structure, as at the heart of social organization. In a talk he gave at Hull House about proposed Chicago school system reforms, he said, “Teaching is not a mechanical art; it is a social process; it is a process in which personalities come into contact with each other; and where we have contact of personalities, we have social organization. This organization cannot be imposed from the outside, it must arise from the interaction of these living personalities.” Mead states that the “foundation . . . of settlement theory and practice” was the fact that settlement workers live in a neighborhood and make that their home. Their ability to understand their neighbors and to improve social conditions, he wrote, “flow from this immediate human relationship, this neighborhood consciousness.”

Mead’s emphasis on ‘personality’ and ‘neighbors’ would have been familiar to the initial readers of “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest.” Addams’s essay was published in Charities and the Commons, a professional journal for charity workers and settlement workers. In their discourse, personality, neighborliness, sympathy, citizenship, fellowship, and interpretation were clustered terms. We can trace this vocabulary back to Samuel Barnett. Toynbee Hall, which Barnett founded in 1884 in London, inspired the American settlement movement.
The initial sensibility was Victorian; Barnett used Carlyle, Ruskin, and Arnold to frame his understanding of the settlement’s work. By living in a poor, industrial neighborhood, the educated and well-to-do could share their knowledge and good character with the poor through fellowship and friendship. While these Victorian assumptions well describe Addams’s mentality when she founded Hull-House in 1889, her understanding of her task changed in the first few years. Fellow resident Florence Kelley’s investigations of Chicago sweatshops, Hull House’s work with labor unions, and Addams’s own powers of reflection led her to realize that Victorian benevolence was profoundly anti-democratic. By the time she wrote *Democracy and Social Ethics* in 1902, Addams’s philosophical orientation and her methodology were thoroughly pragmatist.

Throughout this change in philosophical orientation, however, the discourse of personality and neighborliness remained useful. Outsiders might have viewed a settlement’s activities as charitable or philanthropic, but settlement workers themselves viewed their activities first of all as manifestations of neighborhood citizenship, and the settlement itself as primarily a way of living. In an 1896 essay, Addams made just this point. The “soul” of the settlement was its “neighborhood point of view,” she claimed, and the most important neighborhood ties were ones of “good fellowship and mutual interest.” Most importantly, by living as a neighbor, Addams observed her own perceptions being altered as her moral sensibilities and understanding widened. She found herself caught up in her neighbors’ worlds, sharing their cares and joys, desires and frustrations, needs and generosities. From such neighborly fellowship, personalities were transformed, and joint activity was a natural outgrowth.

Living in the neighborhood was not merely a preference, but enacted a knowledge claim. One settlement worker described it this way:

> From the settlement I have gained that subtle, interpretative method of dealing with facts which I believe can only come by steeping one’s self in the standards, manners, and customs of races, and by entering into the community life of a neighborhood. By so doing one . . . comes to interpret the lives of individuals with all the gradations of shading which make fact true.

Knowledge of a neighborhood, i.e., “the gradations of shading which make fact true,” cannot be obtained by the detached academic sociologist or the case worker who commutes in to meet with clients. Addams’s knowledge of Russian Jewish immigrants and her competence to interpret them to the general public were grounded in knowledge that could only be obtained through long dwelling and sympathetic exchange.

Social psychologist Charles Horton Cooley gives a helpful image for understanding how Addams’s self was reconstructed through her long
engagement with multiple social groups. Cooley was one of the few male social scientists of the era to express his appreciation for Addams in his theoretical writings. For Cooley, the self is social through and through. “Society” and “individual,” he writes, are “collective and distributive aspects of the same thing.” Best known for his depiction of the looking-glass self, Cooley claims that we develop a sense of self through imagining how others see and judge us. This reciprocal construction of selves takes place through sympathy. For Cooley, sympathy is not an emotion or sentiment; it is more fundamental. Sympathy is an orientation of the whole mind toward others and toward one’s experiences. Using multiple forms of verbal and non-verbal communication, one enters into sympathetic relations with others, and thereby acquires a self. The various social circles to which one belongs are through one’s being. As the arcs of more social circles intersect, one’s self enlarges and becomes more variegated.

