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In his contribution to the first Central European Pragmatist Forum in June 2000, Emil Višňovský asked, “Can pragmatism as a distinctively foreign philosophy be somehow compatible with our local philosophic and cultural needs in Central Europe?” Philosophy, he observed, arises out of a culture and addresses concerns of that culture. He wondered how a philosophy could “travel” beyond its native cultural roots, and asked, “Does it mean that there must be something in common in the background of the cultures, for example Slovak and American, for pragmatism to be influential or adopted here?”

Vladimír Zeman suggested a connection between pragmatism and Central European thought, citing Karel Čapek’s comment to Tomás Masaryk that he might be “partly a pragmatist.” To this Mararyk replied: “Pragmatist—not that.”

The historical connection between Central European thought and pragmatism is even closer than Zeman suggests, and the background cultures of Central European peoples and America were intertwined in the decades of classical American pragmatism’s flowering. In this paper I will explore the relationship and work of Tomás Masaryk, philosopher and first president of Czechoslovakia, and Jane Addams, one of the founders of classical American pragmatism.

This study is in keeping with the conference theme of identity and social transformation, understood in two different ways. First, as Mead describes it, the processes of social reconstruction in society and in the self are reciprocal, and mutually and organically intertwined. It will be evident throughout this study that both Masaryk and Addams share this view. In achieving democracy, social institutions along with
personal modes of thinking, feeling, and interacting, are concomitantly transformed. Second, this study contributes another strand to the identity of American pragmatism. Drawing on Richard Bernstein’s description of pragmatism as a plurality of conflicting narratives, I suggest that we find in Addams another narrative, that I call a trans-nationalist form of pragmatism.⁴ I do not here call Masaryk a pragmatist, although he and Addams were both trans-national thinkers. In their writings on nationalism and internationalism they self-consciously dealt with individuals as organized into nations, i.e., as historic and cultural groups. Similar to Randolph Bourne’s view of America as a trans-national “federation of cultures,” Masaryk and Addams envisioned nations interacting dynamically, synthesizing cultural materials, and moving toward changing configurations that were distinctive and variegated.⁵

Why call Addams a trans-national pragmatist? How is her work distinctive from that of other classical American pragmatists who drew on various European philosophies? The difference is that Addams’s lived context in the United States was itself trans-national. She perceived Chicago as a gathering place of national groups, and thus as a site of experimentation toward trans-national comity.⁶ In Addams’s Chicago, immigration and urbanization were taking place simultaneously. The immigrants from “over there” weren’t adjusting to what was “already here,” since in the city there was little “already here” before they arrived. “Over there” and “here” were not separate locations, but sites that were deeply continuous, engaged in complex, on-going, dynamic interactions. This was Addams’s lived context, and it shaped her sensibilities and her intellect. After presenting biographical connections, I will show how Masaryk and Addams held similar visions of what can be called trans-national humanitarianism and
how they charted similar paths toward its achievement, relying in large measure on cultural reciprocity.

