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Abstract
There is general consensus that Randolph Bourne was right in his criticism of Dewey’s support for U.S. participation in World War One. Bourne’s central argument against Dewey was that war is inexorable. War cannot be controlled; pragmatist method becomes inoperable. Jane Addams largely agreed with Bourne, but would question his claim that war’s inexorability is absolute. I will use Addams’s participation with the U.S. Food Administration to show cracks in the inexorability of war and also to raise questions about the pragmatist grounding of Bourne’s attack on Dewey. I argue that although Addams’s participation with the Food Administration was in some ways morally ambiguous, it also demonstrated a more thoroughgoing, pragmatist understanding of democracy than Bourne’s critique contained.
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Much has been written on Randolph Bourne’s criticisms of Dewey’s support for the United States’ participation in World War One. Dewey agreed with President Wilson that entering the war provided an opportunity to reconstruct the international order along democratic lines.1 Bourne’s central argument against Dewey was that war is inexorable. War cannot be controlled; it is the one arena in which pragmatist method is inoperable. That is, creative intelligence could not use war as instrumental in reconstructing the world order toward peaceful internationalism.2 The general consensus is that Bourne was right, Dewey was wrong. Dewey admitted as much in the years...
between the World Wars. Addams largely agreed with Bourne, but would question his claim that war’s inexorability is absolute, leaving the pacifist with no options but to capitulate or remain quiet. I will use Addams’s participation during the war with the United States Food Administration to show cracks in the inexorability of war and thus raise questions about the pragmatist character of Bourne’s attack on Dewey.

**Bourne and Addams on War’s Inexorability**

“War is inexorable,” Bourne proclaimed repeatedly. Neither the ends of war nor the means to achieve them can be guided toward democracy by creative intelligence. In “The Collapse of American Strategy” Bourne charts how in less than ten weeks, Wilson’s initial stated aim of a negotiated peace without victory was replaced by demands to “conquer or submit.” Wilson quickly capitulated to the war aims of the Allies rather than reconstructing the Allies’ aims toward democratic ends. Bourne observes that in war, events overtake ideals, until there is “but one end—victory; and but one means—the organization of all the resources of the nation into a conventional war technique.”

Addams agreed with Bourne that there can be no pragmatist justification for U.S. participation in the war. Commenting on Bourne’s essay, “War and the Intellectuals,” she wrote, “It was hard for some of us to understand upon what experience this pathetic belief in the regenerative results of war could be founded.” She sent Bourne a letter congratulating him on the essay, and asked for permission to send reprints to members of the Woman’s Peace Party. Addams’s skepticism about war’s regenerative potential came from the heart of her conception of democracy as comprised of processes of obtaining inner consent, processes that must be based on understanding and fellowship. These processes are “violently interrupted and thrown back in war time.” Bourne wrote of “war in the interest of democracy” as a reversion to “more primitive ways of thinking.” Addams directed the same sentiment to President Wilson, asking, “Was not war in the interest of democracy for the salvation of civilization a contradiction of terms?” That is, Addams and Bourne shared the belief that war cannot function instrumentally toward pragmatist social change. While this paper uses Addams’s work with the Food Administration to critique Bourne’s claim that war is inexorable, we should keep in mind how close their positions actually are.

**Bourne’s Likely Critique of Addams’s Participation in the United States Food Administration**

In writing “War and the Intellectuals,” Bourne evidently did not consider Addams among the intellectual class, in spite of her extensive writings on peace, her honorary degrees, and her frequent lectures on college campuses. Nor did he consider her activism as fulfilling his
call for intellectuals to use their influence and to use U.S. neutrality to achieve a peaceful resolution to the European war. Had he considered her an intellectual, he could have used her as a counter-example to the intellectuals he criticized in “Twilight of Idols” for leaving democracy as an “unanalyzed term” and for not providing “intellectual paths” or “shining ideas.” Addams’s widely read 1907 book, *Newer Ideals of Peace*, does both of those things. It articulates the meaning of social democracy and charts a clear relation between democracy, social justice, and international peace. Between the beginning of the war in Europe in August 1914 and the U.S. entry in April 1917, Addams did many of the things that Bourne in “War and the Intellectuals” asked those unreconciled to war to do. She met his call for education regarding war through founding the Woman’s Peace Party in January 1915; a year later its members numbered 40,000. She presided over the meeting of the International Congress of Women at The Hague in April 1915, with its 3000 participants from both sides of the war and neutral nations, and met with heads of state throughout Europe to discuss mediation. She personally pressed President Wilson to lead this effort. She also testified before a number of Congressional committees, speaking against increasing military personnel and materiel and against conscription and the Espionage Act.

