



The author of this thesis has granted the University of Calgary a non-exclusive license to reproduce and distribute copies of this thesis to users of the University of Calgary Archives.

Copyright remains with the author.

Theses and dissertations available in the University of Calgary Institutional Repository are solely for the purpose of private study and research. They may not be copied or reproduced, except as permitted by copyright laws, without written authority of the copyright owner. Any commercial use or publication is strictly prohibited.

The original Partial Copyright License attesting to these terms and signed by the author of this thesis may be found in the original print version of the thesis, held by the University of Calgary Archives.

The thesis approval page signed by the examining committee may also be found in the original print version of the thesis held in the University of Calgary Archives.

Please contact the University of Calgary Archives for further information,

E-mail: uarc@ucalgary.ca

Telephone: (403) 220-7271

Website: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/archives/>

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Jane Addams' Standpoint: A Study in Relationship and Sociology

by

Janet Ruth Sawatsky

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL

FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

CALGARY, ALBERTA

MAY 2001

© Janet Ruth Sawatsky 2001

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I explore the writings of Jane Addams (1860-1935). Drawing on the work of contemporary feminist sociologist Dorothy Smith, I argue Addams practiced a method of inquiry called standpoint. Addams wrote a sociology for people; her sociology sought to empower people. While Addams' work is essentially feminist, I argue that the once liberating term 'feminist sociology' may have reached its limits of utility. This project challenges contemporary sociological textual practices of writing the social, including the textual practices of contemporary feminist sociology. This project attempts to broaden the discussion regarding the purpose of sociology and contemporary feminist practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to mention several people who have been extremely supportive throughout the writing of this thesis. First, I would like to thank all of the graduate students and staff in the Department of Sociology who provided me with a friendly and supportive environment. I especially want to take the time to mention the members of my cohort for their unwavering friendship and continued encouragement: Linda Trypka, Jana Lait, Jane Mitchell, Viola Cassis, and Monica Crumrine. I am grateful to Viola in particular, who was there for me in so many crucial periods. I would also like to recognize Linda Henderson, Linda Di Luzio, Michelle Ambrose, and Siegrid Deutchlander for giving me valuable advice, and making me feel confident.

To my examining committee, Dr. Mary Valentich and Dr. Liza McCoy, thank you for your kind comments and thoughtful suggestions. I appreciate and respect every question you asked. A special thank you goes to Dr. Bill Reeves who encouraged me throughout my undergraduate and graduate programs. I have always enjoyed our talks. I am grateful for everything you have taught me academically, and also, about life in general.

I would like to remember an exceptional group of friends without whose love and support I could not have accomplished this project. My dear friends: Cindy Gusikoski, Kelly Bradley, Darren King, Matt Davidson, Chelsea Cook, Colin McGilvery, Aaron Purves, Scott McLean, Kim Rendell, Ted Bauer, and Lynn Spyker. I would also like to thank Christopher Burns for providing me with dinners, love, patience, and coffee. I am grateful for having you in my life.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Arthur W. Frank, for everything that he has taught me. I am grateful for the time that we have spent together, and words can not express everything I would like to say. I appreciate your honesty, bluntness, humour, and brilliance. Thank you for being the perfect supervisor for me, and for helping me grow intellectually. I admire you so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Approval Page	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of Contents	vi
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	 1
Who was Jane Addams?	3
What did Jane Addams do?	4
Hull House	4
Sociology	6
Publications	7
Influences	8
The Disappearance of Jane Addams from Sociology	12
 CHAPTER TWO: A FEMINIST VERSION OF JANE ADDAMS	 14
Why did Jane Addams disappear from Sociology?	14
Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's Standardized Version of Jane Addams	19
Why Jane Addams Resists Standardization	33
 CHAPTER THREE: ADDAMS' STANDPOINT	 36
Similarities between Contemporary Theorists and Addams	36
Beck, Giddens, and Lash's Method of Writing the Social	39
Addams' Method of Writing the Social	44
Addams Importance to Sociology and Sociologists	54
 CHAPTER FOUR: ADDAMS' SOCIOLOGY FOR PEOPLE	 56
What is a Sociology for People?	56
Addams' Sociology for People	63
How might Sociology be Different?	68
 CHAPTER FIVE: FEMINIST SOCIOLOGY	 73
Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's Feminist Sociology	77
Addams' Sociology and Smith's Sociology	77
The Ambiguity of Feminist Sociology	84
Conclusion	87
Bibliography	89

Chapter One

Introduction

When I discovered the writings of Jane Addams, the discovery was like finding a mentor who had been absent for too long. As a student of sociology, it always bothered me, even angered me, that I had no women role models when it came to studying sociological theory. Having no female role models as theorists meant learning male sociology and male sociological theory. I have learned the way traditional sociology was supposed to look, the questions that were appropriate to ask, and the methods that would enable me to discover the social world that I wished to know about. However, as I studied the work of Addams, I quickly learned that what she was doing in her writings was very different from the sociology that I had been taught.

One of the most important things about this project for me is the discovery of a woman writer of sociology. Discovering a woman sociological theorist is not only personally satisfying; I believe the discovery has many implications for the way that I practice, and others practice, sociology today.

When I began reading Addams' texts, at first I thought that she was not sociological at all. Using the knowledge that I had learned in studying sociology, Addams did not appear to be a sociologist. There were no sociological concepts that needed defining, no grand theory that was brought together in a unified system, and very little, if any, abstraction that is characteristic of male sociological theory. What I found were many stories and many analyses based on those stories, but those analyses were never wrapped up or packaged into an overall conceptual schema. According to

everything that I have learned about sociology, up to and including my recent graduate student years, Addams did not seem to fit into the canon of sociological theorists.

Addams also did not seem to fit into the overall sociological agenda, or the way I had been taught to practice sociology.

While Addams wrote about sociological topics, there was something different about her work compared to most of the male theorists that I had studied. Instead of the usual presentation of concepts and systems that attempted to explain human behaviour, I found a theorist who talked to me. I knew who Addams was, where she was coming from, and what her interests were, because she told me in her texts. When I read Addams, I also discovered as much about her as I did about the people and issues that she studied. Because Addams wrote from her personal experiences with others, and based her analyses on those experiences, she challenged (and challenges) the way that I thought sociological theory was supposed to be done.

After reading all of Addams' writings, I did not know how to articulate the importance of Addams for sociology. The topics that she addressed were certainly sociological, but the way she wrote sociology was completely different from anything I have ever read. Like Marx, Addams was a theorist who recognized that she was a part of the social relations that she described. She did not write from above or apart from the social relations and problems that she talked about. She did not write from an objective standpoint as if she was not part of the situation that she described. It is not, I have learned, the topics that Addams addressed that are important for students of sociology, although they are certainly interesting historically. The importance of Addams' work for

readers of sociology today lies in her method of writing theory and her approach to social inquiry.

Dorothy Smith (1999) has helped me to understand Addams' method of writing theory in contrast to the 'standard' ways of writing theory. Unlike most sociologists, both past and present, Addams began her inquiry from a standpoint. By beginning from her own experience, Addams does not attempt to be objective. By not attempting to be objective, Addams does not transcend the actualities of her living with others. Addams began her inquiry at the local level; the community surrounding Hull House. By examining the dynamics going on in her life and the people's lives around her, she connects her personal problems, and the problems of those around her to the problems of her society. As Addams moved from micro to macro, she stays grounded in the social realities of her day.

Who was Jane Addams?

Addams was born on September 6th, 1860, in Cedarville, Illinois. She was a white woman and came from a well-respected and wealthy family (Addams, 1910; Linn, 1935; Davis, 1973). She attended Rockford Female Seminary school, and graduated as the class valedictorian in 1881. Before the turn of the century, opportunities for women were limited. Women of Addams' status and class were expected to marry and have children. Other options for educated women like Addams included becoming a charity worker or a missionary. But Addams did not see herself in these roles. She wanted to find a different purpose in life; she wanted to put her education to use, somehow, in a time and place that was dominated by limited ideals of what a woman could and should

become. Addams tells her reader(s) of her struggle, and the struggle of women like her at the boarding school, about what she thought she should be:

Towards the end of our four years' course we debated much as to what we were to be, and long before the end of my school days it was quite settled in my mind that I should study medicine and "live with the poor".... As our boarding-school days neared the end, in the consciousness of approaching separation we vowed eternal allegiance to our "early ideals," and promised each other we would "never abandon them without conscious justification," and we often warned each other of "the perils of self-tradition." We believed, in our sublime self-conceit, that the difficulty of life would lie solely in the direction of losing these precious ideals of ours, of failing to follow the way of martyrdom and high purpose we had marked out for ourselves, and we had no notion of the obscure paths of tolerance, just allowance, and self-blame wherein, if we held our minds open, we might learn something of the mystery and complexity of life's purposes... Whatever may have been the perils of self-tradition, I certainly did not escape from them, for it required eight years – from the time I left Rockford in the summer of 1881 until Hull House was opened in the autumn of 1889 – to formulate my convictions even in the least satisfactory manner, much less to reduce them to a plan for action. During most of that time I was absolutely at sea so far as any moral purpose was concerned, clinging only to the desire to live in a really living world and refusing to be content with a shadowy intellectual or aesthetic reflection of it¹. (1910:60-64)

Addams did not become a medical doctor due in part to her own illness, but she certainly did 'live amongst the poor'.

What did Addams do?

Hull House

In 1889, Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Star opened the first settlement house in Chicago. In her words, Addams tells her reader(s) about her plan to open the social settlement called Hull House.

It is hard to tell just when the very simple plan which afterward developed into the Settlement began to form itself in my mind. It may have been even before I went to Europe for the second time, but I gradually became convinced that it would be a good thing to rent a house in a part of the city where many primitive and actual needs are found, in which young women who had been given over too

¹ Addams often uses quotations in her texts, but she does not reference any authors.

exclusively to study, might restore a balance of activity along traditional lines and learn from life itself; where they might try out some of the things they had been taught and put truth to “the ultimate test of the conduct it dictates or inspires” It was suddenly made quite clear to me that I was lulling my conscience by a dreamer’s scheme, that a mere paper reform had become a defense for continued idleness, and that I was making it a *raison d’être* for going on indefinitely with study and travel. ... I had made up my mind that next day, whatever happened, I would begin to carry out the plan, if only by talking about it... I had confidence that although life itself might contain many difficulties, the period of mere passive receptivity had come to an end, and I had at last finished with the everlasting “preparation for life,” however ill-prepared I might be. (1910:85-88)

Jane Addams is perhaps best known for the famous Hull House. Hull House was established to help alleviate some of the negative effects that industrialization had brought to the poorest people in Chicago. It also provided Addams with a forum to begin discussions between classes of people from various backgrounds. Addams argued that the classes were dependent on each other, and therefore were responsible to and for each other. By opening a social settlement, Addams sought to bring people together from various backgrounds, both rich and poor, so that they might “at least see the size of one another’s burdens” (1902:6). Addams describes in her own words, the purpose of Hull House:

It represented no association, but was opened by two women, backed by many friends, in the belief that the mere foothold of a house, easily accessible, ample in space, hospitable and tolerant in spirit, situated in the midst of the large foreign colonies which so easily isolate themselves in American cities, would be in itself a serviceable thing for Chicago. Hull House endeavors to make social intercourse express the growing sense of the economic unity of society. It is an effort to add the social function to democracy. It was opened on the theory that the dependence of classes on each other is reciprocal; and that as “the social relation is essentially a reciprocal relation, it gave form of expression that has peculiar value.” (1893:1-2)

The Settlement, then, is an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions of life in a great city. It insists that these problems are not confined to any one portion of a city. It is an attempt to relieve, at the same time, the over-accumulation at one

end of society and the destitution at the other; but it assumes that this over-accumulation and destitution is most sorely felt in the things that pertain to social and educational advantage. (1893:22)

Through Hull House, Addams became a public figure. She was asked to speak at various public gatherings and conventions throughout the United States. Addams spoke about the value of social settlements and the way classes are interdependent. By speaking out about the wounds industrialization inflicted on humanity, Addams brought the problems that faced her neighbors into public view. Addams made people aware that the problems faced by the poor in Chicago were everyone's problems. Addams insisted that 'equality for all' did not really exist, and her purpose in life was to humanize the worst neighborhood in Chicago.

Sociology

What makes Addams a sociologist? Addams identified herself as a 'pioneer of field research' as she explains in the following quotation:

During its first two decades, Hull House with other American settlements, issued various studies and fact-finding analyses of the city areas with which they were most familiar. The settlements had antedated by three years the first sociological departments in the universities and by ten years the establishment of the first Foundations so that in a sense we were the actual pioneers in field research. We based the value of our efforts not upon any special training, but upon the old belief that he² who lives near the life of the poor, he who knows the devastating effects of disease and vice, has at least an unrivaled opportunity to make a genuine contribution to their understanding. (1930:405-406)

Addams wanted to understand the problems that her neighbors faced in Chicago. The main question that Addams addressed was, is industrialism compatible with humanity (Lasch, 1965:xiv)? Some of the major problems in the city of Chicago that Addams tried

to understand and solve through Hull House were: inadequate housing and schools, prostitution, juvenile delinquency, child labor, political corruption, sanitary conditions in the home, health standards in the factories, and immigrant relations. In order to alleviate some of these problems, social clubs for immigrants and children were set up and operated out of Hull House. The Hull House residents organized garbage collection and opened apartments for working men and women. They also started evening educational classes for working class people, organized trade unions, and lobbied the government for legislative change. However, it is because of the research that she performed at Hull House and her excellent criticisms of the society within which she lived, that Addams could easily be seen as a sociologist.

Publications

In addition to her activities at Hull House, Addams wrote extensively about the social inequalities and injustices that she observed in the city of Chicago. Addams wrote about the ‘necessity’ and ‘value’ of social settlements like Hull House in two essays in *Philanthropy and Social Progress* (1893). In *Hull House Maps and Papers* (1895), Addams and the Hull House residents documented the inadequate housing and wages that various nationalities in Chicago experienced. Addams wrote five articles that appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology*; “A Belated Industry” (1896), “Trade Unions and Public Duty” (1899), “Problems of Municipal Administration” (1905), “Recreation as a Public Function in Urban Communities” (1912a), and “A Modern Devil Baby” (1914). Addams also published articles in *The Chautauquan* (1904), *Religious Education* (1911), *Survey* (1912b, 1916a, 1930a), *Christian Century* (1927, 1931), *Ladies Home Journal*

² Addams use of the words ‘men’, ‘he’, ‘him’, throughout her texts is characteristic of her era. Instead of putting [sic] in every time she only uses male nouns and pronouns, I will alert the reader to this usage only

(1910a) and *Neighborhood* (1928, 1929). Addams was also the sole author of nine books: *Democracy and Social Ethics* (1902), *Newer Ideals of Peace* (1907), *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets* (1909), *Twenty Years at Hull House* (1910), *A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil* (1912), *The Long Road of Woman's Memory* (1916), *Peace and Bread in Time of War* (1922), *The Second Twenty Years at Hull House* (1930), and *My Friend, Julia Lathrop* (1932).

Not only was Addams a prolific writer, she also was a peace activist. In 1915, Addams helped organize the Women's Peace Party, and was later elected as the national chair. During the First World War, Addams visited various heads of government of both warring and peaceful nations arguing for negotiations between governments to end the war. At the Second Women's Peace Conference in 1919, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom was formed and Addams became president. To acknowledge her work as a peace activist, in 1931, Addams won the Nobel Peace Prize for her international efforts to promote peace.

Influences

After reading everything that Addams wrote, I believe that Addams was heavily influenced by the American philosophy of pragmatism. Pragmatism, popular in Addams' day, was a type of philosophical thought that emphasized the experiences and actions of human beings (Martindale, 1981). Like Marx's concept of praxis, pragmatism sought to resolve the incompatibilities between idealism and materialism that troubled and divided philosophers and social theorists. Some of Addams' influences included John Dewey, William James, and George Herbert Mead.

