

Transcript
Philosophy Bakes Bread
Patricia Shields
Political Science
Texas State University
Feminism, Peace and the Philosophy of Jane Addams (Episode 84)
March 29, 2019

Philosophy Bakes Bread is a radio show and podcast sponsored by the [Society of Philosophers in America \(SOPHIA\)](#). In episode 84, Dr. Patricia Shields is interviewed by Dr. Eric Thomas Weber and Dr. Anthony Cashio.

In this transcript Patricia Shields discusses feminism, peace and the philosophy of Jane Addams. In part one “know thy self” she shares a little of her personal history and how she got from economics, to public administration/political science and eventually to philosophy. In part two Shields shares her discoveries about the remarkable Jane Addams. Born during the Civil War and the first American woman to win the Nobel Peace Prize, Addams led a full life. This podcast is devoted to her later works where she applied her feminist standpoint to crafting new ideas of peace applicable within a neighborhood, city or across international borders.

Interviewers: Eric Thomas Weber, Anthony Cashio

Interviewee: Dr. Patricia Shields

00:00

[Music playing]

00:04

Announcer: This podcast is brought to you by WRFL, Radio Free Lexington. Find us online at wrfl.fm. Catch us on your FM radio while you’re in central Kentucky at 88.1 FM all the way to the left.

00:23

Announcer: Thank you for listening and please be sure to subscribe.

00:29

[Music playing]

00:41

Anthony: Hello everyone and welcome to Philosophy Bakes Bread. Food for thought about life and leadership.

00:49

Eric: Philosophy Bakes Bread is a production of the Society of Philosophers of America, AKA SOPHIA. I'm Dr. Eric Thomas Weber.

Anthony: And I'm Dr. Anthony Cashio. A famous phrase says that philosophy bakes no bread. That is simply not practical. But we, and SOPHIA, and on this show, aim to correct that misconception.

Eric: Philosophy Bakes Bread airs on WRFL Lexington 88.1 FM and is distributed as a podcast next. Listeners can find us online at <https://philosophybakesbread.com> and we hope you'll reach out to us on Twitter @philosophybb and Facebook at *Philosophy Bakes Bread* or by email at philosophybakesbread@gmail.com.

01:25

Anthony: Last but not least you can leave us a short recorded message with a question or a comment or even some bountiful praise. Eric loves his bountiful praise.

Eric: Yeah, I do.

Anthony: I always like to imagine him sort of bouncing around in it.

Eric: [laughs]. Alright.

Anthony: We may even play it on the show. You can reach us at 859-257-1849. That's 859-257-1849.

01:46

Anthony: Today we're ecstatic to be talking with Patricia Shields. Welcome, Patricia.

Patricia: Well, welcome to you, too.

Anthony: Excellent. Patricia Shields is the editor of *Jane Addams: Progressive Pioneer of Peace, Philosophy, Sociology, Social Work and Public Administration*, which was published in 2017. We'll be talking with Pat today about feminism and peace and Jane Addams' legacy. Very excited about this conversation.

02:14

Eric: That's right. Dr. Patricia Shields is Professor of Political Science at Texas State University in San Marcos, Texas. She's also editor and chief of the journal *Armed Forces in Society*, the leading peer-reviewed journal on civil military relations. I came to know Pat from a distance back when I was in graduate school in Illinois and I had come upon her work on Charles Peirce and John Dewey in connection with public administration. I reached out at the time and she knew my

dissertation director, Larry Hickman, who's been a guest on our show back in episode 40 of the show on *Democracy and Education Today*.

02:48

Anthony: You know Larry, Pat?

Patricia: Yes. I have met him. I was ecstatic when I got a chance to meet him. He certainly influenced me.

Eric: Oh, he's a great guy.

Anthony: He's a really great guy. Really, really fantastic. So, Pat's work has been recognized many times and in many ways. She has received teaching awards from the National Association for Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, the Leslie A. Whittington Excellence in Teaching Award, the Texas State Presidential Award for Excellence in Teaching, the Everett Sweeney Teaching Award, as well as Professor of the Year from the Central Texas Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration.

03:24

Eric: Wow. That's quite a list. And, Pat has published over 60 articles and book chapters as well as four books and won the 2007 Public Administration Reviews Laverne Birchfield Award for the best review essay, as well as Texas State's Presidential Seminar Research Award back in 1984. You're a prolific scholar, Pat, and we'll get to your latest book very soon but before that, as you know, we want to make sure that our listeners know you as a person. So, we call this first segment "Know Thy Self" and we want to know whether you know thy self, but more importantly, we want to learn about you - the person behind the philosopher. Tell us about yourself, where you grew up, how you, you know, came to be who you are, you know, and so on. Who is Pat Shields?

04:06

Patricia: Well, Pat Shields was born in Portland, Oregon and her father was a... He worked for the Department of Agriculture inspecting grain elevators. One of my first ever memories was hugging his legs and finding grain in the cuffs of his pants.

All: [laughter]

Patricia: So I had a very tangible... I mean, and he was a public administrator, which was one of the reasons I got interested in public administration. And then when I was 13, he was transferred to Washington D.C. and so I moved to Washington D.C. and went to the University of Maryland for my undergraduate degree in economics, and I went to Ohio State for a masters in economics and a PhD in Public Administration. And I think that early experience with my father with public service informed my interest in public administration.