Once the U.S. entered the war, Addams experienced the silencing about which Bourne wrote. The Espionage Act, government surveillance, and press antagonism cut off many of her usual channels for educating the public about peace and affecting government policy. Addams was concerned about complicity in the war effort, and so stayed away from participating directly in military relief organizations such as the Red Cross, although other pacifists found them to be acceptable avenues for humanitarian work. She did, however, welcome the chance to speak under the auspices of the United States Food Administration, directed by Herbert Hoover. It gave her an “anodyne of work” through which to counteract her forced inactivity in a way she felt did not compromise her pacifism.

During the first 2 ½ years of the war, Hoover founded and directed the Commission for Relief in Belgium, delivering over 2½ million tons of food to nine million civilians made hungry by Germany’s occupation of Belgium and northern France. After the U.S. entered the war President Wilson gave Hoover virtual control of American food production and distribution. His charge was to stabilize U.S. food markets and to encourage food conservation on a massive scale so that the surplus could be shipped to soldiers and civilians among the European Allies. Hoover realized that women’s participation was crucial, as they prepared food for the nation’s twenty-two million households, and so launched a massive marketing campaign to enlist their help. As part of this program, Addams gave many speeches around the country encouraging food
conservation. She particularly enjoyed meeting with women’s groups, finding this work “both an outlet and a comfort to me.”

Was this work consistent with pragmatist pacifism? We can take Bourne’s criticisms of Dewey and direct them against Addams, although on a smaller scale. To Dewey’s recommendation that conscientious objectors find alternative means for seeking peace, Bourne responds rhetorically, “[W]ill [Dewey] tell us what social mechanism he knows of that is considered relevant or even permissible in wartime that does not contribute to the war technique?” Bourne could argue that the Food Administration was a “social mechanism” contributing to “the war technique.” It was developed expressly in wartime; its stated purposes and propaganda were full of war imagery. “Food Will Win the War” was the Food Administration’s slogan; its posters proclaimed that “Food is Ammunition: Don’t Waste It” and “Every Garden a Munitions Plant.” Bourne could ask how Addams, working through an agency expressly designed as a tool of war, could possibly use her speeches toward the end of peaceful, democratic internationalism. In “Conscience and Intelligence in War” Bourne states the case starkly: a pacifist’s only alternatives are to obey, to resist, or to remain quiet. If one obeys, one’s voice is silenced. If one resists or rebels, one is charged with disloyalty, and thus is silenced. He ends the essay by asking, “Can one do more than wait and hope for wisdom when the world becomes pragmatic and flexible again?” War’s inexorability is absolute; one cannot turn the machinery of war to good account. At most, Bourne concludes in “Twilight of Idols,” one can be a Nietzschean malcontent with sinister imagination, bad-tempered and contemptuous.

Addams’s Subversive Speeches
I claim that Addams’s speeches for the Food Administration can be defended as a form of pacifist, pragmatist work, and that they reveal a crack in the inexorable. To show this, I will summarize the speech Addams gave at the Biennial Convention of the General Federation of Women’s Clubs in Hot Springs, Arkansas, in May 1918, and point out its pragmatist orientation. In the next section I lay out the broader context, showing how Addams’s many similar speeches for the Food Administration can be understood as continuing the patterns of democratic, pragmatist, and pacifist work she had been doing for almost three decades.

While given under the auspices of the Food Administration, the content of Addams’s speeches was, in fact, subversive of war. Drawing on Hoover’s assessment that “the situation is more than war, it is a problem of humanity,” Addams showed how addressing this “problem of humanity” could be a step toward an international, humanitarian ethic. She did not simply encourage audience members to conserve food, but gave them a way to reconstruct their experiences with food.
conservation and view them, not as acts of war-patriotism against the enemy, but as contributions to building an international community, bound together by humanitarian commitments and care. Acknowledging how hard it is to change a family’s food habits, Addams told the audience, “A great world purpose cannot be achieved without our participation founded upon an intelligent understanding—and upon the widest sympathy. At the same time the demand can be met only if it is attached to our domestic routine, its very success depending upon a conscious change and modification of our daily habits.” 27 She asked audience members to make a synthesis, using their intellectual and affective resources, in joining together their household obligations with international needs. This was a large challenge, involving much constructive work beyond having “wheatless Mondays” and “meatless Tuesdays.” 28