The first main idea of pragmatism is that truth and reality are dependent on human thought. Pragmatists believe that truth is actively created by people, and something is only true if it works in practice. This idea can be found throughout Addams' work. For example, Addams challenged the ideal stated in the American constitution that "all men are created free and equal". Addams felt that this ideal did not really work in practice, and if the government actually knew its people and the conditions that they lived in, the government would know that not all men, in reality, are free and equal. Illustrating the way Addams was influenced by pragmatism, she placed emphasis on the importance of experience. Addams states:

Because their idealism was of the type that is afraid of experience, these founders of our American cities refused to look at the difficulties and blunders which a self-governing people was sure to encounter, and insisted that the people would walk only in the paths of justice and righteousness. It was inevitable, therefore, that they should have remained quite untouched by that worldly wisdom that counsels us to know life as it is, and by that very modern belief that, if the world is ever right at all, it must go right in its own way.... But our eighteenth-century idealists, unconscious of the compulsions of origins and of the fact that self-government had an origin of its own, timidly took the English law as their prototype, "whose very root is in the relation between sovereign and subject, between lawmaker and those whom the law restrains," and which has traditionally concerned itself more with the guarding of prerogative and with the rights of property than with the spontaneous life of the people. They serenely incorporated laws and survivals which registered the successful struggle of the barons against the aggression of the sovereign, although the new country lacked both nobles and kings. Misled by the name of government, they founded their new cities by an involuntary reference to a lower state than that which they actually saw about them. They depended upon penalties, coercion, compulsion, and remnants of military codes to hold the community together; and it may be possible to trace much of the maladjustment of our cities to these survivals, to the fact that our early democracy was a moral romanticism, rather than a well-grounded belief in social capacity and in the efficiency of the popular will. (1905:426-427)

The second main idea of pragmatism involves memory. People remember, and this knowledge is based on what is useful to us. Our memories are constantly

reformulated and reshaped by the knowledge we consider relevant and useful. To illustrate the influence of this idea on Addams' thought, she wrote about the power of memory in her book, *The Long Road of Woman's Memory* (1916). In her analyses of women's memories, she tells the reader(s):

... I found that the two functions of Memory -- first, its important role in interpreting and appeasing life for the individual, and second its activity as a selective agency in social reorganization -- were not mutually exclusive, and at moments seemed to support each other. (1916:xiii)

In sharp contrast to the function of woman's long memory as a reconciler to life, revealed by the visitors to the Devil Baby, are those individual reminiscences which, because they force the possessor to challenge existing conventions, act as a reproach, even as a social disturber. When these reminiscences, based upon the diverse experiences of many people unknown to each other, point to one inevitable conclusion, they accumulate into a social protest, although not necessarily an effective one, against existing conventions, even against those which are most valuable and those securely founded upon cumulative human wisdom. (1916:53)

In these quotations, we can find Addams' insight regarding memory. Our memories can act as powerful tools that can make life better for ourselves and act as an agent of social change. Through memory, we can challenge "existing conventions" of knowledge according to what we consider useful.

The third main idea of pragmatism is that people understand objects through their use. We do not really understand something unless we practice and experience it. An example of this idea is illustrated by what Addams wrote about education:

We constantly hear it said in educational circles, that a child learns only by "doing", and that education must proceed "through the eyes and hands to the brain"; and yet for the vast number of people all around us who do not need to have activities artificially provided, and who use their hands and eyes all the time, we do not seem able to reverse the process. We quote the dictum, "What is learned in the schoolroom must be applied in the workshop," and yet the skill and handicraft constantly used in the workshop have no relevance or meaning given to them by the school; and when we do try to help the workingman in an educational

way, we completely ignore his everyday occupation. Yet the task is merely one of adaptation. It is to take actual conditions and to make them the basis for a large and generous method of education, to perform a difficult idealization doubtless, but not an impossible one. (1902:208-209)

Here, Addams suggests that not only do people learn by doing, but by doing, we also learn to value something practical.

The fourth main idea of pragmatism is that in order to understand the people you want to know about, you must see what they do. For Addams this means living amongst the poor in hopes of truly understanding what problems they faced. She saw first hand what the problems of the city looked like and what the people were doing. In one example, Addams describes the problems of housing in the ward of the city in which she lived:

The houses of the ward, for the most part wooden, were originally built for one family and are now occupied by several. They are after the type of the inconvenient frame cottages found in the poorer suburbs twenty years ago. Many of them were built where they now stand; others were brought thither on rollers, because their previous sites had been taken for factories. The fewer brick tenement buildings which are three or four stories high are comparatively new, and there are few large tenements. The little wooden houses have a temporary aspect, and for this reason, perhaps, the tenement-house legislation in Chicago is totally inadequate. Rear tenements flourish; many houses have no water supply save the faucet in the back yard, there are no fire escapes, the garbage and ashes are placed in wooden boxes which are fastened to the street pavements. One of the most discouraging features about the present system of tenement houses is that many are owned by sordid and ignorant immigrants. The theory that wealth brings responsibility, that possession entails at length education and refinement, in these cases fails utterly. (1910:99-100)

Addams can make these descriptions because she saw the housing situations first hand.

Observing human action is essential to understanding who people are, and why they do the things they do. By observing directly what people are doing, Addams adheres to the ideas of pragmatism.

Addams' approach to understanding the reality of those around her was a practical one. Addams was not interested in studying social structures or looking for the one true reality. She was mainly interested in how people can shape and change society for the betterment of all inhabitants. Addams was deeply committed to the idea that social problems can be solved, and she believed that through practical action grounded in the observations of what is going on around us, society can be changed.

The Disappearance of Jane Addams from Sociology

After reading about Addams life and everything she accomplished, I hope that you, the reader of this text, are wondering how she could have ever disappeared so completely from the history of sociology. Feminist authors have offered one explanation of why Addams disappeared (Deegan, 1988; Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, 1998). The standard feminist argument suggests that sexism is the main reason why Addams was not included in the canon of sociology. While I believed that sexism might have played a role in Addams' disappearance from sociology, I felt that the standard feminist argument was somehow inadequate. Surely, there must be more to Addams disappearance than her being a woman.

Dorothy Smith (1999) has helped me to understand what was wrong with the standard feminist argument, that Addams disappeared because she was a woman in a man's world. In this thesis I will explore an alternative explanation of why Addams disappeared, and more importantly, why it is so important that she appear again in sociology.

In chapter two, I will discuss Madoo-Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's feminist version of Jane Addams, and what the specific problems of their version are.

Chapter three discusses Addams' non-standard sociology in comparison to 'standard' contemporary sociology. Chapter four considers how sociology might have been different if we had known about her work. In chapter five, I will discuss the ambiguity of the term 'feminist sociology'.

Chapter Two

A Feminist Version of Jane Addams

Why did Jane Addams disappear from sociology and why do sociologists need to bring her back? First, I will discuss the standard feminist argument of why Addams disappeared, and why this argument is inadequate. Second, I will show how Addams has been presented to readers of sociology by the feminist scholars, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley (1998; 2000), and I will show why their version is problematic. Third, I will argue that while Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley ‘standardize’ Addams’ contribution to sociology, Addams resists such standardization.

Why Did Addams Disappear From Sociology?

In Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley’s book, *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory 1830-1930*, they argue that “women have always been significantly involved in creating sociology; that women have always made distinctive and important contributions to social theory; and that women’s contributions to sociology and social theory have been written out of the record of the discipline’s history”(1998:1). The authors claim that the main reason women have not been acknowledged in contributing to the development of sociology is due to “a politics of gender and a politics of knowledge” (1998:10).

The “politics of gender” involve women’s lack of “authority in a man-made culture”(1998:11). Women founders of sociology, these authors claim, “were viewed by their male associates through the veil of male privilege as “the less-than-being,”

“the being who need not be taken seriously, as *she who lacks authority*” (1998:11, italics in original). Although I believe that this conception of women in history is generally true, the authors do not present any evidence of how male associates viewed the women founders, nor why some women sociologists did build successful careers. According to these authors, the ‘politics of gender caused the marginalization of women from sociology’ (1998:14). This statement is problematic because it is a tautological explanation: the marginalization of women proves no authority, and no authority explains marginalization.

The “politics of knowledge” also contributed to the exclusion of women from sociology’s canon according to Madoo Lengermann and Niebrigge-Brantley (1998). The politics of knowledge are “professional power relations” that influenced the debate over what the role of the sociologist should be, and what the purpose of sociology was (14). According to these feminist authors, the male intellectual elite “arrived at the consensus that the appropriate role for the sociologist was that of an intellectual committed to scientific rigor, value-neutrality, and formal abstraction” (1998:14). The real question is what work would count as exemplifying these highly general qualities. Again, this is not an explanation. I cannot imagine a conspiracy of sociologists arriving at a consensus on any issue, never mind the purpose of sociology and the role of the sociologist. However, these authors are suggesting that male sociologists decided what sociology should become. It was not a conspiracy; sociology merely began to resemble what was valued in the rest of society: masculine traits that emphasize objectivity and rationality verses subjectivity and emotions.

A complementary explanation for why Addams disappeared from sociology comes from Dorothy Smith:

The women's movement has struggled to make women's voices heard in universities and colleges, and within academic disciplines. Those of us who were active in universities and colleges were, in the early stages of this struggle, activists in the women's movement outside as well; what we worked for in the academy was inseparable from what we were working for outside it. We wanted the immense resources vested in the university and college systems to sustain the development of thought, knowledge, and culture by women and for women. We had discovered – were and are discovering – an intellectual and political world to which women were marginal, if present at all. The intellectual, cultural, and political achievements of our foremothers had been for their time only – if at all. The academy has never vested its resources in preserving and advancing their thought and work. If there was no ongoing intellectual tradition among women, no conversation extending from the past into the present, it was in part because the resources of the academy were never dedicated to this project. (1999:16-17)

While Smith contributes to the understanding of why Addams disappeared from sociology, her other ideas break the tautology by specifying the canonical version of 'theory' that Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley are still caught in.

Now that scholars are dedicated to the discovery of non-canonical sociological writings like those of Addams, it is important that sociologists present their work carefully and honestly. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have been dedicated to this project, and I am very grateful for what they have tried to accomplish by writing a book about early women sociologists. However, after reading all of Jane Addams' original writings and comparing what Addams wrote to Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's version of Addams, I felt that something was terribly wrong. Why is it that I cannot see what these scholars see in Addams' work? Dorothy Smith (1999) has helped me to understand what is so problematic in Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's version of Addams, and what is wrong with sociology in general.

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley are still part of what Smith (1999) identifies as 'standard' sociology. Smith offers a very complex and important argument of what is wrong with 'standard' sociology. One of Smith's main arguments is that 'established' or 'standard' sociology does not represent the social world from the standpoint of peoples' experiences. Standard sociology represents the social world from a 'concealed standpoint,' which is objective and abstracted from the particular experiences of people in their 'actual settings'(25, 43). Sociology and its practitioners have not always objectified people and their experiences, but because we now live in a world that is 'textually mediated', 'standard' sociology has contributed and contributes to abstractions that 'regulate and organize' our knowledge (35). Living in a 'textually mediated' world means that peoples' lives are controlled by knowledge within texts that are generated elsewhere (36). For example, if texts (all kinds of messages whether printed, heard or through screens from televisions and computers) disappeared, 'society' would disappear because 'society' is a concept that sociologists and others have created through texts (33). All of our concepts and knowledge about society would disappear without texts. 'Texts act as a bridge between the actualities of our living and the ruling relations' (7).

The 'ruling relations' are a complex set of relations that are not 'operated by a ruling class', but are 'institutionalized' and 'pervasive' (38).

By the 'ruling relations,' I mean that internally coordinated complex of administrative, managerial, professional, and discursive organization that regulates, organizes, governs, and otherwise controls our societies. It is not yet monolithic, but it is pervasive and pervasively interconnected. It is a mode of organizing society that is truly new for it is organized in abstraction from local settings, extra-locally, and its textually mediated character is essential (it couldn't operate without texts, whether written, printed, televised, or computerized) and characteristic (its distinctive forms of organizing and its capacity to create

relations both independent and regulative of local setting depend on texts). (1999:49)

While all sociologists contribute to the ruling relations by producing texts, the ruling relations also hover above and over us, dominating our lives. Imagine what it would be like to live in a world without texts. Can you? If you cannot, that is because we live in a world of textually mediated reality.

‘Standard’ sociology is part of and has contributed to the ‘ruling relations’ that organize our knowledge in abstraction. Any knowledge that represents the actual apart from the context in which it is situated contributes to the ruling relations. Knowledge that is abstracted from actual settings with actual people being active, serves the interests of the ruling relations and not the interests of the ruled:

The sociology we have works within institutional boundaries. It is hooked up dialogically to the institutional order at multiple points. Sometimes the latter’s categories and concepts are directly incorporated into its discourse; invariably its standpoint is located in the ruling relations. Its research methodologies harvest information, data, and other forms of knowledge derived in various ways from people and what they have to say, and bring them home to the text-based discourses housed in universities. In general, social scientific knowledge represents the world from a standpoint in the ruling relations, not from the standpoint of the ruled. (1999:16)

Smith argues that sociologists must change the way that they think and write the social; if they do not, they import the ruling relations into the texts that they produce. Smith’s project is to make the ‘ruling relations’ visible; if sociologists can make the ruling relations visible, then we will be aware of people’s practices as they contribute to the ruling relations. Because the practices of people contribute to the ruling relations, we can change what people do. By beginning inquiry from one’s own experiences and the

experiences of others, sociologists can serve the people they study instead of merely contributing to the ruling relations.

Dorothy Smith's argument helped me to understand why I had a problem with Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's version of Addams in their text.

Although they have invested resources into discovering women writers like Addams, they have also imported the ruling relations into their texts. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley begin their inquiry with criteria, organized extra locally, in which they then evaluate and categorize the early women sociologists. The criteria they begin with arise from their knowledge of sociology and they use that knowledge to organize a reader's understanding of these women's theories. The problem is that they do not represent Addams for who she really was and what she really said. By practicing their sociological knowledge on Addams, they 'standardize' Addams according to their criteria.

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's criteria, like all criteria, represent the ruling relations because they are abstract and organized elsewhere. The criteria do not come out of Addams work; they are imposed upon her writings. When Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley organize Addams' work around their criteria, they produce a standardized version of Addams that is not true to her original writings.

In the following section, I will show how Jane Addams has been standardized by Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley. Then I will explain what has been lost by evaluating Addams according to standard sociology's methods.

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's Standardized Version of Jane Addams

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley (1998; 2000) present Addams in a standardized way that is characteristic of 'established' sociology. According to Smith (1999):

Social scientific inquiry ordinarily begins from a standpoint in a text-mediated discourse or organization; it operates to claim a piece of the actual for the ruling relations of which it is a part; it proceeds from a concept or theory expressing those relations, and it operates selectively in assembling observations of the world that are ordered discursively.

While a standpoint beginning in text-mediated discourse begins with the concepts or schema of that discourse and turns toward the actual to find its object, the standpoint of women never leaves the actual.

Sociologists' intentions may be as oppositional and progressive as any of us could wish, but if they work with standard methods of thinking and inquiry, they import the ruling relations into the texts they produce... (4-5)

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley present Addams beginning from a standpoint in a text-mediated discourse called sociology. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley claim Addams for the ruling relations that feminist sociologists are made a part of. They proceed from a sociology that expresses the ruling relations. They selectively organize Addams' social thought discursively. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley begin from feminist sociology's concepts and theory, and they impose that knowledge upon Addams. I believe that Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's intentions in discovering and presenting the 'founding mothers' are progressive. However, because they present Addams using standard methods of thinking and writing the social, they not only distort what Addams had to say, they turn her into something she is not. In their presentation of Addams, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley standardize Addams so that she might fit into what sociologists might recognize as sociology.

The standardization of Addams (and all other women theorists that they discovered) begins when Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley utilize criteria in which to evaluate these women as, not only social theorists, but feminist social theorists as well. In their presentation of women theorists in Ritzer's *Classical Sociological Theory* (2000), Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley state:

The parts that seem essential to any social theory are some sense of (1) the fundamental unit to be used in social analysis, (2) the nature of the human being, (3) the relations between ideas and materiality, (4) the purpose and methods appropriate to social-science study. The women whose theories we describe developed such an understanding, and that understanding is essentially feminist. By describing these theories as feminist, we mean that from the vantage point of contemporary feminist sociological theory, we recognize certain themes and concerns central to the theories of these women. These include: (1) the theorist's awareness of her gender and her stance in that gender identity as she develops her sociological theory, (2) an awareness of the situatedness of her analysis and the situatedness of the vantage points of others, (3) a consistent focus on the lives and work of women, (4) a critical concern with the practices of social inequality, and (5) a commitment to the practice of sociology in pursuit of social amelioration. (291)

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley begin with what is essential to any social theory. Where do these criteria come from? Who decides what is essential to a social theory? These criteria come from Ritzer's text. The way that Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley organize the women theorists is very similar to the way that Ritzer organizes the male sociological theorists. By adopting the first set of criteria, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley begin with standard sociology's methods and concepts. They create women theorists around these criteria instead of presenting what these women actually said, and how they actually said it. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley organize our knowledge of these women with criteria that have been developed elsewhere, and at least for Addams, these criteria do not really work.