1. Biographical Connections

I laughed when I read Milič Čapek’s remarks that “we would look in vain for any systematic exposition of Masaryk’s philosophy in his own writings,” and “Masaryk’s thought acquires its full meaning only within the context of his life: his philosophy and his actions are inseparable.” So like Addams, I thought. She spoke and wrote to particular audiences, in response to specific situations; her philosophy and life are also inseparable. The contexts in which Addams and Masaryk lived and worked overlapped and frequently intersected. Masaryk (1850-1937) was born in the vast, multi-national Austrian Empire. One of his parents was Bohemian, the other Slovak. He described his American wife, Charlotte Garrigue, as one “in whom French blood and American vigor were united.” Once formed, Czechoslovakia, along with Yugoslavia, were the most multi-national states in Europe. In the United States the Bohemian and Slovakian immigrant communities in the U.S. were large. During the war Chicago was the second largest Bohemian city in the world, second only to Prague, and was the center of Masaryk’s financial organization for the Czechoslovak government in exile. Addams interacted with these international populations constantly. When she founded Hull House in 1889, 78% of Chicago’s inhabitants were immigrants or children of immigrants, with eighteen nationalities represented in Addams’s ward of over 44,000 residents. Addams traveled abroad frequently, and visited and corresponded with a vast number of international contacts, including Tomáš Masaryk, his wife Charlotte Garrigue Masaryk, and their daughter, Alice Masaryk.
In 1902 Tomás Masaryk delivered a series of thirteen lectures on Czech and Slavonic history and literature at the University of Chicago’s School of Slavonic Studies. He met with many groups of Bohemian immigrants while in Chicago, and also lectured at Hull House. In 1904 Charlotte Garrigue Masaryk wrote to Addams, “Two years ago my husband sent me from America your book, “Democracy and Social Ethics.” I was so enthusiastic about it that it was often only with great self-restraint, that I prevented myself from expressing my opinion to you; it was only the conviction, that it is better to live up to it than to talk about it, that conquered my impulse.” In her letter Charlotte Masaryk did more than praise Addams’s philosophy; she also asked Addams to give “guidance and protection” to her daughter, Alice. Alice Masaryk, with Ph.D. in hand, had come to Chicago to gather material for a history of the Bohemian people. She lived for a year at the University of Chicago Settlement House, located next to the large Bohemian immigrant community. The head resident, Mary McDowell, had trained at Hull House and her philosophy and methods mirrored Addams’s. Alice Masaryk’s biographer makes the ironic observation that in Chicago, Alice learned American social work methods through working among her own Bohemian people. During her year in Chicago, Alice Masaryk also spent time at Hull House, establishing a long friendship with Addams. Addams, she noted, was “sympathetic with everyone, understanding all the hidden cultural values of the immigrants.”

In 1915 the Austrians arrested Alice and imprisoned her for eight months without formal charge or trial. Tomás Masaryk, in exile at the time, saw her imprisonment as retaliation against him. In one of her letters from prison to her mother, Alice wrote, “I often think of Jane Addams: I see here her strength, gentleness, better than ever. Oh, if I
were only like her!!”\textsuperscript{16} McDowell and Addams mobilized a letter-writing and petition campaign, amassing over 40,000 signatures, and asking the U.S. government to pressure the Austrians for Alice’s release. In her study, “The Arrest of Alice Masaryk,” Betty Unterberger stated that those associated with Hull House and other settlements in Czech and Slovak immigrant communities, “knew of their customs, traditions, histories and hopes probably better than anyone else in the United States at that time.”\textsuperscript{17} Immediately after the war, Alice Masaryk, as first President of the Czechoslovakian Red Cross, asked McDowell to send trained researchers to survey social needs in Prague and to help establish a school of social work in Slovakia. Alice Masaryk’s vision for the Czechoslovakian Red Cross added health, education, and social services, patterned in part after the American settlement house movement, to its traditional emergency services.\textsuperscript{18}

On Addams’s seventieth birthday, Tomáš Masaryk sent a telegram praising her work and recalling his time at Hull House when he was “under the influence of her moral personality.”\textsuperscript{19} Addams likewise praised Tomáš Masaryk. In her Presidential Address to the 1929 International Congress of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, held in Prague, Addams quoted Masaryk, who had said, “In a true democracy, war and revolution will be obsolete and inadequate, for democracy is a system of life. Life means work and a system of work; and work, unostentatious work, is peace.” To Masaryk’s words, Addams added, “In this lies our salvation.”\textsuperscript{20}

In the following three sections I will explore the stunning similarities in some of Masaryk’s and Addams’s methodologies and central concepts. Both conceived of democracy in similar terms and defined their tasks in terms of moving from autocracy to democracy. For both, humanitarianism was understood as pluralist, embracing
distinctive and cooperating nationalities. Finally, for both, cultural reciprocity was a key mode for bringing about these transformations.