In the speech Addams begins with women’s daily experiences of food preparation, experiences that have intellectual, emotional, and active dimensions as part of caring for their families. Her aim was not simply to meet the Food Administration’s goal of food conservation, but to enable audience members, through synthesizing intellect and emotion with concrete, daily action, to establish relationships of democratic solidarity with those suffering from war. Addams’s message is a concrete expression of the conceptions of reconstruction of experience and education as growth that she shares with Dewey. The context most conducive to education is the current event, the lived environment. Like Addams, Dewey stresses that in education as growth, intellectual perceptions are broadened to include a wider range of connections. One’s sympathies are engaged as one enters imaginatively into the experiences of others. These perceptions are concretized in bodily actions through which daily activities are carried out. 29

Addams gave her audience two contexts for making this synthesis, one concrete and current, the other historical. First, she conveyed extensive, precise details of the situation in Europe: fields destroyed in France, population dislocation in Romania, and famine in Russia, along with thoroughly disrupted transportation networks. Her only reference to the Central Powers was to the hungry people there. She did not demonize them as the hated enemy but presented them as fellow humans. She gave concrete examples of what American women were already doing to increase the supply of food available to ship to Europe. 30 That is, she gave audience members the information they needed to foster sympathetic connections with those starving in Europe, and by their food conservation activities, insert themselves as participants in an international, humanitarian community.

Addams, who constructed her speeches carefully in terms of her specific audiences, also gave a wider historical frame. Drawing on the women’s clubs’ practice of studying texts from a range of disciplines,
Addams placed their food conservation efforts within the context of then current scholarship on woman’s historical relation to food. She referred to Frazer’s *Golden Bough*, with its collection of myths of the Corn Mother, the Rice Mother, and others from around the world that associated women with agriculture. She discussed anthropological theories that credited women as the first agriculturalists, responsible for the transition from hunter-gatherer to settled communities, to ensure a more stable food supply. She encouraged her audience to understand their own food conservation efforts as embedded within this larger historical sweep of ethical obligation.

She also framed food conservation in terms of the tension between the fighting instinct and instincts of compassion and pity for the helpless, instincts she said are present in every individual. Psychologists at the time often explained human behavior in terms of adjusting tensions among various instincts. Some wrote that the war had exaggerated the pugnacious instinct, and so the social instincts needed to be strengthened to counterbalance it. Anthropologists claimed these social instincts were much older, and thus more deeply embedded in the human psyche, than the fighting instinct. Addams hoped that her work with her audiences would bring countervailing instincts of pity and gregariousness to the fore.

Again we see reconstruction of experience at work. James writes that truth is made, not found. He describes truth-making as a marriage function in which an accepted stock of ideas is conjoined and in part reconfigured, with new ideas and experiences. In good pragmatist form, Addams invoked the psychological and anthropological knowledge her audience members already had and showed them how to graft new information and new perspectives into their existing stock of knowledge. In doing this, their sense of self and their motivation to meet world needs could be enlarged. She used these various frames to redirect their understanding and action away from a narrow patriotism and to envision them as stages or steps toward international comity.

At the end of the speech Addams suggested one way that the audience members’ efforts might become part of a peaceful, international order. It was true that Hoover developed his food programs in response to the war, but in doing so, food production and distribution had in fact shifted from a market driven, commercial basis, to a needs-based, humanitarian basis. Concrete patterns of food production, rail and shipping schedules, and attendant legal policies regarding rationing and tariffs had been altered in response. Addams noted, “Commercial competition has been suppressed, not in response to any theory, but because it could not be trusted to feed the feeble and helpless.” To the extent that this was being done among the Allied nations, Addams asserted, “A new internationalism is being established day by day.” Addams realized that she was powerless at the time to change the Allies’
food blockade against the Central Powers. However, she expressed the hope that at war’s end, this already existing international machinery would not be dismantled, but would be expanded to include all hungry people, regardless of their nationality.