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley claim that “[t]he discussion that follows is true to Addams’ themes, though we impose some analytic linearity, describing her theory in terms of its epistemology, its method, its view of the individual, and its concept of society”(1998:75). The discussion that follows, however, is not true to what Addams said herself. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley do more than impose some ‘linearity’ to Addams’ texts. A standard version of Addams is created by Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley using their criteria in the following way:

1. For Addams the work of the sociologist is to analyze the situation-at-hand in order to bring about ameliorative social change in the world in which the situation occurs. (75)
2. Addams’s method of doing theory is to report and analyze the situation-at-hand as a narrative of multiple vantagepoints. (76)
3. Addams understands the individual social being as an embodied, agentic subjectivity, motivated by interests and ethics. (78)
4. Addams’s social theory outlines society’s essential characteristics, describes their particular configuration in American society, and analyzes how that configuration must change if America is to be transformed into a socialized democracy. (80)

These criteria are problematic because they are created by Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley to fit into in Ritzer’s text; they import Ritzer’s style of using criteria into their own text. These general criteria cannot be imposed on Addams if we want to really understand what she said. While these criteria are not strictly wrong, their cumulative effect changes what Addams said in her own words. Referring to the first point above, the authors suggest that Addams wrote about what ‘the work of the sociologist was’. However, Addams did not make a general statement about what ‘the work of a sociologist was’. In the second point, they suggest that Addams’ ‘method of doing theory’ is a narrative, “a story involving characters and events, told in chronological sequence and making some attributions of cause” (76). Again, this

statement is too general for Addams. Addams wrote about her own and her neighbors' experiences, and she connected those experiences to the broader social context. She suggested what the causes of those experiences might be, but when Addams wrote about cause, it was always specific to a particular context. In the third point above, the authors suggest that Addams wrote about "the individual social being". Addams did not write about a general 'individual social being'; she wrote about particular individuals with particular problems in a particular time and place. In the fourth point above, the authors suggest that Addams 'outlined society's essential characteristics'. However, this statement is again, too general for Addams; she did not 'outline society's essential characteristics'. Addams wrote about American society and the particular events that she experienced. By applying these generalizing criteria to Addams, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley not only "impose some linearity" to Addams, they create a standard version of Addams.

Consistent with the ideas of pragmatism, Addams was a theorist who avoided creating a general theory with a system of tenets and principles. Addams "theorized about every subject she ever touched, but without arriving at a general theory of modern society – doubtless because she distrusted the dogmatism with which such theories are often associated" (Lasch, 1965:xxvi). Through their criteria, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have presented a standardized version of Addams recognizable to sociologists; however, in doing so, they have missed the most important reason why we need Addams today.

Not only do Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley apply these criteria to Addams' work, they also apply five feminist criteria to Addams' work:

Addams's configuration of the feminist paradigm is marked by (1) a gendered standpoint, (2) a focus on women's lives, (3) the exploration of multiple vantage points, (4) the invention of a research methodology respectful of these multiple vantage points, and (5) a commitment to change. (1998:85)

These criteria are also problematic. First, Addams did not 'configure a feminist paradigm'. Addams does not mention 'a feminist paradigm' in her writings. As suggested above, her pragmatism rendered her suspicious of anything that resembles a paradigm. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's sociological concepts slip into their version of Addams. The language they use represents the standardization of Addams.

As well, Addams always spoke from a standpoint; but that standpoint was from Hull House, not a 'gendered standpoint'. Referring to point four above, Addams did not invent a 'research methodology'; she never talked about methodology. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley are concerned with methodology because they are within a discipline that is concerned with methodology. Addams enjoyed the freedom of being able to express herself; her era did not require that she uses particular methods, and Addams wrote from Hull House, not from a university setting.

What Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have done to Addams by adopting criteria like these is an example of how standard sociology creates a reality for the reader through texts. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have organized their criteria in Ritzer's text, and have used these criteria to organize our knowledge of the women founders in their own feminist text. Ritzer organizes the male sociological theorists around particular themes and concepts. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley use the same formatting techniques as Ritzer's text when they present the

women founders. For example, Ritzer presents Karl Marx with conceptual headings like, 'The Dialectic, Human Potential, Alienation, The Structures of Capitalist Society', and so on (2000:147). Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley present Addams with conceptual headings like, 'Theory versus Application, A Distinctive Theoretical Voice, An Expanded Interpretive Paradigm, Constraint versus Agency' and so on (1998:83-84). By using the same formatting techniques as Ritzer uses for male sociologists, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley present the women founders according to the way male sociology is organized. This is how the ruling relations work. The women founders have been organized extra locally. Because Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley begin with criteria created in Ritzer's text, and organize the women exactly the way male sociologists have been organized, these sociologists import the ruling relations into their texts. This further contributes to the ruling relations that invasively dominate our lives.

Another way Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley standardize Addams is through their editing practices of Addams' work. While all authors must edit for practical reasons, I found it interesting that Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have edited particular references to male authors in Addams' texts. As noted in a footnote earlier, Addams does not mention other authors' names very often, if at all. When she does mention an author, it is usually William James, John Dewey, or Tolstoy. In order to fit Addams into the feminist criteria, they have excluded Addams' references to male authors.

One of the best examples can be found in one of Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's excerpts from Addams' book, *The Long Road of Woman's Memory*

(1916). Here, Addams' reference to William James has been excluded from their text.

The brackets indicate what has been left out of Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's version.

Here was an explanation which I might have anticipated; it was the Muses again at their old tricks [--the very mother of them this time,-- thrusting their ghostly fingers into the delicate fabric of human experience to the extreme end of life. I had known before that the Muses foregathered with the Spirit of Youth and I had even made a feeble attempt to portray that companionship, but I was stupid indeed not to see that they are] equally at home with the aged whose prosaic lives sadly need such interference. [Even with this clue in my hands, so preoccupied are we all with our own practical affairs, I probably should never have followed it, had it not been for the visit of a mythical Devil Baby who so completely filled Hull-House with old women coming to see him, that for a period of six weeks I could perforce do little but give them my attention. When this excitement had subsided and I had written down the corroboration afforded by their eager recitals in the first two chapters of this book, I might have supposed myself to be rid of the matter, incidentally having been taught once more that, while I may receive valuable suggestions from classic literature, when I really want to learn about life, I must depend upon my neighbors, for, as William James insists, the most instructive human documents lie along the beaten pathway.] The subject, however, was not so easily disposed of, for certain elderly women among these selfsame neighbors disconcertingly took quite another line from that indicated by Euripides. (1916:xi)

Initially, I did not think that this omission was a problem; however, I found that there were other examples of how Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley attempt to fit Addams into their feminist criteria.

In the next example, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have included in their text an excerpt from Addams' article, "Problems of Municipal Administration" (1905). Here, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley exclude Addams' reference to Thomas Jefferson:

We are accustomed to say that the machinery of government incorporated in the charters of the early American cities, as in the federal and state constitutions, was worked out by men who were strongly under the influence of the historians and doctrinaires of the eighteenth century. [The most significant representative of

these men is Thomas Jefferson, whose foresight and genius we are here to commemorate, and their most telling phrase is the familiar opening that “all men are created free and equal.”] We are only now, however, beginning to suspect that the present admitted failure in municipal administration, the so-called “shame of American cities,” may be largely due to the inadequacy of those eighteenth-century ideals, with the breakdown of the machinery which they provided, and further, to the weakness inherent in the historic and doctrinaire method when it attempts to deal with growing human institutions.(1905:425)

By excluding references to people like William James, Tolstoy (1998:103), and Thomas Jefferson, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley are trying to exclude the influence of men on Addams. They do this because they are trying to fit Addams into their feminist criteria.

Another example of how Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley emphasize the importance of women over men is when they imply Addams was a lesbian. They tell the reader:

The Hull-House women often formed intense and lifelong relations of many types. Addams usually controlled her public presentation of self and was addressed as Miss Addams by Hull-House residents except for an inner circle, like Kelley and Lathrop, who called her J.A. Yet she developed deep friendships and had two major love relations. The first, with Ellen Gates Starr, was critical to the founding of Hull-House because, in her passionate devotion to Addams, Starr may have had more confidence in Addams than Addams had in herself. But in the 1890's, Addams transferred much of her affection to Mary Rozet Smith, a volunteer at Hull-House, and later a trustee. Smith, the daughter of a wealthy Chicago family, provided Addams with close to unconditional love. She filled the role of Addams's constant supporter and helpmate, financing Hull-House projects, buying clothes for Addams, worrying over her health, paying for their vacations, bringing Addams into the elegant home she shared with her parents, and above all, giving Addams a constant sense of being loved by one person in particular. (1998:70)

I find this quote interesting because the authors do not provide any evidence of where they obtained this information. In a footnote, should the reader look it up, they say that they really do not know whether Addams was a lesbian or not:

We have tried to describe this relation as it would have been seen by Addams and Smith; they did speak of themselves as “married to each other,” but probably within the context of “Boston marriages.” They were not politically lesbian and we do not know what their sexual relations were (which would in part depend on the standard one used to categorize “sexual”). (1998:89)

Why would Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley state that Addams had “love relations” with other women, yet they contradict themselves in a footnote? We may never know if Addams was a lesbian, but I think it is plausible to consider that women can live together, and care for each other without being lesbians. Constructing Addams as a lesbian fits into Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley’s feminist criteria, and it is one more example of how they emphasize the importance of women over men in Addams’ work.

Another way that Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley standardize Addams is by editing out certain kinds of words. They exclude words like “evolution”, “instinct”, “habit”, “progress”, and “primitive” from her texts. In this example, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley omit Addams’ words such as “evolutionary” and “unprogressive”:

[Because their idealism was of the type that is afraid of experience, these founders of our American cities refused to look at the difficulties and blunders which a self-governing people was sure to encounter, and insisted that the people would walk only in the paths of justice and righteousness.] It was inevitable, therefore, that they should have remained quite untouched by that worldly wisdom which counsels us to know life as it is, and by that very modern belief that, if the world is ever right at all, it must go right in its own way. [A man of this generation easily discerns the crudeness of that eighteenth-century conception of essentially unprogressive human nature, in all the empty dignity of its “inborn right of man,” because he has grown familiar with a more passionate human creed, with the modern evolutionary conception of the slowly advancing race whose rights are not “inalienable,” but are hard-won in the tragic processes of civilization.] Were self-government to be inaugurated by the advanced men of the present moment, as the founders were doubtless the advanced men of their time, they would make the most careful research into those early organizations of village communities,

folknotes and *mirs*, those primary cells of both social and political organization where the people knew no difference between the two, but quite simply met to consider in common discussion all that concerned their common life. (1905:426)

There is one more example of how Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley cut out particular words that Addams uses. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley use a quote from Addams' *Newer Ideals of Peace* (1907), in which they cut out the words "simple", "primitive", and her particular reference to "American cities":

In the midst of the modern city which, at moments, seems to stand only for the triumph of the strongest, the successful exploitation of the weak, [the ruthlessness and hidden crime which follow in the wake of the struggle for existence on its lowest terms,] there comes daily—[at least to American cities] – accretions of [simple] people, who carry in their hearts a desire for mere goodness. They regularly deplete their scanty livelihood in response to [a primitive] pity, and, independent of the religions they have professed, of the wrong they have suffered, and of the fixed morality they have been taught, have an unquenchable desire that charity and simple justice shall regulate men's relations. (88)

Due to the editing practices of Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, particular words have been excluded from Addams' texts. Editing out Addams' original words is another way that Addams is standardized for contemporary readers of sociology.

The next examples of the way Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley standardize Addams is illustrated by what they decide to include and exclude when it comes to Addams' writings. As authors, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have the power to decide what selections to include and what selections to exclude. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley included readings from "The Settlement as a Factor in the Labor Movement", the only chapter that Addams wrote in *Hull House Maps and Papers* (1895). They also included excerpts from *Democracy and Social Ethics* (1902), "Problems of Municipal Administration" (1905), and *The Long Road of Woman's Memory* (1916). Before the reader gets a chance to read Addams' original

words, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley imposed their knowledge of sociology onto Addams' social thought as the following examples will show.

In the introduction to "The Settlement as a Factor in the Labor Movement", Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley state:

This selection is excerpted from pages 183-203. This is Addams's theoretical contribution to the famous volume of critical research and theory by Hull-House residents – a landmark yet forgotten classic in sociology. It is important to understand that Addams views the settlement as the site for doing sociology, as she chooses to define that field. This statement is thus about the role of sociology in class relations in capitalist society. Addams's analysis of these relations is radical, and informed by both observation and theoretical reading. The sociological settlement has a distinct and activist role to play in class relations and the labor movement – a role framed by Addams's sociological theory of ethics in society. (90)

What is interesting in this introduction given by Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, is that Addams' and the residents' book, *Hull-House Maps and Papers*, is considered "the famous volume of critical research and theory", and 'a landmark classic' in sociology. This argument contradicts what the authors have been saying all along. How can this book be 'famous' and a 'classic' when Addams has disappeared from the record of sociology? 'Famous' to whom? In the next line, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley suggest that "It is important to understand that Addams views the settlement as the site for doing sociology". Addams did not say that she viewed Hull-House as 'the site for doing sociology'. She did say the Hull-House settlement had "sociological tendencies" (1916: xi); however, Addams practiced her sociology at Hull House. As well, Addams did not talk about 'the role of sociology', and she never referred to Hull House as a 'sociological settlement'. Further, Addams did not 'frame a role for a sociological settlement in her theory of ethics in society'. Addams did talk

about the role Hull House could play in labor disputes. Hull House was a place where unions were formed and a place where union members could exchange ideas. It is interesting in their selection from Addams that follows their introduction that Addams does not mention sociology at all. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley are exercising their power as authors when they introduce the reading with words and concepts that do not appear in Addams' texts.

In this example, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley almost have everything right; however, they add their own ideas to what Addams actually said. In their introduction *Democracy and Social Ethics* (1902), they state:

This is Addams's programmatic statement of the significance of ethics in social life, the need for American society to adopt a social ethic of collective participation and responsibility, and the importance of social analysis and theory in supporting and expanding these claims. This selection is excerpted from pages 1-12. Its general thesis is that ethics are essential in social life; that the times call for a new and social ethic, understood as a systematic expansion of the democratic principle; and that this ethical transformation requires a broader understanding of the lives and perspectives of society's various groups. Social research and social theory will assist in the creation of a social morality. (94)

First, Addams did not make a 'programmatic statement' about ethics; nor did she write about the 'importance of social analysis and theory'. Second, Addams did not suggest that 'social research and social theory will assist in the creation of a social morality'.

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley are making Addams into an advocate of sociology when she was not. They are trying to make her into an advocate of sociology in order to advance her importance for us today. However, what these authors suggest is not consistent with what Addams wrote.

When they introduce "Problems of Municipal Administration" (1905), Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley go a bit too far. They state:

This selection is excerpted from pages 425-39. This paper illustrates Addams's theory of the democratic state and her critique of American government in her own time, not in terms of a popular outcry about corruption, but in terms of (1) the persistence of a militaristic ethic in government and (2) the absence of a truly democratic process which rests in a faith in the humanity and virtue of the average citizen. (98)

The problem with this introduction is that Addams' paper is not 'a theory of the democratic state'. Her paper is a serious and condemning critique of the way the ideals of the American government do not really work in practice. Despite that, Addams never offered a unified theory of the democratic state. What is interesting in the selection that follows is that Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley leave out her critique of the American government all together. They present a much softer Addams in their selection.

While Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley included some of Addams' original writings, an inclusion I find commendable, I find more interesting what they chose to exclude. The selections that they did include are selections that come closest to 'standard' sociology. They selected readings that possibly resemble male sociology including only those selections that resemble sociological methods today. For example, they included *Hull House Maps and Papers* to show that Addams used both qualitative and quantitative methods. However, Addams only wrote one chapter in the book, and the rest of the book is a documentation of numbers of immigrants, housing conditions, and wages surrounding Hull House that was collected and recorded by the residents of Hull House.

What Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley did not include were Addams' two autobiographies, *The First Twenty Years at Hull-House* (1910), and *The Second*

Twenty Years at Hull-House (1930). In these two works, Addams describes the years of her life at Hull House, and these are two of the most important books that Addams wrote because they tell the stories of what Addams believed and practiced. They are not ‘standard’ sociology books, nor are they filled with ‘standard’ sociological theory. In Addams’ autobiographies, the reader can find out who Addams was and what she did. Apparently, Addams’ own autobiographies were not considered sociological for Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley.