2. From Autocracy to Democracy

Both Addams and Masaryk defined the task at hand in terms of moving from autocracy to democracy. Masaryk’s context was to work with Bohemian and Slovak peoples in moving from oppression under Austria-Hungary toward democratic self-determination. Before the war, Addams defined her challenge as aiding immigrants and those she called “native-born Americans” in moving from industrial, political, and cultural repression, toward democratic institutions and relationships. Masaryk and Addams employed similar methodologies, associating autocracy with non-empirical, creedal beliefs, and democracy with empirical, scientific investigation and tests of concrete experience. Identifying himself with scientific sociology, Masaryk writes, “Democracy works by scientific method, and its tactics are therefore inductive, realistic, and empirical; theocratic aristocracy is deductive, unrealistic, fanciful, and scholastic.”

Addams also considered herself as a sociologist and was so regarded by her peers. At times in her writings, Addams presents normative recommendations through identifying emerging sociological trends that, if fostered, would lead toward democratic humanitarianism. To detect these trends, she writes, one must “substitute the scientific method of research for the a priori method of the school men.”

Masaryk likened Austria-Hungary to an absolutist, theocratic, medieval empire. For the Bohemian people, with their long history of Reformation Protestantism, oppression under the Hapsburgs was particularly onerous. Masaryk identifies theocracy with hierarchical relations between ruler and subject, where rulers and priests enforced
their power through forced conversion, repression, and violence.\textsuperscript{24} Addams likewise identifies how American institutions functioned autocratically, or as she terms it, “militaristically.” Using the experience of immigrants in the U.S. as her lens, she investigated the repressive impacts of political, economic, and cultural institutions on immigrants. To them, “liberty,” “equality,” and “natural rights” were merely \textit{a priori}, creedal expressions.\textsuperscript{25} In their lived reality, political and economic practices reproduced Anglo-Saxon traditions of hierarchical privilege and so functioned to preserve the privileges of elites.

Masaryk’s account of democracy has striking resonance with those of Addams and Dewey. All three regard democracy, not simply as a system of political machinery, but as a way of living, extending into economic, social and community life, and replacing hierarchical relations with a democratic equality of rank and spirit.\textsuperscript{26} One could well imagine the following sentence from Masaryk’s \textit{The Making of the State}, slipped into Dewey’s essay on “Creative Democracy” or Addams’s introductory chapter of \textit{Democracy and Social Ethics}: “For the maintenance and development of democracy the thought and cooperation of all are needed; and as none is infallible, democracy, conceived as tolerant cooperation, signifies the acceptance of what is good no matter from what quarter it may come.”\textsuperscript{27}

Claiming the heritage of Comenius, Masaryk associates democratic living with education, a process of continual growth that enables individualities to flourish.\textsuperscript{28} “Man is a creature of habit,” Masaryk declares.\textsuperscript{29} Living under autocratic rule, the Slavic peoples had developed habits of passivity and political indifference. The process through which Masaryk claims they can “de-Austrianize” themselves and develop democratic habits
sounds curiously pragmatist. “But true philosophy and science demand that men should think, that they should gather wide experience, observing and comparing the present and the past, and verifying their deductions from experience by further experience so that haste may not lead them to fantastic conclusions.”

30 For Masaryk, as for Dewey and Addams, imagination is a key faculty for freeing oneself from routine habit and entering into the lives and experiences of others. 31 Thus, even though Masaryk was wary of pragmatist metaphysics and epistemology, his orientation toward democracy and sociological method have much in common with the American pragmatists.