**Addams’s Established Patterns of Pragmatist, Pacifist Work**

Addams’s work with the Food Administration was of a piece with the patterns of thought and engagement she had used for decades. Identifying these patterns reveals that, in his analysis of war, Bourne’s pragmatism and his understanding of democracy do not go down deep enough. Bourne criticizes intellectuals for thinking they could control and direct the war machinery. He claims that Dewey had abandoned the pragmatist intellectual work of formulating clear, democratic values and goals. By moving from pragmatism’s primary venue of education and redirecting his efforts toward the war, Bourne argued, Dewey had also abandoned the younger intelligentsia, leaving them poorly equipped to continue this task of articulating a clear, democratic vision. Here, Bourne has a truncated vision of pragmatist work. His prescriptions are on the intellectual and policy level, described solely in terms of formulating intellectual conceptions of democracy for the intelligentsia. His few references to the rest of the population are to “the herd,” under the influence of “mob psychology.” In writing that war is inexorable and that, at most, irreconcilables can be Nietzschean malcontents, Bourne does not appreciate the full range of what counts as work toward peace. Nor does he consider how those outside the intelligentsia have important resources to offer toward constructing peaceful, international relations. In essence, while Addams agreed with Bourne that war itself could not be used pragmatically, i.e., be intellectually directed toward a democratic peace, she did not think that all pragmatist work toward peace had to cease during wartime.

In an 1899 speech for the Anti-Imperialist League, Addams articulated the definition of peace that informed her subsequent work. She told that audience, “Peace . . . is no longer merely absence of war, but the unfolding of life processes which are making for a common development.” Her 1907 book, *Newer Ideals of Peace*, connects domestic social reform programs to similar efforts abroad, and theorizes them as significant elements in the progress toward a just peace. Thus, Addams’s activism toward factory safety, fair labor relations, women’s suffrage, and rights for immigrants and African-Americans were all ways of creating institutional structures and concomitantly transforming people’s intellectual and emotional energies toward justice and peace. This is education in the widest sense—not just for the young intelligentsia, but for everyone. Addams believed that democratic social change was best accomplished through “lateral progress,” that is, by working through associations and in close cooperation with ordinary people. By speaking
through the auspices of the Food Administration, Addams was in effect saying that the war had not closed all avenues for lateral progress, but that some cracks in the inexorable remained open. Movement toward a peaceful, democratic internationalism needed to take place within and among common people, as well as among the powerful. By addressing lay audiences around the country, where attendance at times numbered in the thousands, Addams demonstrated her belief that the grip of mob psychology was not inexorable, but that people whom Bourne scorned as members of the “herd” were capable, even in wartime, of reconstructing their experiences toward peaceful internationalism. To Addams, this was important pragmatist, democratic work to do.

We can more clearly understand how Addams’s speeches for food conservation furthered this work by identifying just who her audience members were. Many of her speeches were given at annual conventions of national organizations such as the National Education Association and the National Conference of Social Work, where the attendees were already engaged in work for educational and social reform. Many of her appearances were organized and attended by members of women’s clubs. Membership in the General Federation of Women’s Clubs, at whose biennial convention Addams gave the speech summarized above, numbered two million in 1918. In a time when few women went to college, these clubs in effect offered continuing education to their members, calling themselves a “middle-aged woman’s university.” They also were active in organized social reform. Addams had long been associated with these clubs. From many audience members’ points of view, Addams’s speeches for food conservation were continuous with their patterns of activity in sustaining and repairing the social fabric.

Many of the audience members also had ongoing transnational commitments. At that time, over one-third of the U.S. population were immigrants or children of immigrants; Addam’s audiences would have included many first, second, or third generation immigrants, as well as people who worked closely with this population. In a letter to Addams, Mina Van Winkle of the Food Administration estimated that over one-fourth of U.S. homes were immigrant households. She asked Addams for information on the dietary practices of “Italians, Jews, Poles, Syrians, Greeks, Austrians, and the different Slavic peoples.” Howard Whipple of Turlock, CA made a special point of mentioning the town’s large immigrant population in his request that Addams speak there. Many immigrants maintained strong cultural and personal ties to their countries of origin, including countries then under the Central Powers. Such transnational relations among ordinary people were a central element in Addams’s conception of international peace. In a speech delivered just two months after the U.S. entered the war, Addams described how, for immigrants from lands then under the Central Powers, the war was “exquisite torture.” The spirit of the United States, she
continued, was cosmopolitan in essence, with ties to every country of the Earth. Addams presents here an image of cultural pluralism and trans-nationalism very close to Bourne’s own.46 With keen sensitivity to the fact that social processes do not stand still, Addams’s speeches on food conservation fit into the pattern of her life work of reinforcing people’s transnational ties and enabling them to create new ones.