Why Addams Resists Standardization

The problem with excluding Addams’ autobiographies is that they provide insight into why Addams is important for us to study today. By standardizing Addams, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley miss the process within Addams’ writing. By process, I mean the relationship that Addams develops with the reader in all of her writings. Like Marx and Engels in *The Communist Manifesto*, Addams wrote before we lived in an extensive textually mediated reality. Addams wrote before ‘standard’ sociology began to objectify social relations. In her writings, she writes from the standpoint of her Hull House experiences, and in doing so, talks to the reader as she is aware of the relationship between the author and reader through the medium of the text. While Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley missed this point because they began with sociological categories in which to place Addams, Addams’ autobiographies tell us what is significant about her work.

In the following example, from the preface to Addams’ first autobiography, Addams wrote as if she was talking directly to the reader. My favorite part about reading

Addams' original writings is the connection that Addams makes to the reader. In almost every book, Addams tells the reader where the book came from. The following examples show the process within her writings as she tells the reader why the book was written:

Every preface is, I imagine, written after the book has been completed, and now that I have finished this volume I will state several difficulties which may put the reader upon his guard unless he too postpones the preface to the very last. Many times during the writing of these reminiscences, I have become convinced that the task was undertaken all too soon. One's fiftieth year is indeed an impressive milestone at which one may well pause to take an accounting, but the people with whom I have so long journeyed have become so intimate a part of my lot that they cannot be written of either in praise or blame; the public movements and causes with which I am still identified have become so endeared, some of them through their very struggles and failures, that it is difficult to assess them. It has also been hard to determine what incidents and experiences should be selected for recital, and I have found that I might give an accurate report of each isolated event and yet give a totally misleading impression of the whole, solely by the selection of the incidents. For these reasons and many others I have found it difficult to make a faithful record of the years since the autumn of 1889 when without any preconceived social theories or economic views, I came to live in an industrial district in Chicago. If the reader should inquire why the book was ever undertaken in the face of so many difficulties, in reply I could instance two purposes, only one of which in the language of organized charity, is "worthy". Because settlements have multiplied so easily in the United States I hoped that a simple statement of an earlier effort, including the stress and storm, might be of value in their interpretation and possibly clear them of a certain charge of superficiality. The unworthy motive was a desire to start a "backfire," as it were, to extinguish two biographies of myself, one of which had been submitted to me in outline, that made life in a Settlement all too smooth and charming. (1910:viii)

When I read Addams' words, I feel that she is talking directly to me. Not only does Addams' develop a relationship with her reader, she tells me where the book came from and what the purpose of the book is. In contrast to 'standard' sociology, Addams' texts do not 'appear from nowhere' (Smith, 1999).

In *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets* (1909), Addams tells the reader who her intended audience is. From the foreword, "Much of the material in the following pages has appeared in current publications. It is here presented in book form in the hope

that it may prove of value to those groups of people who in many cities are making a gallant effort to minimize the dangers which surround young people and to provide them with opportunities for recreation". In this book, Addams argues that young people need recreation time and places for recreation. She begins each chapter with stories of people she knows in order to make her case. She analyzes the situation after the telling of the stories. Addams often uses literature to get her point across. At the end of each chapter, she offers suggestions of what people might do to make life a little better and a little brighter for young people. In reading *The Spirit of Youth*, I realized that the relationship that Addams makes with her reader through her text is typical of all her works.

Addams develops a relationship with her reader and stays grounded by giving the context in which the book was written. From the preface to *A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil* (1912), Addams explains:

The following material, much has been published in *McClure's Magazine*, was written, not from the point of view of the expert, but because of my own need for a counter-knowledge to a bewildering mass of information which came to me through the Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago. The reports which its twenty field officers daily brought to its main office adjoining Hull House became to me a revelation of the dangers implicit in city conditions and of the allurements which are designedly placed around many young girls in order to draw them into an evil life. (ix)

In the preface, Addams explains to the reader about her own revelation of the dangers and risks that young girls face in the city. Throughout the book, Addams is deeply concerned with the problem of prostitution, particularly the involvement of very young girls. The book demonstrates Addams' careful analysis of the social problem and the way a new moral conscience will help to eliminate such terrible risks for young women. She begins with an analogy of prostitution with the slave trade and how people must have a change

in conscience before any real physical change can take place. What I like about this book is that Addams looks at the problem from various angles. Addams studies prostitution and the law, along with economics, moral education, philanthropy, and social control.

Addams resists standardization because she does not write 'standard' sociology. When Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley categorize Addams, they miss the main reason why we should study Addams today. Addams shows us an alternative to contributing to the ruling relations because she practices that method of inquiry called standpoint. By writing from one's own experiences and the experiences of others, Addams' practices the sociology outlined by Dorothy Smith (1999). In the next chapter, I will compare Addams' standpoint to the textual practices of 'standard' sociology's most influential practitioners: Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash. By comparing Addams to contemporary scholars, I will show further why it is so important to study Addams today.

Chapter Three

Addams' Standpoint

Now that I have analyzed some of the reasons why Jane Addams disappeared from sociology, in this chapter and in the following chapter, I will show why Addams should re-appear. Addams practiced non-standard sociology. Comparing Addams to contemporary sociological theorists not only shows how different Addams' sociology is, but why her approach remains necessary. I chose to compare Addams to Beck, Giddens, and Lash's (1994) text, *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, because there are some similarities of topics and also because their text is considered to be 'cutting edge' sociology. More important, I will show that Addams is an example of a theorist who practiced Dorothy Smith's (1999) 'method of inquiry' called standpoint, while Beck, Giddens, and Lash (1994) continue to practice the 'conventions of established sociology'.

Similarities between Contemporary Theorists and Addams:

Beck, Giddens and Lash's collaborative undertaking of *Reflexive Modernization* (1994), develops a theory of the transition from industrial modernity to 'risk society' or 'late modernity'. Some of the common themes that these three authors share are 'reflexivity', 'detraditionalization', and 'issues of ecology' (vi-vii). The authors attempt to break 'the stranglehold' of debates between 'modernity' verses 'postmodernity' which have 'produced rather little'. These theorists suggest that the changes that are taking place in contemporary society are 'unintended' and 'uncontrolled'. While modernity and

notions of progress promised a better future, the transition to 'late modernity' is characterized by risks, uncertainties, contingencies, and ambivalence. Reflexive Modernization means, 'what happens when modernity begins to reflect on itself?' (112).

The similarities between Addams, and Beck, Giddens, and Lash, are evident in what these theorists chose to analyze. Like Addams, Beck, Giddens, and Lash are interested in social change in many areas of social life, change including democracy, politics, values, inequalities, individualism, work, gender, risks, economics, and war. Yet while these theorists have some similarities evident in the content of their writings, the ways in which they 'write the social' are completely different.

By 'writing the social', Smith (1999) means the textual methods authors use to communicate their ideas to the reader; the way that the text is written organizes the readers' knowledge about a particular subject. While reading *Reflexive Modernization*, I could not help but notice the difference between Beck, Giddens, and Lash's way of writing theory and Addams'. My experience as a reader was similar to Dorothy Smith's experience when she compares the difference between Marx and Engels' writing in *The Communist Manifesto* to contemporary Marxist theories of class (1999:34). Smith noticed that when Marx and Engels wrote, they wrote from a particular standpoint. They talked to the reader as "us" the communists against "them" the capitalists, and they created a relationship between themselves and the reader. Marx and Engels 'located the reader historically' in their writings, and they spoke from the standpoint of the communists, or *as* communists. Smith describes her experience:

The text places the reader historically; class struggle is going on, and we are in the middle of it. The sides are drawn up in the text itself as subjects are directly summoned and addressed. We can enter ourselves directly into its drama. Class is not objectified in the text as it is in the elaborate theoretical constructs of the

contemporary Marxist theorists, needing rather careful fitting to the actualities of contemporary social relations. Rather, class emerges as a great historical process of struggle in which the pamphlet and its analysis are situated, and it draws us into it. The time of the text is just exactly that hinge where the past turns on a present that will be the making of the future. This is where you, as reading subject, are placed by the pamphlet. This also is where you live... Though the reader isn't always being called on to act as he (I use the pronoun advisedly) is here, Marx's and Engels's analyses have generally this historically situated character; the time of the text isn't separate from the historical time of which it speaks. (1999:34)

Like Marx and Engels, Addams' writings are characterized by 'locating the reader historically'. She talks to the reader in her texts, and in doing so, Addams creates a relationship with her reader within the actual world. Addams writes from the standpoint of Hull House; she writes as a resident situated in Chicago at the turn of the century. Like contemporary Marxist theorists of class, Beck, Giddens, and Lash write theory that does not 'locate the reader historically'. Their text is 'extra local' as they write *about* people instead of *as* people. In Beck, Giddens, and Lash's text, their standpoint is not clear; they do not write from their own experience nor from the experiences of the people that they know.

While pursuing Dorothy Smith's critique of established sociology's method of inquiry, I have discovered that Addams' texts are examples of how to write about the social world -- how to write theory -- by beginning from one's own standpoint. Beck, Giddens and Lash, in contrast, adopt conventional sociological methods of writing and inquiry that do not address their own lived experiences, the experiences of their subjects, the experiences of their readers. While Addams' texts remain grounded in her experiences and people's experiences around Hull House, Beck, Giddens, and Lash's text assumes an objective standpoint that does not stem from anyone's experiences.

In the following pages I will show first, how Beck, Giddens, and Lash practice methods that are ‘extra local’ when they write the social. Second, I will show how Addams practices methods that are ‘local’ when she writes the social.

Beck, Giddens, and Lash’s Methods of Writing the Social:

According to Smith (1999), theorists who adopt the practices of established sociology engage in the ‘objectification’ of people and the social world (59). They do so by adopting the following methods. First, in writing the social, ‘theorists suspend the presence of the subject’ (59). Second, theorists ‘transfer agency from the subject to social phenomena’ (59). Third, theorists create a distance between a ‘discursive world and the actual world’ in which we live (60). Fourth, subjects are reconstructed as ‘figments of discourse’(61). Smith explains what the problems are when these practices are adopted for writing the social:

Such elaborate technical and artful practices produce from the actualities of people’s lives readings that are expressed in terms that are not theirs and from a standpoint that conceals its positioning in the relations of ruling while appearing to be that of nowhere in particular. They enable properties of the social organization and relations in which people are active to be attributed to the figmental personages of the sociologist’s narrative. (62)

Beck, Giddens, and Lash’s text ‘appears from nowhere’ because they do not reveal their standpoint nor do they address the standpoint of others. By adopting these conventions of ‘established sociology’, Beck, Giddens, and Lash produce a text within the ruling relations-- a text that contributes to the ruling relations-- by producing people as objects. The actual experiences of individuals in their particular circumstances are not privileged in the text because what people do is reconstructed by the narrative of the sociologist. In

the following examples I will show how Beck, Giddens, and Lash adopt the conventions of 'established' sociology that are situated in and contribute to the 'ruling relations'.

In *Reflexive Modernization*, Beck, Giddens, and Lash 'suspend the presence of the subject'. Subjects are suspended within the text when their experiences and actions are talked about without the subjects themselves. One way of doing this is to transform the verbs of what people do, like think and feel, into nouns that act without the subject. For example, instead of saying person A feels depressed and cannot continue to do their school work, authors who suspend the presence of the subject might say something like, 'depression is responsible for the uncompleted assignment'. One example of how Giddens suspends the presence of the subject is when he talks about addiction. There are people in the beginning when he talks about addiction, but then he shifts and suspends the subject:

Addiction, it has been said, 'is anything we feel we have to lie about'. It is, one could say, repetition which has lost its connection to the 'truth' of tradition; its origins are obscure to the individual concerned, although he or she may lie to others too...The progress of addiction is a substantively significant feature of the postmodern social universe, but it is also a 'negative index' of the very process of the detraditionalizing of society. (71)

In this example, it is 'addiction' that 'has lost its connection to the 'truth' of tradition'. Giddens is not talking about people who have addictions, real addictions that damage their lives and perhaps other peoples' lives too, depending on the addiction, and depending on the people and their situation. Giddens seems to be talking about addiction without addicts. In the next line, addiction's 'origins' are obscure to 'the individual' concerned. Does that mean that the individual doesn't know where their addiction comes from? What does this mean? And who is the individual with the 'addiction' that

Giddens is talking about? In the next line, it is the ‘process of addiction’ that is a ‘negative index’ of the ‘very process of the detraditionalizing of society’. Do people play a part in this ‘detraditionalizing of society’? This quotation from Giddens is one example of how subjects are replaced by nouns that do the acting for people.

Beck, Giddens, and Lash also ‘transfer agency from the subject to social phenomena’. It is not the subjects who are acting in their text. Social phenomena, categories and concepts invented and constructed by sociologists/authors, are given agency within these authors’ text. The following examples demonstrate how these authors transfer agency from subjects to social phenomena. The first example comes from Beck’s essay on “The Reinvention of Politics” (1-55):

Thus, by virtue of its inherent dynamism, modern society is undercutting its formation of class, stratum, occupation, sex roles, nuclear family, plant, business sectors and of course also the prerequisites and continuing forms of natural techno-economic progress. (2)

In this example, Beck’s ‘modern society’ is given agency. ‘Modern society’ is doing the ‘undercutting’ of various forms of social life. There are no actors here making decisions, changing their lives, thinking and feeling. ‘Modern society’ is an entity with a life of its own, an entity which can change social life without the participation of people. In this example, Beck shows how agency has been transferred from people to concepts like ‘modern society’.

The next example that I discovered of how agency is transferred from people to social phenomena is taken from Giddens’ essay, “Living in a Post-Traditional Society” (56-109):

The connection between ritual and formulaic truth is also what gives traditions their qualities of exclusion. Tradition always discriminates between ‘insider’ and

‘other’, because participation in ritual and acceptance of formulaic truth is the condition for its existence... Tradition claims a privileged view of time; but it tends to do so of space also... (79-80)

There is nothing wrong with what Giddens says here, but it is how he says it that is important. In this example it is the concept of ‘tradition’ that is doing the discrimination, and it is the concept of ‘tradition’ that claims a privileged view of time. There are no people here who have created traditions over time, in a specific culture, in a specific time in history. There are no subjects who enact, carry out, believe in, practice, or care about whether traditions are maintained or not. In this example, agency has been transferred from the subject to the social phenomenon and concept of ‘tradition’. I would like to ask Giddens, where are the people in your work?

The third way that these authors objectify people and the social world in which you and I live, is by creating a distance between a ‘discursive world’ and the actual world. What Smith means by this practice is how authors when writing the social create a text that is like an “escape hatch out of the actual” (7). Beck, Giddens, and Lash do not begin from their own experiences, nor do they locate the reader historically. The text is written as if the outside world, the world outside the text does not exist. There is no relationship acknowledged between the author and the text in some time and space and the reader in their time and space. The text allows an escape into a reality of its own, as if that was the world in which the reader lived. By creating a distance between the textual world and the actual world, and a distance between the reader and the author, Beck, Giddens, and Lash objectify people and reality.

For example, in the opening to their book, these authors do not tell the reader who they are, why they are writing this book, nor the purpose for which the book was written.

You and I do not know who their intended audience is, because they do not talk about themselves at all. From the first words in the preface, Beck, Giddens, and Lash give us only a few ideas of why the book was written:

The idea of this book was originally suggested by Ulrich Beck. Scott Lash taught for some while in Germany and Lash and Beck came to see common threads in each other's work. Giddens and Beck gained a proper grasp of each other's writings only at a somewhat later date. Once this three-way interchange was established, however, a number of striking convergences emerged between what were originally separate bodies of work. These cluster around several dominant themes. (vi)

The authors then proceed to explain what is common about their work. What I have learned from this opening is that the book was Beck's idea, Lash and Beck had ideas in common, and Beck and Giddens understood each other's writings. I really don't know anything about them, their experiences, nor do I really know why they wrote this book or for whom. Beck, Giddens, and Lash write in a transcendent voice, and do not tell me where they are coming from.

The fourth way that Beck, Giddens, and Lash practice objectification of people and the social world is when they produce 'subjects as figments of discourse'. To produce people as 'figments of discourse' means that subjects or people who are actors in this world are talked *about* as if they existed without bodies. Beck, Giddens, and Lash talk *about* people, subjects, men, women, and children, but they talk *about* people as categories and concepts without a body. These authors talk about men and women's relationships, for example, but there are no specific people with real lives, problems, struggles, thoughts or feelings within the text. When they talk about "women" and "men", there is no reference made to the differences between women or differences between men. By talking about 'women' and 'men' as abstracted categories without

bodies, outside of lived experience and their everyday/everynight worlds, Beck, Giddens, and Lash produce people as figments of sociological discourse.