3. Masaryk and Addams on Humanitarianism

What is most interesting for my purposes, and a reason to focus on Addams rather than Dewey, is the way Addams and Masaryk worked out their thinking about democracy in explicitly international settings and sought to achieve an expressly trans-national humanitarianism. Mapping out their intellectual sources would be daunting. The names of the same European intellectuals of the day sprinkle their pages; many they knew as personal friends, as well as intellectual colleagues. Both appealed to Mazzini’s humanitarian internationalism; both visited Tolstoy and appreciated, though wrestled with his formulation of Christian humanism. 32 Masaryk explicitly names Herder as a central intellectual resource; it is harder to trace Addams’s intellectual sources with specificity. She read and conversed widely, and synthesized ideas from many people in her writing. She soaked in her immigrant neighbors’ cultural practices and turns of mind, and conversed with their intellectuals for whom Hull House was a refuge. Given Addams’s frequent references to Slavic peoples and customs, it would be surprising if Slavic intellectual thought did not fertilize her thinking.
In this section I will show commonalities in Addams’s and Masaryk’s conceptions of humanitarianism. They both saw great value in national cultures, which they viewed not as static or closed, but as open to synthesis, mingling with and thereby enriching each other. The following dimensions characterize both of their conceptions: In working toward humanitarianism, emotions as well as reason are engaged. Through the process, personal relationships are transformed and social institutions are rebuilt within one’s specific location. Also, new forms of patriotism, compatible with international comity and cooperation, are called for.

Masaryk on Humanitarianism: To Masaryk, Herder was the “high priest of pure humanity.” Masaryk was drawn to Herder’s chapter on the Slavs in *Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*, where Herder threads Czech history through the Czech Reformation. Masaryk traces Czech nationality back to Jan Hus and the Bohemian Brethren, and through educators, historians, and literary figures such as Comenius, Dobrovský, Kollár, Palacký, Šafařík, and Havlíček. With shared language, history, soil, and cultural traditions, nations are “natural organs of humanity,” in contrast to states, which are artificial constructs. Like Herder, Masaryk’s ideal of *Humanität* was not a uniform cosmopolitanism, but a variegated plurality of interacting cultures. Nationality, as Masaryk envisioned it, is fully compatible with, and is presupposed by internationality. He defines internationalism as “linguistic and national federation” in which nations not only tolerate, but also appreciate each other. “Trans-national humanitarianism” is a fitting descriptor of his view.

For Masaryk, humanitarianism engages emotions and spirit, as well as reason. In reflecting on modernity’s penchant for war and its attendant excessive individualism and
materialism, Masaryk hypothesizes, “Maybe, we have all cultivated the intellect too one-sidedly and have forgotten the harmonious cultivation of all our spiritual and physical powers and faculties.”\(^{37}\) Masaryk characterizes humanity in terms of love and care, to be enacted in practice, taking specific forms in specific contexts. He notes, as an example, that in America, this rising humanitarianism manifests itself “in exemplary hospitals and in welfare work.”\(^{38}\)

Finally, Masaryk’s vision of humanitarianism requires a form of patriotism that does not contain intolerance or hatred toward other nations. He describes movement from the old patriotism of loyalty to dynasty and ruling classes, to a new, modern patriotism in which loyalty to one’s nation should be, in effect, one’s way of showing loyalty to all humanity. Masaryk describes this as “a more concrete internationalism” whose ideal is “a positive association of all nations in an harmonious whole.”\(^{39}\)

Addams on Humanitarianism: Addams articulates her conception of humanitarianism in her 1907 book, *Newer Ideals of Peace*. She describes humanitarianism as an emerging evolutionary stage in which nurture and social justice, rather than militaristic repression, will be embodied in the practices of all major societal institutions and in people’s relationships with each another. With her sociologist’s eye, Addams detected threads of humanitarianism developing as immigrants of many nationalities lived and worked together. We hear echoes of Herder in her statement, “We know better in America than anywhere else that civilization is not a broad road, with mile-stones indicating how far each nation has proceeded upon it, but a complex struggle forward, each race and nation contributing its quota; that the variety and continuity of this commingled life afford its charm and value.”\(^{40}\)
Though they were located on American soil, Addams perceived American cities as trans-national gathering places. Noting that many cities all over the world were experiencing rapid industrialization and the resulting, disorganized social life, Addams considered Moscow, Paris, London, and Berlin to be as “new” as American cities. An active participant in international social reform movements, she peppers *Newer Ideals of Peace* and her various speeches with examples of reform efforts from many countries. She points to Switzerland where widows’ children were given scholarships to continue in school, to England which made employers liable for injured workers, and to Germany’s provision of industrial accident insurance as evidence of movements toward humanitarianism outside of the U.S. and as patterns for the U.S. to consider. Expanding these humanitarian threads engages intellect and emotion alike. Descrying the enormous waste in industry, as young children worked at factory looms rather than attending school, and workers’ intellectual capacities were deadened by dull, repetitive work, Addams writes, “Nothing can help us here save the rising tide of humanitarianism, which is not only emotional enough to regret the pitiless and stupid waste of this power but also intelligent enough to perceive what might be accomplished by its utilization.”