These perspectives suggest a reconstruction, if you will, of Addams’s speeches for food conservation. From the point of view of those in the Food Administration who scheduled her speeches and provided informational and publicity materials, Addams was participating in their wartime efforts to preserve the lives of civilians and soldiers among the Allies. From the experiential standpoint of many in the audience, however, Addams was also continuing the work of education, social justice, and international peace that they had shared for decades. If there was to be a possibility of democratic peace after the war, then creating and strengthening compassionate, transnational bonds, woven into the habits of daily life, was work that merited attention during the war.

Moral Ambiguities in Pragmatist Work

Even if we accept the above, reconstructed description of Addams’s speeches for food conservation, it does not eliminate the moral questions. It is a fact that Addams was working under the auspices of an agency expressly designed and directed toward winning the war. Her hands were not clean. Was her choice to participate with the Food Administration consistent with her pragmatism and her pacifism? Here it is important to note that the situation itself was laced through with moral ambiguities. In 1917, when Addams chose to work with the Food Administration, she could not have known that the war would issue, not in Wilson’s vision of a world made safe for democracy, but in the punitive Paris Peace treaties, the Allies’ continued food embargo against civilians under the Central Powers, or the rise of virulent nativism in the U.S.47 She did, however, realize at the time that her efforts could be unfruitful. In typical self-deprecating style, she noted that when the opportunity to work with the Food Administration arose, she “clutched at it with something of the traditional desperation of the drowning man.”48 She had responses, but no compelling argument against Bourne’s claim that working through wartime agencies would render her message ineffective. She acknowledged that the work of the international food organization “might be a new phase of political unification in advance of all former achievements, or it might be one of those shifting alliances merely for war purposes, of which European history affords so many examples.”49 While she hoped that the Food Administration would be expanded after the war, she knew it could also be dismantled and replaced by purely commercial exchange. The inexorable contained cracks, but there were no promises that the cracks would widen.
In choosing to work with the Food Administration, Addams was entering a Jamesian “will to believe” moment of decision. At that point in time, the outcome of her efforts, as well as the outcomes of the war, could not be predicted. Dewey’s description of the world as “uncertain, unpredictable, uncontrollable, and hazardous” was, in 1917, terrifyingly accurate. She watched war redirect people away from democratic fellowship and understanding, and toward hatred and injustice. Yet she agreed with James about the importance of tending those personal relationships where “faith in a fact can help create the fact.” Democracy for Addams was a matter of personal relations woven through cooperative activity. She saw her work with the Food Administration as opening the possibility of helping her audiences reconstruct their experiences of conserving food as forms of transnational, democratic action. Not to act as if this were possible would foreclose such relations from being created and sustained.

At the heart of the matter, James writes, is one’s attitude toward risk. He asks whether one’s fear of being duped by false belief is stronger than one’s desire for the truths that might be created through one’s actions. Addams was a risk taker. When asked to call the organizing meeting of the Woman’s Peace Party, Addams wrote to Carrie Chapman Catt, “I am undertaking all this with a certain sinking of the heart.” “Hopelessly melodramatic and absurd” was her initial reaction when asked to visit European heads of state after the International Congress of Women at The Hague. Only illness kept her from sailing with the Ford peace ship, a venture whose wisdom she severely doubted. As she notes in Democracy and Social Ethics, “[T]he sphere of morals is the sphere of action.” To remain inactive through fear of failure is to remove oneself from the sphere of morality, where risk of failure is ubiquitous.

Did Bourne fear failure or the risk of being duped? Perhaps he feared what Addams knew to be true: the answer to whether working with the Food Administration would contribute to international peace, or further the cause of war, was probably “yes” on both counts. Whether her actions would issue in international peace depended on multiple factors outside her control. This is the paradox of action. James claimed and Addams confirmed through daily experience that the world of action is “tangled, muddy, painful and perplexed.” Our own actions are entangled with those of others. One cannot escape the moral ambiguities inherent in concrete action.

Addams’s pacifism was not ideological; she was not a Tolstoyan non-resister. Addams was suspicious of ideological reformers, and dubious about the value of focusing intensely on one’s own integrity. For Addams, as for other pragmatists, each person’s standpoint is partial; every decision or action is an experiment, made with incomplete information, facing an uncertain future. Perhaps the best lesson here is to have humility about where one draws one’s own lines of integrity, and...
generosity of spirit toward those who draw them differently. Addams could respond to Bourne’s critique of Dewey, and his potential critique of her, by quoting James’s penultimate paragraph in “The Will to Believe,” where he states, “No one of us ought to issue vetoes to the other, nor should we bandy words of abuse. We ought, on the contrary, delicately and profoundly to respect one another’s mental freedom. . . .”