An example of how people become figments of discourse comes from Beck's essay, "The Reinvention of Politics":

Now, how should one conceive of the connection between individualization and the welfare state, between individualization and the legally protected labor market more precisely? An example might clarify this, the work biography: for men it is taken for granted, but for women it is controversial. None the less, half the women (at least) work outside the home in all industrial countries, increasingly even those who are mothers. Surveys document that for the coming generation of women a career and motherhood are taken for granted as part of their life plans. If the movement towards two-career families continues, then two individual biographies – education, job, career – will have to be pursued together and held together in the form of the nuclear family. (15)

In this example, 'men' and 'women' are talked about objectively. Beck uses categories like 'women' to develop his narrative, but he does not talk about women with bodies in a particular time and place with major decisions to make regarding their career choices and whether or not to have children. By producing what people do as figments of discourse, the people he talks about are lifted out of the actualities of their own living with others.

Addams' Method of Writing the Social:

In contrast to Beck, Giddens, and Lash's practicing the objectification of people and reality through their text, Smith (1999) advocates "an alternative organization of knowledge"(74). Standpoint is an alternative to practicing established sociology's way of writing the social. Standpoint is a method of inquiry which begins from the experience of the researcher:

While the standpoint beginning in text-mediated discourse begins with the concepts or schema of that discourse and turns toward the actual to find its object, the standpoint of women never leaves the actual. (5)

There are six practices of standpoint which I will explain in more detail. First, the researcher is not 'transcendent', but is a 'participant in the social world in which she/he is discovering' (5,6). Second, the focus is on the 'actual ongoing practices of actual individuals in local sites who are in a particular time and place' (6). Third, 'concepts are not abstracted' out of 'time and place' (7). Fourth, the concepts are 'people's actual practices in actual settings'; there is no 'theory practice split' (7). Fifth, the researcher is aware that the 'text acts as a bridge between living and the ruling relations' (7). Sixth, the 'aim of the researcher is not to explain people's behaviour, but to explain how people are situated in the ruling relations, and how people contribute to those relations' (8).

While standard methods of writing sociology 'produce people as objects', standpoint researchers emphasize their own experience and the experiences of the people they inquire about (Smith, 1999:5). Writing from a particular standpoint, as Addams does, is one of the main reasons why it is important to study Addams today.

First, Addams is not 'transcendent' when she writes the social. Addams is a participant in the social that she is discovering. Addams wrote her sociology from Hull House and positions herself in her texts as a woman who lived amongst the poor. She locates herself in the neighborhood around Hull House and her subjects are people who she knows from the neighborhood. In all of Addams' texts, she tells the reader where the book comes from and what the purpose of the book is. One example is from the forward to *Peace and Bread in Time of War* (1922), where Addams wrote:

The following pages are the outgrowth of an attempt to write a brief history of the efforts for peace made by a small group of men and women in the United States during the European War, and of their connection with the women of other countries, as together they became organized into the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Such a history would of course be meaningless, unless it portrayed the scruples and convictions upon which these efforts were based. During the writing of it, however, I found myself so increasingly reluctant to interpret the motives of other people that at length I confined all analysis of motives to my own. As my reactions were in no wise unusual, I can only hope that the auto-biographical portrayal of them may prove to be fairly typical and interpretive of many like-minded people who, as the great war progressed, gradually found themselves the protagonists of that most unpopular of all causes – peace in time of war...

Addams signs the forward: Hull-House, Chicago. In comparison to Beck, Giddens, and Lash, Addams does not write from a transcendent voice; she tells me why she is writing the book, about the network of personal relationships that the book arises from. She also makes an honest statement about how she can't speak about other people's motives, but she can speak about her own. Addams begins with her own motives and hopes they might have something in common with the people she worked with towards achieving peace. Addams' text conveys and expands a dialogue that shows how she is a participant in the social relations that she describes.

Second, Addams writes about the 'actual ongoing practices of actual individuals in local sites' who are in a particular time and space. The reader knows who Addams is and comes to know who the people are that she talks about. The people she talks about and the situations that she describes are grounded in people's everyday and every night world. These people have complex lives and multifaceted problems to deal with. The people that Addams talks about are described within their context in the actual world that she, the researcher, and the people share. Addams knows the context surrounding her subjects' lives because she lives with the people in their neighborhood. An example of

how Addams writes about people's actual practices in their everyday and every night world is evident when she describes the isolation that women experience in domestic labor. In "A Belated Industry" (1896), Addams wrote:

It may be well to make clear at once that this paper does not treat of this occupation as a domestic art, in which the members of the household engage and spend time which would otherwise have no economic value. As an art it is charming and destined to endure so long as women cherish their homes and express affection by personal service. This paper treats of the occupation solely as an industry, by means of which large numbers of women are earning a livelihood. An attempt is made to present this industry from the point of view of those women who are working in households for wages. (536)

The opinions in it have been largely gained through experiences in a Woman's Labor Bureau, and through conversations held there with women returning from the "situations," which they had voluntarily relinquished in Chicago households of all grades. These same women seldom gave up a place in a factory, although many of the factory situations involved long hours and hard work. (536)

The writer has known the voice of a little girl to change so much during three weeks of "service" that she could not recognize it when the girl returned to the bureau. It alternated between the high falsetto in which a shy child "speaks a piece," and the husky gulp with which the *globus hystericus* is swallowed. The alertness and *bonhomie* of the voice of the tenement-house child had totally disappeared. (548)

In the example above, Addams tells the reader about her experience with women who work in domestic labor, and she also expresses the experiences of the women and girls themselves. Addams tells the reader where her analysis comes from; her analysis comes from her own experiences and conversations with women who work in domestic labor in Chicago. This is one example of how Addams writes about people's practices in a particular setting and time.

Third, Addams does not talk about concepts that are abstracted from time and space. Addams never talks about "men" and "women" separate from the context that surrounds them. Addams focused and valued people's experiences and how they relate to

other people's experiences. There is not one description or story told in which Addams does not explain the context of people's lives or the context surrounding a problem that she addresses. Her readers are thus drawn into these relationships. In the following example, Addams tells a story about a 'gang of boys' in her neighborhood who had become addicted to cocaine:

I recall our experience with a gang of boys living on a neighboring street. There were eight of them altogether, the eldest seventeen years of age, the youngest thirteen, and they practically lived the life of vagrants. What answered to their club house was a corner lot on Harrison and Desplaines Streets, strewn with old boilers, in which they slept by night and many times by day. The gang was brought to the attention of Hull-House during the summer of 1904 by a distracted mother, who suspected that they were all addicted to some drug... An investigation showed that cocaine had first been offered to these boys on the street by a colored man, an agent of a drug store, who had given them samples and urged them to try it. In three or four months they had become hopelessly addicted to its use, and at the end of six months, when they were brought to Hull-House, they were all in a critical condition... The boys would tell nothing for three or four days after they were discovered, in spite of the united efforts of their families, the police, and the residents of Hull-House. But finally the superior boy of the gang, the manliest and the least debauched, told his tale, and the others followed in quick succession. They were willing to be helped, and were even eager if they could go together, and finally seven of them were sent to the Presbyterian Hospital for four weeks' treatment and afterwards all went to the country together for six weeks more... It is doubtful whether these boys could have ever pulled through unless they had been allowed to keep together through the hospital and convalescing period,—unless we had been able to utilize the gang spirit and to turn its collective force towards overcoming the desire for the drug. (1909:64-66)

In this example, Addams is trying to understand the boys' 'quest for adventure'. She uses the story to show that many of the activities that youth partake in the city are not because they are bad children, but because they 'desire adventure'. Addams tells the story about a specific group of boys that she knows, in order to tell the reader that a bad situation can be turned into a good one, if only you approach the situation with deep understanding of the problem. Addams and the Hull-House residents recognized their

‘gang spirit’ and used it to help the boys. This example is typical of all of Addams’ stories. She tells stories about real people in real places at a particular time. Then she offers an analysis of the problem, and uses her stories to understand the problems of youth, for example, at a more general level. But because she stays grounded through the use of these stories, her concepts are not lifted out of time and space. Her concept of the ‘gang spirit’ came from the stories of the boys themselves. In contrast to Giddens’ understanding of addiction quoted above, Addams’ stories about real people are grounded in time and space.

Fourth, Addams demonstrates how theory is a practice. Addams shows us how we can ‘learn to address concepts, beliefs, ideology as people’s actual practices in the local settings of their everyday lives’ (Smith, 1999:7). Addams was a part of her theory; she began her theory within her own experience of the world around her. Addams made her forms of thought active outside and within the text. When Addams writes, her texts are full of people who act, think, have feelings, and are alive. You and I can read her texts today to show us how to make thought active. Addams thought is active because she begins from her body, and people’s bodies. In one example, Addams tells a story of how she became aware of the problems of ‘child labor’, how she realized how prevalent it was, and what she did about what she had learned through her investigations:

Our very first Christmas at Hull-House, when we as yet knew nothing of child labor, a number of little girls refused the candy which was offered them as part of the Christmas good cheer, saying simply that they “worked in a candy factory and could not bear the sight of it.” We discovered that for six weeks they had worked from seven in the morning until nine at night, and they were exhausted as well as satiated. The sharp consciousness of stern economic conditions was thus thrust upon us in the midst of the season of good will. During the same winter three boys from a Hull-House club were injured at one machine in a neighboring factory for lack of a guard which would have cost but a few dollars. When the injury of one of these boys resulted in his death, we felt quite sure that the owners

would share our horror and remorse, and they would do everything possible to prevent the reoccurrence of such a tragedy. To our surprise they did nothing whatever, and I made my first acquaintance then with those pathetic documents signed by the parents of working children, that they will make no claim for damages resulting from "carelessness." The visits we made in the neighborhood constantly discovered women sewing upon sweatshop work, and often they were assisted by incredibly small children... We learned to know many families in which the working children contributed to the support of their parents, not only because they spoke English better than the older immigrants and were willing to take lower wages, but because their parents gradually found it easy to live upon their earnings... While we found many pathetic cases of child-labor and hard-driven victims of the sweating system who could not possibly earn enough in the short busy season to support themselves during the rest of the year, it became evident that we must add carefully collected information to our general impression of neighborhood conditions if we would make it of any genuine value... As a result of its investigations, this committee recommended to the Legislature the provisions which afterward became those of the first factory law of Illinois, regulating the sanitary conditions of the sweatshop and fixing fourteen as the age at which a child might be employed...(1910:198-201)

In this example, we can see how Addams became aware of the problem of child labor, how she investigated various conditions of child labor, and how she tried to understand why parents would allow their children to work under these conditions. Addams did not offer a general theory of child labour. She investigated the conditions, tried to understand the situation, and then tried to solve the problem through legislation. In this example we can see how Addams is part of her theory, and how she doesn't stop with an analysis of the situation. Addams enacts her theory by stating her case in the courts. Her investigations resulted in Illinois' first child labor law.

Fifth, Addams was aware of the power of the text. Smith (1999) claims that 'the text is the bridge between our lived reality and the ruling relations' (5). So that the text does not act as an 'escape hatch out of reality', it must 'preserve the presence of actual individuals while using the technology of writing that displaces the individual'(8). While I have already demonstrated how Addams' texts are full of 'actual individuals', this next

example will show how Addams was concerned that people of her class were using literature to escape from what was going on in the less desirable neighborhoods in England and America. In Addams' words:

This is what we were all doing, lumbering our minds with literature that only served to cloud the really vital situation spread before our eyes. It seemed to me too preposterous that in my first view of the horror of East London I should have recalled De Quincey's literary description of the literary suggestion which had once paralyzed him. In my disgust it all appeared a hateful, vicious circle which even the apostles of culture themselves admitted, for had not one of the greatest among the moderns plainly said that "conduct, and not culture is three fourths of human life". (1910:70-71)

Here, I find evidence that Addams knew how texts can provide an escape from the real conditions that people are living in and dealing with. Addams was very much concerned about creating writings that were grounded in her own and other's experiences so that her texts do not act as an 'escape hatch out of reality'. I think that is why Addams talked to the reader in her texts; she always tells the reader why the book was written, and also what experiences instigated it.

Sixth, 'politics are foundational to standpoint'(Smith, 1999:8). The aim of standpoint is first, "how to write a sociology that speaks in and of the world as it is in women's, in people's, actual experience" and second, "connecting such a sociology to those for whom it might be useful and who might use it" (25). In other words, writing the social using an alternative method of inquiry is political because it intends to empower the people who the text describes. I think that Addams wrote in order to explain the problems in her neighborhood to herself and to others. The reason I think that Addams tried to empower people is because "Addams and her colleagues at Hull-House posted the results of their research so that the people who used it, their subjects, could read

them” (Mc Donald, 1997:115). Addams tried to explain how and why things were the way they were. For example, she explained why it is not logical to exclude women from politics and government (1907a), and why women should have the vote (1910b).

Addams wrote these articles in order to change how people thought about women. She also wrote what she wrote so that people would change how society was organized. By suggesting how things were and how things might be different, Addams tried to empower people. She tried to empower herself, and those people who she wrote about and for: working class men and women, children, and the sick and the old. She told their stories to make everyone at least aware of the neighborhood conditions.

One example of how Addams can be viewed as political is when she argues why women should have the vote:

For many generations it has been believed that woman's place is within the walls of her own home, and it is indeed impossible to imagine the time when her duty there shall be ended or to forecast any social change which shall release her from that paramount obligation. This paper is an attempt to show that many women today are failing to discharge their duties to their own households properly simply because they do not perceive that as society grows more complicated it is necessary that woman shall extend her sense of responsibility to many things outside her own home if she would continue to preserve the home in its entirety... In a Complex Community Like the Modern City all points of view need to be represented; the resultants of diverse experiences need to be pooled if the community would make for sane and balanced progress... In closing, may I recapitulate that if women would fulfill her traditional responsibility to her own children; if she would educate and protect from danger factory children who must find their recreation in the street; if she would bring the cultural forces to bear upon our materialistic civilization; and if she would do it all with the dignity and directness fitting one who carries immemorial duties, then she must bring herself to the use of the ballot – that latest implement for self-government. May we not fairly say that American women need this implement in order to preserve the home? (1910b: 21-22)

This example shows that Addams was political, and also that her “[i]nquiry is in and of the same world as people live in” (Smith, 1999:8). Addams was a woman who could not

vote. She didn't just identify with other women who couldn't vote; she wrote to change their situation, and her own position too. Addams is in the social relations she seeks to explore; she is self conscious and does not make a positionless account of social life.

In stark contrast to Addams, Beck, Giddens, and Lash's text is an excellent example of what Smith calls textually mediated reality; the book is not of and in a world where people carry out their complex and often difficult lives. I felt that their book creates an escape hatch through which I can go into another world, into the world created by social scientists. Beck, Giddens, and Lash, like most social science versions of the world, exclude the standpoint of experience. Through their concealed standpoint and their objectification of the social world and of people, these "practices of objectification are constitutive of the modes of organization in the ruling relations, creating forms of consciousness that are properties of organization and discourse rather than of individuals" (Smith, 1999:35). By failing to reveal their standpoint, and by adopting objectifying practices, Beck, Giddens, and Lash operate within the ruling relations and contribute to the ruling relations. They have created 'forms of consciousness' through their text that are 'properties' of sociological organization and discourse, and not forms of consciousness that are properties of actual individuals.

In contrast, Addams' texts do not provide an escape hatch into another world because she begins her inquiry from her own and other's experiences. Addams develops a relationship with her reader throughout her texts by directly addressing them and calling upon them to act. Her texts are not part of the ruling relations, nor do they contribute to them. Addams does not produce forms of consciousness that are properties of sociological organization or discourse. Addams' social thought was written as a

woman who was a participant in the social relations she was discovering, and therefore, her texts are products of experiences.

Addams Importance to Sociology and Sociologists:

Why are the differences between Addams' way of writing theory and Beck, Giddens, and Lash's way of writing theory important for sociology? The differences that are evident in their work are important because sociologists can learn through Addams' texts how to write the social from the experiences of people. By reading Addams' social thought, sociologists can learn "how to write a sociology that speaks in and of the world as it is in women's, in people's, actual experience" and how to connect "such a sociology to those for whom it might be useful and who might use it" (Smith, 1999:25).

Sociologists can learn how to write, think, and talk about social relations, not in the terms of sociology, its discourse, its concepts that organize our knowledge and therefore our experiences, but based on experiences of actual individuals.