*Newer Ideals of Peace* gives a series of case studies of trans-national humanitarianism being worked out in practice. In part, this refers to movements for governmental adoption of social welfare policies regarding health and sanitation, industrial reform, fair wages, and so on. Addams interpreted these movements as democratic, that is, as enabling citizens through their own efforts to transform industry and government into tools through which they could meet their needs. Through and by this process, hierarchical relationships of control and contempt could be transformed into
horizontal relations of “vital and fraternal relationship.” She also observed this
democratic, trans-national humanitarianism being enacted in non-governmental arenas,
such as labor unions. Addams describes the Chicago stockyards, where skilled Irish,
German, and Bohemian workers joined in solidarity with more recently immigrated,
unskilled Slovak, Polish, and Lithuanian workers. She quotes a study of the United Mine
Workers, a union that had taken men of many nationalities, languages, and beliefs and
was “welding them into an industrial brotherhood.” Here, institutional practices were
being transformed toward providing a higher standard of living and cultural identities
reshaped toward trans-national comity.

Addams asks that the courage and energy valued in war heroes be redirected in
the service of social amelioration rather than destruction. With this “beneficent and
progressive patriotism,” or even “cosmic patriotism,” the embrace of fellowship extends
outward, following the familial and cultural ties of immigrants back to their lands of
origin. Her immigrant neighbors, she observed, were developing “the only sort of
patriotism consistent with the intermingling of the nations.”

During and immediately following the war, Addams gave two explicit
endorsements of Masaryk’s conception of humanitarianism, underscoring their shared
intellectual orientation. In 1916 Addams and her colleagues in the Woman’s Peace Party
organized the Conference of Oppressed or Dependent Nationalities, held in Washington,
DC, December 10-11, 1916. Predicting that the still neutral U.S. would have a significant
role in deciding the post-war fate of oppressed European nationalities, Addams and her
colleagues wanted to educate American public opinion on these matters. For millions of
Americans with ties to oppressed peoples in Europe, these issues were not remote, but

This experimental conference had behind it a very sound theory of the contribution which American experience might have made toward a reconciliation of European differences in advance of the meeting of the Peace Conference.

Professor Masaryk, later President of Czecho-Slovakia, attempted to accomplish such an end in the organization of the Central European nationalities, which actually came to a tentative agreement in Philadelphia more than a year later. In Addams’s mind, the conference demonstrated that immigrants, with their experience of working in international neighborhoods while maintaining loyalty to their homelands, had acquired experience helpful for establishing post-war justice and peace.

Addams gave a second endorsement during an address to the American Sociological Society shortly after the war ended. Addams discussed the extent to which in just thirty-five years, nationalism had devolved from expressing trans-national humanitarian ideals to becoming poisonous and divisive. She recounted her trip to Europe in 1885,

It rather smacked of learning, in those days, to use the words slavophile and pan-slavic, but we knew that the words stood for a movement toward unity in the
remoter parts of Europe where Bohemia was the most vocal. . . . The very striking characteristic of all these nationalistic movements was their burning humanitarianism, a sense that the new groupings were but a preparation for a wider synthesis, that a federation of at least the European states was a possibility in the near future.  

She commented that unlike some in other subsequent national movements, Masaryk, in establishing Czechoslovakia, had remained true to the older, beneficent and humanitarian form of nationalism. In this speech, titled, “Americanization,” Addams uses Masaryk’s conception of humanitarian nationalism as a model for the United States.