In light of the uncertainties of the future, and given Addams’s care to construct her speeches in a way that continued her work toward democracy, social justice, and international understanding, her work for the Food Administration was consistent with her pragmatism and with her understanding of pacifism.

The Pacifists’ Isolation in War

Both Bourne and Addams were “wrenched” by the war, to use Bourne’s term; both suffered from their isolation. In spite of the cracks, Addams largely agreed with Bourne that war is inexorable and eliminates the conditions needed for pragmatist verification. I do not know whether Addams ever commented on “Twilight of Idols,” Bourne’s direct attack on Dewey, but we can craft a likely response from passages in Peace and Bread in Time of War. The comparison is not entirely fair: Addams published Peace and Bread in 1922, four years after war’s end, when she was a soberly reflective 62 years old. Bourne was still an impetuous youth when he died at 32 in the 1918 global influenza epidemic.

Addams became inured to scurrilous attacks by the press, but said she found it harder to bear “when enthusiastic and fanatical pacifists openly challenged the honesty and integrity of their former associates who had become convinced of the necessity for the war.” I suspect she would have been troubled by Bourne’s self-righteous tone and by his lack of tolerance toward pragmatists who came to different conclusions about the war. In a most probing examination of her own deep sense of increasing isolation and the severe press attacks as the U.S. phase of the war went on, Addams included herself in observing, “[T]he pacifist in wartime. . .constantly faces two dangers. Strangely enough he finds it possible to travel from the mire of self-pity straight to the barren hills of self-righteousness and to hate himself equally in both places.”

Noting that pragmatism’s “great teachers” supported the war, Addams grieved over the loss of intellectual and spiritual companionship and longed for reconciliation. Most of the residents at Hull-House supported the war; a room at Hull-House was turned into a draft registration office. The following passage contains the clue that Addams was talking about more than personal loneliness in these reflections. “We were well aware that the modern liberal having come to conceive truth of a kind which must vindicate itself in practice, finds it hard to hold even a sincere and mature opinion which from the very nature of things can have no justification in works. The pacifist in war time is
literally starved of any gratification of that natural desire to have his own
decisions justified by his fellows.” I read Addams here as saying that
one of the dimensions of war’s inexorability is that pragmatist testing
stops, not only for war supporters, but also for pacifists. Pragmatist veri-
fication is a communal enterprise; when the community is rent, no one
can test whether war’s inexorability is total, whether quietude is the only
option, or whether speeches on behalf of the Food Administration just
might contribute to a peaceful, democratic, international order. Addams
would include Bourne in her conclusion that “in moments of crisis . . . a
man’s primary allegiance is to his vision of the truth.” However, I sus-
pect that her second allegiance would be to reconciliation, to restore the
community within which pragmatist thinking and action are possible,
and in which one’s primary allegiance can be affirmed. Another crack
in Bourne’s pragmatism was in not seeing this need for reconciliation.

One of Bourne’s criticisms of Dewey was that younger intellectuals
were so taken with pragmatism’s instrumentalism that they ignored its
vision. Calling on Nietzschean malcontents to mock old values and
assert new ones, Bourne observes, “[Pragmatism] has everything good
and wise except the obstreperous vision that would drive and draw all
men into it.” Sympathetic to his general sentiment, Addams would
nonetheless find his metaphor misleading. In Addams’s pragmatist vi-
sion, “identification with the common lot” is “the essential idea of De-
mocracy,” and “diversified human experience and resultant sympathy”
are its “foundation and guarantee.” The process of obtaining inner
consent does not “drive and draw.” It is not obstreperous. It is wel-
coming, fluid, tolerant, and forgiving. It invites participation and then
gives people their own time to reconstruct their experiences out of the
bits and pieces of experience and wisdom that they have. In discussing
the effects of working together to feed the hungry Addams inserts a
quote from James, writing, “As we undertake a mutual task of this sort
‘how our convulsive insistencies, how our antipathies and dreads of
each other’ would soften down; what tolerance and good humor, what
willingness to live and let live, would inevitable emerge.” Through
his essays, Bourne invoked the spirit of William James, but in this case,
Addams exhibited it.
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