With this image, we can think of Addams’s self as acquiring more arcs as she engaged with the various immigrant groups in Chicago, as well as with municipal and social reform groups. Because she was deeply engaged with many different social groups in Chicago—various ethnic immigrant communities, civic associations, women’s clubs, labor organizations, professional and business elites—and because she reflected on her experiences with all these groups, she had a wider social self than did many other Chicagoans. Because she had internalized these various forms of social organization and discourse, she could occupy multiple roles and move easily among disparate groups. This continuous reconstruction of the self is integral to the meaning of interpretation and to a person’s ability to do it well.

Reconstructing Community

For Mead, self and society are intimately intertwined. He writes, “The unity and structure of the complete self reflects the unity and structure of the social process as a whole.” One comes to be a self, and to know oneself as a self by acting with others in socially organized settings and coming to view oneself through the perspectives of the others. A given self participates in a variety of social groups, and so in that sense contains multiple selves. Mead writes that some of these groups are concrete, such as social clubs, and one’s family or neighborhood. Some groups are abstract and indirect, such as groups of creditors and debtors. Because these groups change and enlarge, and because selves enter into new social relations, selves and society thereby undergo continual reconstruction, opening the possibility for positive social transformation.

Mead’s well-known example of relations between selves and community is that of children playing a structured game such as baseball. To know how to play as the team’s catcher, the child must internalize all of the other positions. To function as a catcher is to function as catcher-
in-relation, i.e., to anticipate how another child in a given position will respond, and then shape one’s gesture accordingly. As applied to a community in general, Mead calls this taking on “the attitude of the generalized other,” or the shared attitude of the community as a whole.69 To act socially, one must know what one’s gestures mean from others’ points of view, one must be able to grasp the social meaning of one’s acts, and then use that meaning to shape one’s gesture or response.70 Socially problematic situations indicate that the structure of the generalized other is inadequately formed. Resolving the problematic situation calls for selves to enlarge and for the generalized other to be reconstructed.71

Mead does not say concretely how to go about reconstructing the generalized other, or how to go from a deeply fractured community such as Chicago at the time of Averbuch’s killing, to one with common and shared attitudes of the whole.72 Mead rejects the approach of applying abstract ethical rules to a given problem, claiming that the values pertaining to a given situation emerge out of that situation. What is most important is to identify all of the various interests involved and take them into account.73 However, Mead does not say how this reconstruction of the community is to be accomplished. I propose that Addams’s method of interpretation fills this lacuna. Addams’s analysis of the Averbuch affair is just the sort of analysis that Mead would think needed to be carried out in order to resolve ethically problematic situations. Using Mead, we can understand “interpretation” as those processes and activities that bring about personal and social reconstruction toward a more adequate generalized other, and thus a more well-functioning community. No general theory can indicate how to go from a disordered community to a unified one. Each situation requires its own analysis. What is needed is a concrete, fine-grained interpretation that emerges from and responds to the specificity of each situation, such as Addams gave to the Averbuch affair. Pairing some of Mead’s general statements about social reconstruction with Addams’s specific moves in “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest” demonstrates the pattern.

We can think of Chicago in 1908 as having an underdeveloped generalized other; the fact that the general public was not able to anticipate the response of the Russian Jewish immigrant community to its own response of “horror and recoil” was a symptom of this. In “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest,” Addams conveyed information, attitudes, and previous experiences of the immigrant community upon which the public could begin to reconstruct their own selves and the community. Mead writes that social reconstruction presupposes a basis of common social interests.74 In her essay, Addams identified commonalities, forgotten in the heat of the moment, that the general public and immigrants shared. Addams identifies immigrant heritage and commitment to civil liberties as selves shared by the audience and the Russian Jewish immigrant community alike. We can think of these selves...
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as examples of Mead’s “abstract social classes,” and as offering a potential basis upon which xenophobic responses could be dampened.  

Mead considers thinking and intelligence to be critical tools for reconstructing self and society. He defines thinking as “the internalized conversation of gestures,” and as “taking the attitude of the generalized other toward himself.” Essentially, thinking or reflection is a matter of delaying one’s reaction to a situation to give oneself time to anticipate what others’ responses to one’s action or gesture will be, and then modifying one’s action or gesture accordingly. The quality of one’s thought reflects how widely and carefully one can anticipate the responses of others. Using Mead’s definition of rationality, Addams’s dramatizations provided narrative material with which people could think. If the general public had had a visceral appreciation of what it felt like to experience virulent anti-Semitism, they might have been able to slow down their responses and adjust them from ‘horror and recoil’ to sympathetic understanding. The same could be said of police and public officials. Addams calls for restraint; public officials should not judge the case or make unsubstantiated accusations before a thorough investigation has been made. To exercise this restraint, these officials also need to think. That is, they need in their imaginations to hold conversations with all of those parties whose interests are affected, to anticipate their various responses, and take all of these into account. Due process is not merely procedural, but depends upon highly engaged moral imaginations. Simply asking public officials to observe constitutional provisions does not in itself aid in social or personal reconstruction. Providing the rich array of narrative voices is a step toward this reconstructive process.  