4. Cultural Reciprocity

Addams worked with various national groups in a highly interdependent city; after the war, Masaryk was President of a new state that contained several national groups and bordered several others. Both knew that a nation’s existence and cultural identity could not be sustained in isolation. Both spoke of “synthesis,” but not of assimilation; both regarded plurality and variety as “vivifying.” In this section, I will explore how they valued cultural reciprocity as a process through which trans-national humanitarianism could be enacted.

Masaryk on Cultural Reciprocity: Masaryk expresses the transactional potential of cultural reciprocity when he asks, “What (are we) giving to the treasury of mankind, and what (do) we need to take from other nations so as to be able to give greatly?” He draws from the Pan-Slavism of nineteenth century poet Jan Kollár, in developing his conception of cultural reciprocity. A Slovak himself, Kollár saw the Slovak language threatened by the Hungarian Magyars, and the wider Slavic spirit threatened by German cultural
dominance. He recommended that bookstores and libraries be established to give all Slavs access to the language of each Slavic group. Slavia, he envisioned, was the sun; each Slavic nation a planet in its orbit. Among Slavs, reciprocity would be “a communal taking unto oneself, a communal bestowal and consumption.”

With Czechoslovakian independence at the end of the war, Masaryk was faced with the task of building a government, an economy, and functioning social and cultural institutions in a war-rubbled territory. Knowing that the initial burst of enthusiasm accompanying independence would fade, Masaryk asks, “How will it be in a workaday world?” Drawing explicitly on Kollár’s vision, Masaryk adapts the concept of cultural reciprocity, expanding its literary focus to embrace the social realm. In his conversations with Karel Čapek, Masaryk said, “I do not underrate the emotional value of Slav reciprocity; but I look upon it as a step to wider, and the widest reciprocity.”

Masaryk gives several concrete indications of how democratic cultural reciprocity would play out in the new state. He gives particular attention to democratic inclusion of the German minority, agreeing that German ministers would be in the government, that German areas would have representation, as well as local self-government, and schools of their own. Just as he had long advocated that Slavs under the Hapsburgs needed to “de-Austrianize” themselves, so the Germans in Czechoslovakia too, must de-Austrianize themselves, ridding themselves of habits of superiority and privilege. Agreeing with Kollár and Herder on the central significance of language to cultural and national expression, Masaryk stresses that the majority should learn the minorities’ languages. German should be taught in Czech schools and vice versa. In Slovakia, students should learn both Slovak and Magyar. In all of these proposals, cultural reciprocity was to be
the guiding principle, leading to synthesis and growth among the various nationalities and an absence of hatred and intolerance.

Addams on Cultural Reciprocity: Addams searched for a new understanding of what it meant to be an American, in terms of both cultural identity and citizenship. The old patterns of citizenship imposed a repressive, militaristic Anglo-Saxonism, inconsistent with the spirit of democracy. Her immigrant neighbors’ national traditions and practices, while not immediately operative in a congested, industrialized city, could function as resources for crafting these new understandings. Throughout this section Mead’s pattern of transformation is evident: through cultural reciprocity, personal and cultural identities are transformed and social institutions are reshaped toward democratic, cooperative living.

Addams skillfully shaped her speeches and writings to her audiences, many of whom were middle-class, white, native-born Americans. Responding to anti-immigrant biases and calls for assimilation, Addams took care to represent the immigrants as intelligent and resourceful to these audiences. She described the immigrants’ cultural resources with specificity. For example, Addams, a leader in the Chicago Arts and Crafts movement, saw the potential of the many skilled craftspeople in her neighborhood to revive Americans’ aesthetic sensibilities, deadened by monotonous, cheaply made factory goods. She bemoaned Chicago’s loss, as a Bohemian silversmith and a Vienna-trained glassblower spent their days in unskilled factory work, and noted the irony when an Italian woodcarver, whose craftsmanship earned his church in Naples a double-star in Baedeker, was evicted from his Chicago tenement for performing similar artistry on its doorframe.57 Addams and her colleagues opened a Labor Museum where her skilled
neighbors could teach their crafts to their children’s generation and to native-born Americans, and sell their goods in the Museum shop.  