I want a sociology that values peoples' experiences, and I want a sociology that is useful. Dorothy Smith has articulated the problem with established sociology, and now it is my problem too. Addams has shown me that such a sociology can exist. I think that some sociologists might be ready for an alternative sociology that is based on and values peoples' experiences in their terms, not in sociologists' terms. But the way we think about, write about, and talk about sociology must change. The objectification of people and the social world would have to end. Sociologists could no longer produce texts that are abstracted from the world in which they and others live. Sociological research might actually show how people are hooked up into the ruling relations that organize peoples'

lives and knowledge. If sociologists could explain “the socially organized powers in which their/our lives are embedded and to which their/our activities contribute” then sociologists can make visible the powers that control our lives.

In the next chapter I will continue to show why Addams is so important for sociology today. I will discuss the implications that Smith’s and Addams’ method of inquiry has for contemporary sociology. I will show how sociology might have been different had sociologists paid attention to her work.

Chapter Four

Addams' Sociology For People

Why is Jane Addams important for sociology today? In the previous chapter I argued that Addams is important because of her standpoint. Continuing to use the arguments of Dorothy Smith (1999), I will now argue that Addams is important for contemporary sociology because she wrote 'a sociology for people'(25). First, I will discuss what 'a sociology for people' is. Second, I will discuss how Addams wrote 'a sociology for people'. Third, I will suggest how sociology might be different if its practitioners practiced 'a sociology for people' instead of a sociology about people.

What is a Sociology For People?

It proposes to create a knowledge of the social grounded in people's experience of their own lives. It does not treat experience as knowledge, but as a place to begin inquiry. The aim of inquiry is not, as in established sociologies, to explain people's behaviour, but to explain to people the social – or society – as it enters into and shapes their lives and activities. (Smith, 1999:96)

A sociology for people means that the inquiry of the researcher is based on their own or others' experiences and is meant to empower people. A sociology for people attempts to understand how things got to be the way they are and questions why things are the way they are. By uncovering or demystifying social relations, a sociology for people tries to show people how they can change the way they live:

This sociology is of the same world of which it writes; it aims at producing a knowledge of that world which is itself in and of the social. It is committed to inquiry and investigation, to finding out 'how things are put together,' and hence to producing knowledge that represents the social as it happens. (97)

Dorothy Smith argues that sociology must be for people; not 'of or about' people, but for them (1999:96). Smith's project is to find out how and why people come to experience what they do. People have various experiences and they can express those experiences to sociologists. But people do not know how to connect those experiences to the experiences of others, and they do not know about the macro-social processes that are responsible for those experiences. 'Experience is not knowledge; it is only a place to begin inquiry' (96). By beginning from people's experiences as they carry out their lives, sociologists can show people how their experiences came to be the way they are, how they are connected to other people, and how those experiences are products of social relations that are beyond their control. Smith explains the goals of a sociology for people:

Inquiry is directed towards exploring and explicating what s/he does not know -- the social relations and organization pervading her or his world but invisible in it. (5)

Such a sociology or sociologies would recognize that, as Marx saw, the social comes into being only as the doings of actual people under definite material conditions and that we enter into social relations beyond our control that our own activities bring into being. Thus our own powers contribute to powers that stand over against us and 'overpower our lives' (Marx and Engels 1973:90). (Smith, 1999:25)

The standpoint or interests of the researcher must be made explicit in order to have a sociology for people. Marx wrote a sociology for people because he tried to demystify the powers that stand over us, and the powers to which we contribute. Marx also wrote for people so that we might be empowered and could change our lives. Dorothy Smith writes in order to expose or make visible the ruling relations that stand over people. She also tries to show how sociologists import the ruling relations into their

texts by adopting objectifying practices that reduce people to objects. A sociology for people, however, must make their interests clear. Smith argues:

I do not imagine you can have a sociology without standpoint or interests. Rather, the sociology making inquiry into the social as people bring it into being its central project is necessarily in explicit dialogue with them and is necessarily exposed to being changed by that dialogue. Theory, rather than insulating such a discovering discourse from the voices of others, must be seen rather as providing what is good to think with, at least until we find something that does better. (156)

Like Marx, Smith makes her interests clear; her sociology is for people so that they might change the way they live. Smith's sociology makes inquiries into the social as people enact their social relations with each other. Her sociology is in dialogue with people and sociology changes because of that dialogue with people. Her sociology provides people with something that is 'good to think with' and her sociology does not insulate people from the voices of others.

Marx and Smith speak to the reader in their texts. They call upon them to act, to take sides, to think about what side they are on. By speaking to the reader in the text they attempt to engage people through dialogue. Marx and Smith call the readers to action through a dialogue in the text. When a relationship is created between the author and the reader, the reader can become empowered because the text is about them. Through the text the author activates the reader to think and respond to what the text is advocating. Because readers are spoken to, they are empowered; the text calls upon them to become active agents in changing how they might live.

In contrast, sociologists that produce 'established' sociological texts create a dialogue in abstraction that does not form or attempt to form a relationship with the reader. The dialogue created within 'established' sociological texts by the sociologist

does not call upon the reader to act. Instead, these texts contribute to the multitude of texts that act upon people as people use them. ‘Established’ sociological texts do not empower people because sociologists write from an objective standpoint, “objectifying as authoritative a unitary consciousness grounded in and reproducing existing relations of power” (Smith, 1999:97-98). ‘Established’ sociological texts are not written for people, they are about people. Most sociologists do not identify their interests, nor do they point outside the text to the reader’s site of reading. By not beginning from people’s experiences, or engaging the reader in dialogue, ‘established’ sociological texts remain distanced from people. But sociologists who produce sociological texts are not the only ones who objectify and distance people.

Texts, in general, tell people who they are. Texts do not act on their own, without the participation of people, but many texts tell us who we are. For example, think about all the texts in your life that tell you who you are: your resume, your transcripts, your tax forms, even your television, and perhaps, your newspaper or fashion magazine. These texts tell people who they are, or at least, who we should be. The list of texts that tell us who we are is endless; the point is that texts link our lives, mediate our lives and our world. Texts control our lives and we contribute to their mediation when we enact the text. The ruling relations operate through texts with a concealed standpoint. They tell us who we are and how we should live. Think of all the forms of texts that control your life; your paycheck, your progress report at school or at work, perhaps even your GPA, or your application for funding. There are many texts that we are not even aware of that control our lives: administrative, university, and government documents, school board texts, procedure manuals, and government policies. These documents exist and impact

our lives and yet you and I probably don't even know half of them. These texts are supposed to prescribe who people are; yet they are distanced from people whom they are supposed to reflect because they have been organized and produced elsewhere by someone we don't know. There is no room for our experiences in these documents because we are required to accept the relevancies that the person who wrote the text has determined in advance.

By not writing from the standpoint of people, authors who produce texts that are divorced from people continue to serve the ruling relations. These ruling relations are then reinforced by people who implement the use of texts that are abstracted from peoples' lives. But people take for granted that the forms must be filled out, the transcripts must be sent, the documents must be signed. People don't question the ruling relations that stand over and above us, organized in abstraction. Ruling relations that are not revealed remain invisible and continue to control our lives in abstraction, away from us, without the participation of people.

Standard sociological texts are written by people but they are not for people. But writing, thinking, and talking are actions that can be changed. Because it is people who are the actors, practicing the writing, and the thinking, people can change how these practices are accomplished. Sociologists can change the way they write so they don't forget the people. Sociologists can find the texts that control our lives and make people aware of them. People can challenge texts but first, we have to know about them and how people practice them.

Texts turn people into objects when they are written from a concealed standpoint, when authors do not point outside the text to the readers' place of reading. Objects don't

think and act; objects have no voice. The text appropriates people's voice and experiences, and there is no possibility of dialogue with texts that objectify people. A sociology for people must relate to readers so that they can see themselves in the text and be activated by the text.

The sociologist's role is to show people 'how things are put together'; to listen to their experiences and find out how their experiences came to be that way and why (97). People can solve their own problems; our role as sociologists is to show them how it got to be the way it is so that they can change it. Standard sociological texts have turned people into objects. Sociology has become removed from creating a relationship with people. Sociologists are so busy creating texts without themselves or without people in them, that they have become removed from people's lives. The standard sociological texts we have now do not activate people nor do they call upon them to act. Sociological texts place us, categorize us and rewrite what we've said into their discourse. Sociological knowledge is applied to people, and what people say and do becomes something interesting, as something to better understand, as something to be explained. In this way sociology only services people's ruling, it does not empower people. Established sociological texts become part of a network of texts that act upon people. By adopting the objectifying practices of the ruling relations, sociology creates a distant, authoritative, single, expert attitude towards social life. Sociologists present social life as something to be explained, an intellectual problem to be solved.

Sociology has become enclosed in its own discursive game. It is involved in producing texts that are not useful for people, nor do they empower people. Sociologists create texts that are useful for 'established sociology'. The texts sociologists create do

not have the experiences of people in them, they do not address their interests.

Sociologists continue to write from an objective standpoint that mediates people's reality and produces them as objects. Dorothy Smith's work seeks to inform sociologists of the objectifying practices that they may not be aware they are even doing. When they do become aware, this requires that they change their practices of writing the social.

Sociologists need to state their interests. Sociologists must realize that texts mediate what can be possible. Texts mediate our expectations of who we can become and also show us the limits of our actions. Sociologists need to expose the texts that dictate to people who they are. Sociologists must challenge what people can expect and what the limits of our actions can be. Sociologists need to be aware of the discursive game that they are involved in, and perhaps some will take part in exposing that textual game. Sociologists must challenge what has been taken for granted because they are in the best position to reveal to people the texts that control our lives.

Established sociology continues to do business as usual as the distance between sociologists and people's lives gets greater. Today more than ever, sociology needs Addams because she closed the distance between herself and her readers. Sociologists need this relationship back if you and I want a sociology that is useful for people. Sociologists need to value peoples' experiences in their terms and not ours if we want to make a connection to their life. Sociologists need to write texts that people can see themselves in so that they might be activated by what is said. Sociologists need to reclaim sociology for people instead of merely trying to explain their behaviour.

In order to create a sociology for people, sociologists will have to stop producing texts that contribute to the ruling relations. Sociologists contribute to the ruling relations

when they produce texts that objectify people and the social world in which we live.

When sociologists objectify people and reality they contribute to the multitude of texts that act on people. Smith explains:

If we are to be writing a sociology that serves people, we have to create a knowledge of society that provides maps or diagrams of the dynamic of macro-social powers and processes from the standpoint of people's everyday/everynight experience. (25)

The text of a map never stands alone; it is always waiting for its connection with the local actualities it intends; the sense that it can make is incomplete without that local practice of referring, yet that reference is not contained within it. It is indeed always indexical, to use Garfinkel's phrase, but in a stronger sense than he intended. A map does not stand alone; it relies on the actual terrain it can reference in the hands of the map-reader. (129)

Sociologists need to create 'maps' for people that connect their experiences to the abstract power relations that control their lives. But the 'maps' must have a complement in reality; the maps we construct must be accurate accounts that correspond to people's actual lives. Sociologists have been busy creating texts or 'maps' of the social world, but they have lost their correspondence to reality, to people's everyday/everynight worlds. Sociological texts have become texts about sociological reality and sociological concepts, and not what is really going on in society. By beginning from the standpoint of people's everyday/everynight reality sociologists can create a knowledge of society that mirrors people's reality and not sociological reality.

Addams' Sociology For People

Addams' sociology began from a standpoint of peoples' everyday/everynight experiences, but it did not stop there. Her sociology involves three levels of relationship that demonstrates who sociology is for. Addams speaks to her reader about the experiences of people she knew; she connects the problems that people were

experiencing in her neighborhood to the larger city and society, to social forces that were unknown to the people themselves; finally, she empowers people by suggesting possibilities of action so that they might change their lives.

Addams forms a relationship with the reader when she speaks to the reader about people's experiences. She articulates people's experiences in her texts by telling their stories. The people that Addams studies knew how to express what they were experiencing to her, but they did not know how to formulate what was causing those experiences or how to affect change upon those experiences. Addams brings the experiences of people into public view so that she might know, and others might know, what people were experiencing in the neighborhood around Hull House.

Addams speaks to the reader, calls upon the reader so that they might connect their experiences to the people's experiences that Addams is talking about. By calling upon the reader directly, Addams attempts to engage in a dialogue with them. She wants people to see themselves in her texts so that they might be activated by the text and also so they might activate what the text says. Because Addams addresses the reader directly she summons their response. Addams wants people to respond to the text to think about their own experiences so that they might understand them, and to connect them to other people's experiences so that they might change their lives. By forming a relationship with the reader Addams demonstrates her sociology is for people.

In the beginning of Addams' texts, she usually tells the reader about her experiences, why she is writing the book, and who the book is for. The following example, which was partially quoted above, is used here to show that Addams' investigations in the neighborhood around Hull House are for people:

The following material, much of which has been published in *McClure's Magazine*, was written, not from the point of view of the expert, but because of my own need for a counter-knowledge to a bewildering mass of information which came to me through the Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago. The reports which its twenty field officers daily brought to its main office adjoining Hull House became to me a revelation of the dangers implicit in city conditions and of the allurements which are designedly placed around many young girls in order to draw them into an evil life.... I therefore venture to hope that in serving my own need I may also serve the need of a rapidly growing public when I set down for rational consideration the temptations surrounding multitudes of young people and when I assemble, as best I may, the many indications of a new conscience, which in various directions is slowly gathering strength and which we may soberly hope will at last successfully array itself against this incredible social wrong, ancient though it may be. (1912:ix-xi)

Another example of how Addams creates a relationship with her reader is in *Democracy and Social Ethics* (1902). In this book, Addams uses the words “we” and “us”. She doesn’t take for granted that the people who will read her book will know who “we” means. Unlike ‘standard’ sociology texts that do not explain who the “we” includes, excludes, or refers to (Smith, 1999:148-149), Addams tells her reader at the beginning of her book who she is referring to. In this way Addams’ texts ‘do not appear from nowhere’ and the reader is pulled into the text by Addams’ use of the terms “we” and “us”. When she uses the term “we” she means herself, the writer, and me the reader:

The following pages present the substance of a course of twelve lectures on “Democracy and Social Ethics” which have been delivered at various colleges and university extension centres. In putting them into the form of a book, no attempt has been made to change the somewhat informal style used in speaking. The “we” and “us” which originally referred to the speaker and her audience are merely extended to possible readers. (1902:vii)

When reading Addams’ books I felt like she was speaking to me. The connection that she made with her reader when she included them in her texts is one of the most enjoyable things about reading Addams. I felt included in a dialogue that Addams is extending to many possible readers.

But Addams didn't just speak to the reader, nor did she just write about people's experiences around Hull House. Addams could not be considered a sociologist if she only described people's experiences. As she tried to convey the problems her neighbors faced, people's experiences, to the people of the city of Chicago and to American society, Addams tried to figure out how people's experiences were connected to larger social forces beyond their control. First, Addams observes what people are doing and experiencing. Then she takes these common experiences and tries to find out why people are experiencing what they are.

For example, Addams suggested that many children get into trouble with the police in the 'modern city' because they are 'seeking adventure'. It is not because these children are 'bad', but they are looking for something to do that is exciting. Addams suggested that children need outlets for recreation in the city. Children need playgrounds to play. The problem of children getting into trouble is not unique to the neighborhood around Hull House. The problem is in the entire city of Chicago and throughout the cities in America. Addams is a sociologist because she does what the people in her neighborhood cannot do: connect their own experiences with what is responsible for their experiences. The reason why so many children get into trouble is because there is a lack of place and space for children to play. The city is responsible for providing safe places for children to play and the municipal government must realize that it is their responsibility to provide for that need. In the following example, Addams shows how she connects individual experiences in the neighborhood to the larger society:

Only in the modern city have men concluded that it is no longer necessary for the municipality to provide for the insatiable desire for play. In so far as they have acted upon this conclusion, they have entered upon a most difficult and dangerous experiment; and this at the very moment when the city has become distinctly

industrial, and daily labor is continually more monotonous and sub-divided. We forget how new the modern city is, and how short the span of time in which we have assumed that we can eliminate public provision for recreation. A further difficulty lies in the fact that this industrialism has gathered together multitudes of eager young creatures from all quarters of the earth as a labor supply for the countless factories and workshops, upon which the present industrial city is based... Society cares more for the products they manufacture than for their immemorial ability to reaffirm the charm of existence... It is as if our cities had not yet developed a sense of responsibility in regard to the life of the streets, and continually forget that recreation is stronger than vice, and that recreation alone can stifle the lust for vice... We may either smother the divine fire of youth or we may feed it. We may either stand stupidly staring as it sinks into a murky fire of crime and flares into the intermittent blaze of folly or we may tend it into a lambent flame with power to make clean and bright our dingy city streets. (1909:4,5,19,20,161-162)

In this example, Addams shows why youth in general are getting into trouble in American cities. She begins with the experiences of the children in her neighborhood and connects their experiences to the experiences of youth in other cities. She shows in her writings why youth are experiencing what they are. People in Addams' neighborhood knew what they were experiencing, but they did not see that the municipal government was responsible for providing them with safe places to play. Most of the people in Addams' neighborhood did not know about the larger city nor how this was (is) a problem in cities across America. This is one example of how Addams' sociology was for people; she connected their experiences to others' experiences, and showed how it was the provision of recreation that could solve some of the problems of youth.