In his essay, “The Social Settlement: Its Basis and Function,” Mead writes, “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 their community are and as a part of it to help toward their solution.” Because settlement workers reside in the neighborhood, their knowledge and motivation for change grow out of the relationships they form there. Their neighbors to them are not souls to save or objects to study, but full human beings with whom to dwell and work collaboratively. This vantage point and the knowledge it makes possible give settlement workers potential standing, Mead thought, to be agents of social change. Mead speaks of social change agents or moral leaders as people as “of great mind and great character.” They strongly embody principles and values that are already present in the community, but only partially expressed in institutions and in other people’s actions. These community leaders are able to call on members of the community to more fully express these principles, to widen their own selves, and concomitantly to reshape the community. I propose that the image of social change agents Mead had in mind was not that
of an impartial spectator or neutral mediator, but a social settlement worker. Because the arcs of many of Chicago’s disparate social groups intersected within Addams’s self, she had the moral sensitivities and the knowledge with which to provide community members with specific materials with which a more widely shared, generalized other could be reconstructed. One event, obviously, cannot by itself accomplish this reconstruction. But that event can be used to bend the community’s arc toward shared understandings, and toward justice.

Reconstructing Meanings of Citizenship
In her essay’s introduction, Addams notes the power of a current event to bring meanings of citizenship and self-government dramatically to the fore. Addams considered her interventions in the Averbuch affair as enactments of her vision of citizenship, and hence, as attempts to bend the arc of citizenship’s meaning toward justice. I will examine this reconstruction using three sub-themes: the meaning of constitutional due process, the meaning of “American,” and the responsibilities of knowledge holders.

1. Meaning of Constitutional Due Process
For Addams, as for classical American pragmatists, meanings are derived from concrete experience, and are reinforced or reconstructed through subsequent experiences. We see this in Addams’s use of the term “interpret” to describe actions of the Russian and Chicago police. Many members of Chicago’s Russian Jewish community had experienced pogroms in Russia; Averbuch and his family had lived through the 1905 pogrom in Kishinev. Addams states that in Russia, “government is interpreted to [Russian Jews] by a series of unjust and repressive measures” and that in Russia the police, backed by the military “are the final executors and interpreters of autocracy.” This was the lived, experiential background through which Russian Jewish immigrants experienced the Chicago police response to Averbuch’s killing. Within the arc of their experience, the meaning of government as interpreted by the Chicago police was straight in line with their experience of official thuggery in Russia.

Addams gives her assessment: “The only sane, the only possible cure for such a state of mind . . . is that the actual experience of the refugees with government in America shall gradually demonstrate what a very different thing government means here.” In her interventions—hiring an attorney, arranging the second autopsy, and so on—Addams was trying to deflect these immigrants’ arc of experience with government away from tyranny and toward constitutional due process. The only way to do this was to change their concrete experiences in the current event.

Addams could not do this alone. Given Lincoln’s mythic status in the culture, Addams often paraphrased from his speeches for rhetorical
effect. In the essay she writes, “As we allow our public officials to act in this instance, so the American policy will be largely determined; so free speech, ‘freedom of assemblage,’ and all the other stirring words in the bill of rights will become interpreted; so may ‘our charter be torn,’ to use the pregnant phrase of Abraham Lincoln.”86 The critical phrase is “as we allow.” In a democracy, officials act as the public allows. The meaning of due process is “interpreted” through such allowances. Here Addams builds the case that majority prejudice against immigrants made it impossible for Averbuch to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. The general public took recent fears about anarchism, married them to older prejudices of anti-Semitism, and stained the entire Russian Jewish community before the facts of the cases were established. By allowing and even encouraging official malfeasance, community prejudices make due process impossible to obtain.87 Here we see interpretation’s contrapuntal lines at work. Reconstruction of the immigrants’ experience with government depended upon a reconstructed community, one in which prejudices did not function to deny due process.