Her neighbors’ habits of observation, perception, and judgment, acquired in very different cultural contexts, could be resources for diagnosing and addressing Chicago’s urban problems. Valuing her Jewish neighbors’ religious devotion and practice, Addams recounted coffee house conversations where minds long trained by Talmudic study pondered how to bring justice to industrial conditions in Chicago.  

Similarly, the political ideals of her neighbors—in one passage she specified Celtic, Germanic, Latin, and Slavic ideals—could be valuable correctives. She gives the example of some Italian boys, whose teacher had cut off their patriotic enthusiasm for Garibaldi as irrelevant. Had the teacher instead used that enthusiasm to foster a deep study of Italian nationalism, the boys might have come to see how Chicago ward bosses appropriated a cheap and twisted version of that struggle for their own corrupt purposes.  

Addams saw the immigrants’ experiences with many patterns of rural, agricultural life as possible correctives to the social isolation typical on individually owned, 160-acre farms. South Italian villages with their rich social life and the Slavic “mir system” of communal land ownership were two concrete alternative patterns for farming communities. We can now understand Addams’s frustration when she erupted, “All the members of the community are equally stupid in throwing away the immigrant revelation of social customs and inherited energy.”  

Through what process and in what spirit could native-born Americans receive the gifts of the immigrants? In a 1905 speech on adult education, Addams told her Chautauqua audience that fellowship and a spirit of reciprocity were the keys to
recrafting cultural identity and citizenship. She noted, “(We need to) open our minds to
other adult citizens from all parts of the world and find out what it is that they have that
will be of benefit to us, (and which) things we have which will be of benefit to them.”

For example, native English speakers needed to learn the immigrants’ languages, as the
immigrants learned English. Through fellowship and a spirit of reciprocity, audience
members would be able to ascertain the immigrants’ potential contributions, and cultural
syntheses could be made.

Because of Americans’ mixed origins, solidarity could not be fostered by
appealing to a common history or shared cultural traditions as Herder, Kollár, and
Masaryk had done. In a 1911 speech Addams explained that emotional bonds of
“memory and filial piety” were unsuited to the American context. She writes, “The
patriotism of the modern state must be based not upon a consciousness of homogeneity
but upon a respect for variation, not upon inherited memory but upon trained
imagination.” Fellowship, imagination, and respect for variety are best fostered when
people work together to address concrete, shared concerns. Addams rejects the built-in
relations of superiority and inferiority often exhibited through philanthropy, charity, and
academic research as undemocratic. Her immigrant neighbors rightly resented being
treated as objects of charity or study. Instead, all interested parties—those who call
themselves benefactors, public citizens, and scholars, together with immigrants and the
poor, should join with shared interest, shared purpose, and shared hopes, to address the
problems of their community. When social problems are addressed through relations of
reciprocity, people’s sense of cultural identity and of the exercise of responsible
citizenship are concomitantly reconfigured.
5. Conclusion

By interpreting Addams’s sensibilities and intellectual orientation in terms of trans-national humanitarianism and trans-national pragmatism, this study suggests that the usual narrative of Addams’s adult life needs to be revised. The usual story is that Addams began locally in Chicago, added the national stage with her engagement in national social reform movements and women’s suffrage, and then with World War One moved into the international arena. This narrative underplays the national specificity of Chicago’s immigrant communities and the reciprocal, transactional nature of Addams’s participation with them. From her first days at Hull House, Addams was trans-nationally engaged. By focusing on Addams and her associations with Bohemian immigrants and Tomás Masaryk, we can begin to uncover the web of connections between classical American pragmatism and Central European heritage. Through understanding the trans-national contexts within which Addams lived and from which she derived and tested her theorizing, we can identify a trans-national pragmatist narrative that is not foreign to Central Europe, but that incorporates the culture and experiences of Central Europeans in its development.
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