Addams' sociology also empowered people because it suggested possibilities of action. All of Addams' texts are about what people can do in order to change how they live. She makes their problems visible and in showing people what their problems are, how they are connected to other people's problems, she doesn't try to 'fix them' but she suggests what might be done by people themselves in order to change their situation.

Addams wants the people in her neighborhood to know that they can change their situation.

For example, Addams wants people to know that children shouldn't have to play in the streets. She wants people to know that not having enough schools in the neighborhood isn't natural or fair. Addams challenges people to question their living conditions in what she writes. She makes it clear that there are other ways of doing things, other possibilities. Addams tells people that it is possible to change how they live. She tells the people in her neighborhood that this isn't the way it has to be; houses can be improved (1910), the streets can be kept clean, the factories can be kept safe (1909), children do not have to work, women can vote (1910b) and become involved in government (1907a), democracy can work (1902), peace is possible (1907, 1922). But people have to decide to act. If people are made aware of the possibilities of change then they can change their lives. People cause things to happen and it is only people who can change situations. If we know what people do, then we can change what they do. If we know what the government does, then we can change what the government does or what it doesn't do. Addams' sociology is all about making people aware that this is not the way it has to be. She opens up possibilities for change, she gives people hope that they can change their situation, their city, their country, their world. By studying how things are and by suggesting how things might be different Addams empowered people.

How Might Sociology Be Different?

If we want a sociology for people sociologists have to begin from the actual experiences of its subjects. Sociologists must try to show how their subject's experience

is connected to other people's experiences. That connection is invisible to people; the social relations and organization of knowledge are invisible. The ruling relations are invisible as they are organized in abstraction through a discourse that is not a property of individuals. Sociological discourse represents people within its discourse and hence its texts are products of its discourse and not representative of reality or people:

Writing the social as a knowledge for people rejects the grand imaginary maps of the Marxisms of the 1960s and 1970s, which were held in suspension outside local practices of finding and recognizing. It rejects sociologies which give primacy to theory, whose phenomenal universe is constituted by abstractions and in which sequences of referring are completed entirely within discourse in returning to its own discursively constituted objects. Instead it aims at knowing the social as people actually bring it into being. Its objects would not be meaning but the actual ongoing ways in which people's activities are coordinated, particularly those forms of social organization and relations that connect up multiple and various sites of experience since these are what are ordinarily inaccessible to people. (Smith, 1999:129)

Sociological discourse needs to change. Sociologists need to change the way that they write the social. Their discourse must reflect experiences of real people, and people must see themselves within those texts. If readers see themselves reflected, represented, included in the sociological text, the reader can activate the text and be activated by that text. This is the way that sociology can be made useful for people: if people see themselves in the text and act. If we want a sociology for people we have to change our discourse. If we can change our discourse then sociology will change and will become more useful and applicable to people's lives.

Marx and Addams are two authors that have created the discourse that sociologists need. Smith has identified what is wrong with 'established' sociological discourse, and how it objectifies people. Smith has argued that sociology must be for people. She has reminded sociologists that knowledge "is not abstract but is embedded in

a discourse” and because discourse “is in the living” it is “investigatable as people’s actual practices”(Smith, 1999:25,96). Sociologists cannot continue ‘doing business as usual’. Sociologists must develop a relationship with people, with their readers, and engage in ‘a dialogic’ (129). Sociologists must point outside the text to actual people’s lives. Sociologists need to create a knowledge of society that ‘maps’ the social relations and organization of knowledge and experience (25). We must extend our consciousness, the only ‘site of experience’, and challenge what is taken for granted (96). Sociological knowledge must be responsible in telling the ‘truth, being accurate, and having relevance’ for people’s lives (25).

Dorothy Smith has challenged sociologists to think about how they write the social. As a young sociologist, I have been activated by her text, and now I want to challenge sociologists to think about how they write the social. I want sociologists to ask themselves, who is sociology for? Is it for people, or is it for sociologists? Who is your sociology for? Does it reflect people’s experiences, or sociological discourse? Does it empower people or sociologists? If you and I want a sociology for people, we need to change our discourse when we write about the social world. We need to listen to people’s accounts of their life and try to show them why they are experiencing what they are experiencing. We need to show how they are hooked up into the invisible ruling relations of texts and discourses that control our lives. Sociologists need to be responsible to the people that we study. We need to form a relationship with people in our texts. If we don’t speak to people or about their experiences and if they do not see themselves reflected in our texts, then sociology only continues producing texts that objectify people. As Smith notes,

Just as in the development of cartography, there is technical work to be done in discovering just how to find, represent, and name the features and dynamic of the social... The ability of such a sociology to tell the truth would be in just how it could be entered dialogically, just as a map can be, into everyday activities of finding and recognizing where we are in relation to others, and how what we are doing and what is happening are hooked into such relations. (1999:130)

We have to contend with the jungle created by the in-text organization of sociology's object world, so we can put in place a sociology or sociologies oriented to exploring the extended relations of people's lives (1999:25)

I am ready to engage in the technical work that needs to be done in order to write the social for people. I am ready to contend with 'sociology's object world' because I want a sociology that I can justify practicing. I want a sociology that is useful for people. I'm tired of reading sociological texts about people instead for people. I am not satisfied with the sociology that has developed since Marx and Addams' time, because sociology has developed away from the people. What has happened is that sociology has lost its focus and its purpose by creating a knowledge, a discourse that doesn't correspond to the reality of people's lives or suggest possibilities for their action.

Jane Addams and Dorothy Smith demonstrate that there is an alternative to practicing 'standard' sociology. If we could learn to value people's experiences in their terms, what new ideas, approaches, and methods to writing the social become possible? I realize that change, any change, takes time and is usually met with resistance. But Addams has taught me: "We have learned as common knowledge that much of the insensibility and hardness of the world is due to the lack of imagination which prevents a realization of the experiences of other people" (1902:9). I feel that such a transformation of sociology is possible if we can use and expand our imaginations.

In the next chapter I will discuss the ambiguity of the term 'feminist sociology'. What does a feminist sociology mean? I will discuss the issues surrounding feminist sociology and I will show why this once liberating term may have reached the limits of its utility.

Chapter Five

Feminist Sociology

In this chapter I will discuss the ambiguity of the term “feminist sociology”. First, I will return to Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley’s understanding of feminist sociology and show why their criteria cannot be applied to Addams. Second, I will describe Addams’ non-standard sociology and Dorothy Smith’s non-standard sociology. Third, I will argue that feminist sociology which conforms to Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley’s criteria is ambiguous today because it has lost its referent to the reality of women’s lives. Fourth, I will conclude this thesis with a brief personal account of what this project has taught me.

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley’s Feminist Sociology

In both of Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley’s texts on early women sociologists, their essay in Ritzer’s *Classical Sociological Theory* (2000) and their own book, *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory 1830- 1930* (1998), they offer criteria that represent “feminist sociology”. The criteria are:

By describing these theorists as feminist, we mean that from the vantagepoint of contemporary feminist sociological theory, we recognize certain themes and concerns central to the theories of these women. These include: (1) the theorist’s awareness of her gender and her stance in that gender identity as she develops her sociological theory, (2) an awareness of the situatedness of her analysis and of the situatedness of the vantage points of others, (3) a consistent focus on the lives and works of women, (4) a critical concern with the practices of social inequality, and (5) a commitment to the practice of sociology in pursuit of social amelioration. (2000:291)

Addams’s configuration of the feminist paradigm is marked by (1) a gendered standpoint, (2) a focus on women’s lives, (3) the exploration of multiple vantage points, (4) the invention of a research methodology respectful of these multiple vantage points, and (5) a commitment to change. (1998:85)

Using the arguments of Dorothy Smith and Addams, I am conscious of the problems of these criteria. In the first line of the first quotation, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley state that their criteria were derived “from the vantage point of feminist contemporary sociological theory”. I will discuss four problems with the use of such criteria below.

First, these criteria are utilized by Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley to organize their understanding of what these women said, and consequently they organize the reader’s understanding of what these women said. Because these criteria were organized elsewhere, extra locally, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have imported the ruling relations into their texts. The criteria were organized in Ritzer’s text, with its categories and relevancies. Why do Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley use the same formatting as Ritzer? One hypothesis is that they use similar formatting because that is what the publishing company requires. McGraw-Hill, the publishing company, could be the extra local site that demands standardization of texts. They desire standardization because the texts that they publish are produced for the mass education of students. Texts are broken down into headings, conceptual categories and criteria, so that the knowledge within the text is testable for students. McGraw-Hill is the site that hooks sociology into the relations of ruling. While it is difficult to determine how much or how little pressure was exerted on Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley by McGraw-Hill, these sociologists end up conforming to standard textual practices that objectify knowledge. Dorothy Smith explains how feminism in general faces such barriers:

Feminism has made important inroads on political economy. There have been very substantial achievements. At the same time there are barriers to our further advance. As the discursive domain of political economy has been institutionalized in the ruling relations, it has acquired their relevancies. It

depends upon their habits of thought and conceptual organization through the unexplicated incorporation into its discourse of the categories institutionalizing the 'main business' of ruling: to facilitate the self-expanding dynamic of capital. (Smith, 1999:37)

Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley are hooked into the ruling relations through McGraw-Hill. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have acquired the ruling relations 'relevancies', 'habits of thought', and 'conceptual organization' in their text. McGraw-Hill's 'main business' is capital, and they require standardization for mass production of texts. What we are left with, is an account of early women writers that have been assimilated by the 'main business' of ruling.

Second, all criteria, like the ones above, can be challenged because they demonstrate how the ruling relations work in practice. I have learned from Addams' pragmatic ideals that something is only true if it works in practice. Smith's argument of how the ruling relations work applies to Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's textual practice. The criteria utilized by Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, and consequently whatever else they say about these women, use the label 'feminist sociology' to represent the actual apart from the context in which it is situated. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have taken what these women say and have incorporated them into their own contemporary feminist sociological discourse. By applying these criteria to these women, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have revealed that their standpoint is located in the ruling relations. It is interesting that Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley refer to Dorothy Smith, but they do not adhere to what she writes:

The sociology we have works within institutional boundaries. It is hooked up dialogically to the institutional order at multiple points. Sometimes the latter's

categories and concepts are directly incorporated into its discourse; invariably its standpoint is located in the ruling relations. Its research methodologies harvest information, data, and other forms of knowledge derived in various ways from people and what they have to say, and bring them home to the text-based discourses housed in universities. In general, social scientific knowledge represents the world from a standpoint in the ruling relations, not from the standpoint of the ruled. (Smith, 1999:16)

Third, not only does sociology work within institutional boundaries, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's criteria place feminist contemporary sociological theory within institutional boundaries. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley certainly bring the early women sociologists 'home to the text based discourse within the university' as they have adopted the conceptual organization of the 'main business' of ruling though their use of the criteria above. In order to publish and keep their jobs, scholars like Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley end up conforming to the 'disciplinary norms of the academy' (Smith, 1999:26). The norm of the academy is what the ruling relations require: standardization. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley contribute to the ruling relations when they standardize women by adopting criteria that are abstracted from the context in which these women wrote. Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley standardized the early women in Ritzer's text and they standardized the women in their own text.

Fourth, the 'standard' format that Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley have utilized is an example of Smith's textually mediated reality. 'Texts act as a bridge between the actualities of our living and the ruling relations' (Smith, 1999:7). On one side of the bridge we have what the women actually said in the context of their lives and their relationships with others. On the other side of the bridge we have feminist contemporary sociologists, Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, who are hooked

into the ruling relations by their use of criteria. Their text is the bridge that links the reality of what these women actually said into the ruling relations. Their text has assimilated these early women for 'standard' sociology by trying to bring them into the canon of sociology. The problem is that they have now created a feminist contemporary sociological interpretation of these women that doesn't hold true to reality, at least for Addams.

Although I have pointed out the problems of using criteria like those of Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, I understand that a writer, no matter who they are, must organize their document in some sort of coherent manner. I have used headings in this thesis to organize my document. While I will outline what Smith and Addams suggest through their writings as a non-standard sociology, the knowledge that I have of Addams' sociology and Smith's sociology has been imposed on me through their writings. In other words, I did not organize using concepts and categories demanded by the 'main business' of ruling; my headings signal to the reader what I am doing so that s/he may follow along easily. I have not organized or categorized what Smith and Addams have written in their texts themselves.

Addams' Sociology and Smith's Sociology

I prefer to use the terms 'non-standard sociology' to 'feminist sociology' because I want to distinguish between knowledge created within a discourse that is hooked up into the ruling relations and knowledge that is not created according to the standards demanded by the ruling relations. There is no doubt in my mind that Smith is a feminist sociologist because she tells us that throughout her text (1999:62). Addams did not call

herself a feminist, but she spoke about the women's movement (1916:79) and argued why women should have the vote (1910c). I could reliably claim that both Addams and Smith write 'feminist sociology', but by using the term non-standard sociology I distinguish their texts from the feminist sociology of Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley.

Addams and Smith's sociology is non-standard sociology for two reasons. First, both Addams and Smith begin their inquiry from a non-objective standpoint. Second, they both write sociology for people, and not merely about people. In the following pages, I will describe both Addams' and Smith's standpoints as women, and then I will describe how their sociology is a sociology for people. In this chapter I show that Addams' and Smith's sociology comes from their lives as women.

Addams chose a standpoint both for ethical and political reasons. Addams was a woman who couldn't vote and yet she chose to become politically active. Addams was also trained in a religious institution and yet she refused to become active in any religion. While I have used this quotation above, it can now be read to see that Addams made choices about her life, and fashioned that life according to her beliefs and her standards that she held for herself:

Towards the end of our four years' course we debated much as to what we were to be, and long before the end of my school days it was quite settled in my mind that I should study medicine and "live with the poor".... As our boarding-school days neared the end, in the consciousness of approaching separation we vowed eternal allegiance to our "early ideals," and promised each other we would "never abandon them without conscious justification," and we often warned each other of "the perils of self-tradition." We believed, in our sublime self-conceit, that the difficulty of life would lie solely in the direction of losing these precious ideals of ours, of failing to follow the way of martyrdom and high purpose we had marked out for ourselves, and we had no notion of the obscure paths of tolerance, just allowance, and self-blame wherein, if we held our minds open, we might learn something of the mystery and complexity of life's purposes... Whatever may

have been the perils of self-tradition, I certainly did not escape from them, for it required eight years – from the time I left Rockford in the summer of 1881 until Hull House was opened in the autumn of 1889 – to formulate my convictions even in the least satisfactory manner, much less to reduce them to a plan for action. During most of that time I was absolutely at sea so far as any moral purpose was concerned, clinging only to the desire to live in a really living world and refusing to be content with a shadowy intellectual or aesthetic reflection of it. (1910:60-64)

Addams turned herself into Jane Addams of Hull House. Hull House was Addams' life; it represented who she was and what she stood for. Addams actively created her standpoint, her life, Hull House.

Standpoint, in one sense, is who you are; it is where you come from and also where you stand. Standpoint is not definitive; it is always changing just as your life changes. People can decide their standpoint by making decisions and their standpoint might change depending on the decisions we make. Addams chose the standpoint of Hull House. But Hull House was more than a social settlement, a physical structure situated in Chicago at the turn of the century. Hull House can't be viewed as a static object because it grew and changed just as Addams did.

Standpoint is also about noticing differences between people. Addams noticed the extreme differences between social classes in her time. She sought to reconcile those differences by becoming an authoritative voice in Chicago through direct action. She not only wrote about the experiences of people in her neighborhood. Through her writings and speaking at colleges and university extension courses she made people aware of the differences between people, and she formed organizations and associations to lobby the government for legislative change.