2. Reconstructing the Meaning of “American”

In her analysis of the Averbuch affair, Addams tried to bend the arc of what it meant to be “American,” a then fractured term, at the heart of a fractured national community. Some have criticized settlements as assimilators, functioning to wash ethnic markers off of immigrants. For some settlement workers, this charge may be fair, but not for Addams.88 Her vision of America paralleled the one Randolph Bourne offered in “Transnational America” as an international, multi-ethnic tapestry. A repeated theme in her writings is that those who most needed Americanizing were members of the white, non-immigrant general public.89

Just as the meanings of constitutional guarantees of due process and of first amendment freedoms persist through time only as they are re-enacted in concrete affairs, so the meaning of “American” undergoes constant reconstruction. National politicians quickly grabbed onto the Averbuch affair as evidence supporting tighter restrictions on immigration. If Russian Jews were barred from the United States, Addams responded, thousands of people would lose their means of escaping tyranny. Keeping immigration open was a concrete, experiential requirement if the meaning of America as a refuge for the oppressed was to be sustained.90 Addams held up the immigrants’ experiences in Russia and in Chicago as a mirror in which the public could see reflected the meanings of being an American that they enacted at home. The public’s horror at the behavior of police in Russia could become a way of identifying how police behavior at home was inconsistent with what they wanted “American” to mean. Pointing to state-sanctioned terrorism in Russia, Addams asked the public to note its resemblance to the...
terrorism of lynchings at home.91 Such perception is the first step toward reconstruction.

3. Reconstructing the Responsibilities of Knowledge Holders

Addams believed that moral responsibility grew out of concrete experience; because of their long, close engagement with immigrants, settlement workers had a particular responsibility to speak and act on their behalf. Addams compares this responsibility with the professional duties of doctors and lawyers to treat and defend even those guilty of heinous crimes.92 In conceptualizing her interventions as professional obligations, Addams added a bend to the arc of reconstructing the moral responsibilities of those who hold social knowledge. At that time, the domain and methods of sociology were just being defined. Three potential trajectories were evident; the first was that of academic sociology with its male-gendered model of knowledge creation that replicated the detached observers of the natural sciences. The second was the emerging professionalization of social work, with its model of interventions through which individuals were generally channeled toward assimilation. Finally, there was Addams’s model of social settlements engaged in social reconstruction, where interpretation was taken to be a matter of professional responsibility.93 Addams had resisted the University of Chicago Sociology Department’s attempts to take over Hull-House and operate it as its sociological laboratory. Aside from her own independent streak, her reasons were epistemological. In a letter rejecting the University of Chicago’s offer to affiliate with Hull House, Addams wrote, “[T]he usefulness of the effort is measured by its own interior power of interpretation and adjustment.” That is, the settlement’s ability to generate useful social knowledge would be distorted if it became a branch of the university and adopted academia’s detached observer’s stance.94

From the perspective of this contrapuntally layered understanding of interpretation, academic sociologists’ detachment leads to professional negligence, as they refuse to engage with moral ambiguities. Social workers’ interventions with individual cases are too accommodationist. In Addams’s vision, knowledge holders have responsibilities to bend the arcs of structural reform toward social justice.

Conclusion

As officials and the general public denounced anarchists, Addams insisted on interpreting rather than denouncing.95 Denunciation ends thought; interpretation opens it up. Denunciation cuts off conversation, cuts off movements of sympathy, cuts off the willingness to enter another’s point of view. Interpretation starts by making the world of the other something that can be entered. It invites people to stretch, to enlarge themselves, and to bring multiple arcs of association within themselves. With this stretching, there are opportunities for using the
lives of others for self-critique, and for bending arcs of experience toward justice.

On that Saturday afternoon when I first drafted this paragraph, six lay dead and fourteen others, including Arizona representative Gabrielle Giffords, lay injured, shot by Jared Loughner, a mentally and emotionally unstable young man. The country searched for civility and safety. Is there protection against a mentally unstable young man, living in a context of vitriolic political speech, with easy access to extra-lethal weapons? In 1908 many press reports characterized Averbuch as mentally deranged. Some members of the Jewish community preferred this diagnosis, thinking it would spare them the reflective glare of a charge of anarchy. Addams makes clear that legal channels cannot stop “a half-crazed creature bent upon destruction.” The only protection society has against such acts is by “drawing him in to the reassurance and warmth of a fellowship against which he could not strive if he would.” Offering such fellowship is the task of the whole community. The contrapuntal lines of interpretation create openings toward making such fellowship possible.
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