Addams realized that the differences that existed between people were due to forces beyond the control of the people in her neighborhood. Not only were the forces beyond their control, the people in her neighborhood didn't know about responsibilities of the government. People in Addams' neighborhood didn't question the material conditions that people found themselves, but Addams did. She tried to figure out what was responsible for all the problems in the neighborhood from prostitution (1912) to children getting into trouble with the law (1909). When Addams tried to figure out what was causing people's problems she became a sociologist. But she didn't stop at finding out the causes; she empowered people by making them aware of the cause and then she organized people in order to challenge government(s). She made people aware of the possibility that change can happen, but change can only happen if people make it happen. Addams tried to attenuate the differences between classes of people through her life, Hull House.

Hull House was not just a social settlement in Chicago; it was Addams' standpoint. Hull House provided a place for Addams to practice her sociology. Addams wrote about her life at Hull House, and Hull House gave her voice authority. Addams writings gave Hull House, her life that she chose, communicative force. Her writings developed at Hull House and hence Addams' sociology was performative; her sociology is about her life that she lived, and her life made her writings possible.

Standpoint therefore involves seeing what Dorothy Smith calls 'a line of fault'. Addams' line of fault was that she recognized the differences between the classes. Addams experienced the differences between the classes when she traveled in Europe (1910), and realized that classes existed in America as well:

The Settlement, then, is an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions of life in a great city. It insists that these problems are not confined to any one portion of a city. It is an attempt to relieve, at the same time, the over-accumulation at one end of society and the destitution at the other; but it assumes that this over-accumulation and destitution is most sorely felt in the things that pertain to social and educational advantage. (1893:22)

Addams saw the 'over-accumulation at one end of society and the destitution at the other'. This was Addams' double consciousness (Smith, 1999) or second sight (Du Bois, 1969); people weren't equal in America and this isn't right. Addams came from a wealthy background and yet she noticed that not everyone lived as she did. In everything that Addams did including both her writing and her speaking, she tried to make people aware of the differences between people and that these differences are not natural or normal, they can be changed.

In this sense, Addams relates to Marx and Smith because all three sought to demystify what appears to be natural or 'just the way it is,' or that's just the way it's always been done'. They challenge existing conventions in different ways and in different times and places; yet they all seem to challenge what is taken for granted by most people. All three individuals challenge us to see what differences there are, and in this sense all are political because they seek to empower people to change their conditions.

Smith's sociology also begins from her life, her standpoint. Like Addams, Smith's sociology cannot be separated from her life. Because of her life as a single parent raising two children, Smith also experienced a line of fault or double consciousness (1999:3-4). Smith noticed that what she was learning about in sociology did not reflect or correspond to her own life, nor to people that she knew. That is because she was learning male

sociology and male sociological theory. The sociology that she was learning and later teaching didn't sit well with her. She noticed some problem, something uncomfortable about the sociology that she chose to learn. She recognized the divide between her life as a woman and her experiences and the sociology that didn't account for women's experiences.

Smith's sociology developed out of the women's movement in which she was active (1999:17-19). She tells us about the consciousness-raising groups that she was a part of. She also tells us of her involvement with women's activist groups outside of the university. Smith noticed that although feminism had made great gains within the academy, such as women's studies courses and the development of feminist sociologies, there was still something wrong. Even though women were moving into the academy and feminism was becoming part of many different disciplines, Smith had "a sense of problem, of something going on, some disquiet, and of something there that could be explicated" (9).

Smith knew that patriarchy existed; she experienced the effects of a male dominated academy. But it wasn't just overt sexism that Smith experienced along with many women working inside the academy. There were covert sexist practices that were going on as well. It took Smith many years of research, publishing and teaching in order to figure out how patriarchy continued to exist. Smith realized that patriarchy was only part of the problem; people's actual practices could be identified. But what about the covert practices? Could they be identified as well?

Smith developed her method of inquiry, her standpoint from her personal experiences as a woman and her relationships with other feminists. Her standpoint is a

feminist sociologist. But Smith isn't like any other feminist sociologist, nor are her ideas like any other sociologist. Smith's sociology involves difference. Smith noticed the differences between her life as a mother and a sociologist. She noticed that her life as a sociologist was the everyday life, the work that had to be done. But when she got home she changed into someone else, she became the mother of two children. She noticed two worlds apart: her everyday life as a sociologist, and her everyday/everynight life as a mother. This was her line of fault, her bifurcated consciousness, her life pulled apart and yet contained in the same body.

But Smith didn't just notice her own double consciousness; she realized that it was a problem for the many women that she knew and knows. What many people took for granted, such as a male-centered academy with male-centered knowledge and no room for women's voice, Smith and other feminists challenged. But Smith took the challenge much farther than most feminists. Smith has revealed the way the ruling relations work not just in the academy, but within larger society. Because people practice the ruling relations through texts, these practices can be changed. The role of the sociologist for Smith is to begin from people's experiences and their standpoints, and then to show how their experiences are shaped by and contribute to the macro-social power of the ruling relations.

Smith has turned her standpoint into a method of inquiry for sociologists to use so their sociology is useful for people. What began as a sociology for women has now become a sociology for people. Smith's standpoint has changed as her life has changed. Smith's non-standard sociology empowers people because she wants to reveal the ruling relations that control our lives. She wants people to know how the ruling relations work

in practice so that we can change them. Smith wants to demystify the ruling relations so that people can make real changes in their lives.

Both Addams' and Smith's non-standard sociology creates awareness of problems that are invisible to most people. Addams created awareness about the differences between the classes in America. Smith creates awareness about the textually mediated reality of our lives, and how texts act as a bridge between our actual lives and the ruling relations. They both challenged what seemed natural or normal to most people. But they didn't just create awareness, they both call on people to act. They want to create more than awareness, they want to create real change in the way we carry out our lives and engage in relations with others.

By studying the work of Addams and Smith, I have learned that standpoint means many different things to many different people. Standpoint for Addams and Smith involves staying grounded in the actualities of people's everyday/everynight lives. It does not involve theorizing in abstraction people's social relations. Smith tells us how standpoint originated, and how feminist discourse has now theorized standpoint:

In those early days, taking the standpoint of women transformed how we thought and worked, how we taught, the social relationships of the classroom, and almost every aspect of our lives. Remaking sociology was a matter that arose out of practical demands. Established sociology distorted, turned things upside down, turned us into objects, wasn't much use. I thought we could have a sociology responding to people's lack of knowledge of how our everyday worlds are hooked into and shaped by social relations, organization, and powers beyond the scope of direct experience. The theorizing of "standpoint" within feminist discourse displaces the practical politics that the notion of "standpoint" originally captured. The concept is moved upstairs, so to speak, and is reduced to a purely discursive function. (Smith, 1992:89)

Smith distinguishes "between beginning with the standpoint of women [people] and standpoints constituted in text-mediated discourse" (1992:90). Therefore, both Addams

and Smith's standpoints begin from their experiences as women and from the experiences of people, and they do not begin from the theories and concepts of text-mediated discourse.

While standpoint is a place to begin, standpoint is also a method of inquiry that directs the scope of the researcher. But Smith's method of inquiry is not definitive nor prescriptive; "it is a lively, unfolding, fascinating, and very productive method" and "there's no orthodoxy" (1992:92). Standpoint as a method allows for many different kinds of researchers with their own standpoint to show from various angles how we are hooked into the ruling relations. Therefore, standpoint according to Smith is from where the researcher begins in their life, and it is also a method for practicing sociology.

The Ambiguity of Feminist Sociology:

What is "feminist sociology"? The term "feminist sociology" is ambiguous because there are many kinds of feminists and there are also many kinds of sociologies. Smith identifies herself as a feminist sociologist while Addams did not. Addams was wary of any type of labeling, except for Jane Addams of Hull House (1910:56-60). Smith does label herself, but she does not adhere to any particular type of sociology (1992:93-94). She refuses to be pegged into any one type of sociological category at all.

What is interesting is that both Addams and Smith have similar ideas when it comes to women's issues. Both Addams and Smith are conscious of the everyday and everynight worlds of women in particular. Smith's sociology developed out of her consciousness that the experiences of women and men in this world are different:

I have emphasized in my work a distinctive standpoint for women, not necessarily as a general attribute of women as a class of persons, but as a mode of experience that is distinctive to women and in important ways has marked us off from men and still continues to do so. This is an experience of work around particular

individuals, especially children; it is an experience grounded in a biological difference – our bodies give birth and men's do not – but through complex institutional mediations organized as caring and serving work directed towards particular others or groups of others. Locating the knowing subject of a sociology in this site locates a subject outside the textually mediated discourse of sociology: it locates her in her own life, in her self as a unitary being, as a body active, imagining, thinking, as a subject situated in her local and particular actualities. (Smith, 1999:45)

Addams' sociology also developed out of her consciousness that men and women are different. Addams believed that women had a special ability to recognize and attend to matters that men were not concerned with and did not notice:

I do not assert that women are better than men – even in the heat of suffrage debates I have never maintained that – but we would all admit that there things concerning which women are more sensitive than men and that one of these is the treasuring of life. I would ask you to consider with me five aspects concerning this sensitiveness, which war is rapidly destroying. (1915:10; quoted in McDonald, 1997:137)

She argued that women were sympathetic and more attuned to the human side of life (1907a;1910b) . Addams thought that if women were utilized in municipal government, government would fulfill its social duties instead of only focusing on the economic side of life. She argued that women needed the vote in order to have a safer and better society for everyone. Although Addams didn't call herself a feminist, she did talk about the women's movement (1916;1930a) and argued that women should bring themselves to the ballot (1910b).

The problem with the term 'feminist sociology' as used by academics like Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley is that it has become abstract; it ceases to refer to any one in particular in their time and place; it is no longer embodied. Terms like feminist sociology become a figment of discourse, referring to an object without a body.

The term doesn't really refer to anyone in particular anymore. Terms like feminist sociology need to be embodied by the person who adopts such a label. Dorothy Smith defines her feminist sociology when she writes the social. Terms like feminist sociology are universalizing and standardizing; they are not embodied.

Referring back to Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley's criteria once again, their feminist sociology is utilized as a standardizing device. "From the vantage point of feminist sociological theory" they evaluate and classify the early women sociologists. They talk about contemporary feminist sociology as if it is an entity that exists without the person. Terms like these are characteristic of Smith's 'standard sociology' that depends on concepts that transcend the reality of people's lives.

Women who call themselves 'a feminist sociologist' will have to tell readers what that means exactly. If they refer to a feminist tradition, or a feminist theory they are going to have to say which one, in what time, and in what place, and whose voice and body are you talking about. Identifying your self in this way goes against the universalizing inherent in standard textbooks that are a part of the mass education with standardized examinations. Smith and Addams have taught me to be skeptical of labels like 'feminist sociology', and Smith in particular has taught me to question any set of criteria that is supposed to represent what a sociology or a feminist sociology is.

Because there are so many kinds of feminisms and sociologies, and also because we can't forget the person who writes the feminism or the sociology or both, the concept of feminist sociology has lost its meaning. Women can decide for themselves what label they will adopt, as in Smith's case, or not adopt, as in Addams' case. What I think is

important is that actions, or what the mind and the body do or don't do, tell us just as much as words do.

Conclusion:

Smith's non-standard sociology has taught me a different way of practicing sociology. First, the researcher is not transcendent but is a participant in the social s/he is discovering. Second, the researcher's focus is on the actual ongoing practices of actual individuals in local sites and in a particular time. Third, concepts are not abstracted out of time and space; they correspond and refer to the reality of people's experiences. Fourth, there is no theory/practice split; theory is practiced, it is an activity that people do. Fifth, the researcher recognizes that texts act as a bridge between people's living and the ruling relations. Sixth, the goal of research is not to explain people's behaviour but to explain to people, for people, how our lives are situated in the ruling relations.

Addams' non-standard sociology has taught me to how to write the social as a participant in the social relations that I wish to know about. Her sociology has taught me how to write about actual ongoing practices of actual individuals in a particular time and space. She has also taught me how to keep concepts grounded in the experiences of people in their time and space. Addams has also shown me how theory is a practice; she has shown me how sociology is a life to be lived in order to change that life and perhaps other lives as well.

Both Smith and Addams have taught me to practice my sociology differently than I have been taught. They have taught me not only to be aware of what people take for granted as natural, but also to expose what is taken for granted, and challenge existing

conventions. Change can happen but we have to understand people's practices in order to change what they do.

What I have learned from Jane Addams and Dorothy Smith is that sociology can be changed in constructive ways because it is people who practice sociology. These women have taught me that change within sociology is necessary if we want to create a sociology for people. If we want a sociology that has value for people, for sociologists as people, and for people outside of sociology and outside of the university setting, we need to alter our practices of writing and thinking the social. Jane Addams and Dorothy Smith have taught me that change is possible within our discipline, our community, and our society. But people have to be willing to discuss the issues in concrete and embodied terms if we are to bypass the dilemma of our language, our only means of communication. I want a sociology that is useful for people, and Addams and Smith have taught me that this kind of sociology is possible. What kind of sociology do you want?

Bibliography

Addams, Jane

- 1893 "The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements." In *Philanthropy and Social Progress*. Ed. Henry C. Adams. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company Publishers, 1893. 1-26.
- 1893 "The Objective Value of a Social Settlement." In *Philanthropy and Social Progress*. Ed. Henry C. Adams. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company Publishers. 27-53.
- 1895 "The Settlement as a Factor in the Labor Movement." In *Hull-House Maps and Papers: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, Together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing out of Social Conditions*. Boston: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company Publishers. 183-204.
- 1896 "A Belated Industry." *American Journal of Sociology* 1: 536-550.
- 1899 "Trade Unions and Public Duty." *American Journal of Sociology* 4: 488-62.
- 1902 *Democracy and Social Ethics*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1904 "The Humanizing Tendency of Industrial Education." *The Chautauquan* 39: 266-272.
- 1905 "Problems of Municipal Administration." *American Journal of Sociology* 10: 425-44.
- 1907 *Newer Ideals of Peace*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1907a "Utilization of Women and City Government." In *Social Theory: Roots and Branches*. Ed. Peter Kivisto. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, 2000. 158-164.
- 1909 *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1910 *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1910a "Charity and Social Justice." *North American Review* 192: 68-81.

- 1910b "Why Women Should Have the Vote." *Ladies Home Journal* January: 21-22.
- 1911 "The Social Situation." *Religious Education* 6: 145-152.
- 1912 *A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1912a "Recreation as a Public Function in Urban Communities." *American Journal of Sociology* 17: 615-19.
- 1912b "A Modern Lear." *Survey* 29: 131-37.
- 1914 "A Modern Devil Baby." *American Journal of Sociology* 20: 117-118.
- 1916 *The Long Road of Women's Memory*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1916a "War Times Challenging Woman's Traditions." *Survey* 36: 475-78.
- 1922 *Peace and Bread in Time of War*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1927 "A Book that Changed My Life." *Christian Century* 44:1196-98.
- 1928 "Pioneers in Sociology: Graham Taylor." *Neighborhood* 1:6-11.
- 1929 "The Settlement as a Way of Life." *Neighborhood* 2:139-46.
- 1930 *The Second Twenty Years at Hull-House*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1930a "Aspects of the Woman's Movement." *Survey* 8:113-23.
- 1931 "Tolstoy and Gandhi." *Christian Century* 48:1485-88.
- 1932 *My Friend Julia Lathrop*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1932 *The Excellent Becomes the Permanent*. New York: Macmillan.

Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash

- 1994 *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Davis, Allen F.

- 1967 *Spearheads of Reform: The Social Settlement and the Progressive Movement 1890-1914*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1973 *American Heroine*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Deegan, Mary Jo

- 1988 *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892-1918*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.

Du Bois, W.E.B.

- 1969 *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Penguin Books, USA Inc.

Lasch, Christopher.

- 1965 *The Social Thought of Jane Addams*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Lengermann, Patricia Madoo, and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley

- 2000 "Early Women Sociologists and Classical Sociological Theory: 1830-1930" In George Ritzer's *Classical Sociological Theory*. Boston: McGraw Hill. 289-321.

- 1998 *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory 1830-1930*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Linn, James Weber

- 1935 *Jane Addams*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Martindale, Don

- 1981 *The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

McDonald, Lynne

- 1997 "Classical Social Theory with the Women Founders Included." In *Reclaiming the Sociological Classics: The State of the Scholarship*. Ed. Charles Camic. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc. 112-141.

Residents of Hull-House

- 1895 *Hull-House Maps and Papers: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, Together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing out of Social Conditions*. Boston: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Ritzer, George

- 2000 *Classical Sociological Theory*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Smith, Dorothy E.

1999 *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory, and Investigations*.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated.

1992 "Sociology From Women's Experience: A Reaffirmation."
Sociological Theory 10 (1):88-98.