05:05

Anthony: Not everyone follows in their parent's footsteps. Right, you know. I guess my father's a banker. I didn't really... kind of maybe let him down going into philosophy.

All: [laughter]

Anthony: So, what was it about your own father and the work he did that appealed to you?

Patricia: Well, I think it opened my eyes. Actually, there was a really weird thing that happened. We were going to go... Our family was going to go to the Dominican Republic and he was going to teach people how to run grain elevators and I did some babysitting and learned that the grain elevator had collapsed from the people. And, then I told my father and then we didn't go. It was like "how did that happen?". This big federal government and yet this babysitter makes a difference in terms of us learning that we weren't going to be traveling to the Dominican Republic. So, that was just intriguing. What was going on behind the scenes, I just wanted to understand it more. So, I would say with my economics background -- and I switched from economics to public administration partly because I did like that economics had a strong theoretical framework, but it was all founded on assumptions of selfishness and of self-interest being the guiding factor in economic behavior. In moving to public administration gave me a new... It enabled me to not have that selfishness. That, to me... It would be bad for my soul -- to have a career in selfishness. But, public administration didn't really have the kind of ideas that I was interested in.

Anthony: So, this is intriguing, Pat, about human nature. You were studying economics and there were all of these assumptions in economics of self-interest being the fundamental motivator. Why did that come across as wrong to you? What is it that you think motivates people?

Patricia: Well, I think their motivation is pretty darn complex and of course people are interested in their self-interest. But, there's something that's much larger. Why would anyone sacrifice their life for another? That's certainly not self-interest. Anyway, there is something larger than just the self. And, honestly, one of the things that really influenced me early on was the Vietnam War.

Anthony: Uh huh.

07:46

Patricia: And, I can just remember that you were constantly hearing the casualties, how many people died, when I was in high school. Then, when I was in college the Vietnam War was at its peak and I was at the University of Maryland and this was a place where there's lots of protestors and I would go to the protests sometimes, or at least the bonfires at midnight. And, I thought it was very interesting. I didn't think the war made sense, but I didn't necessarily think the military was wrong -- that is it was following orders. What was the alternative? They would go against the Presidential orders? That didn't make sense to me. So, the university shut down. There were national guards with rifles at the end of my freshman year, wandering the campus of

the University of Maryland. And, I went to an all-girls catholic high school and I was confused, I guess. I wanted to contribute to this experience that we had with the Vietnam War, but I didn't exactly know how. When I was in graduate school, I was able to do a dissertation on the equity of the draft during the Vietnam War era. I worked at a research center that had the data available to really answer that question. I found that black high school graduates bore the burden of the draft during the Vietnam War. For one reason, they didn't go to college so they did not get the deferment, but also the military could take who they wanted and they wanted people who could read and write and had good educations. African Americans from the south had terrible educations often because of the school systems and they often didn't complete high school. It was the high school graduate that was more likely to be drafted -- more vulnerable to the draft system. That's what kind of got me into studying the military, because actually I published my first article in *Armed Forces and Society*, the journal that I edit. But, I also want to talk a little about how this person with economics and public administration got into philosophy.

10:22

Anthony: Yes. Next question, how did that happen?

All: [Laughter]

10:28

Patricia: Good question. I actually was... Public administration, and I'll give you a definition of it, which is informed by Dewey. I see it as the stewardship and implementation of the products of the living democracy.

Anthony: A lot to unpack in that definition.

10:51

Patricia: Right. It deals with values as stewardship and one of those values could be efficient use of our resources. Which is our people and our finances, but it's also the implementation. So, the mail arrives at your door, the social security check with the right amount arrives at, well, in your bank, I guess. These things that we call the public sector - somehow, they need to... they get done. William James making things work. Public administrators make our policy framework work. But, they do it in the context of a living democracy and that means an imperfect democracy, and with the democratic values. I see them as stewards, in some ways, of those democratic values. So, I was in public administration and finance and I'd written an article called *Freud Efficiency and Pragmatism*, which looked at user fees through the theoretical lenses of the economist who saw a user fee as a price and social work, which actually drew from Sigmund Freud. Freud said, "You'll get better faster if you pay the appropriate amount." And then the third one, the pragmatism, was the lenses of public administration. And, I got a letter from Amitai Etzioni, who at that time was the chair.. An ethics chair at Harvard Business School, and he said he was reading that article. He loved it, he was sharing it with colleagues, and with his students. And, I was pretty excited to get a letter like that so I was xeroxing it. And, the chairman of the Philosophy Department walked by, Vince Luizzi, and he could tell I was excited and he said, "Well, what happened.." and so I showed him the letter and he said, "I would like to

read that article.” And, I thought, what is someone in the philosophy department wanting to read about user fees? That doesn’t make any sense.

All: [Laughter]

13:22

Patricia: Anyway, I said, well, why do you want to look at this article? He said the words that changed my life. He said, “I studied pragmatism.” I said, what? Pragmatism is a philosophy, it’s a way of thinking, and I just didn’t know it. I reflected on that article and I thought, well, the economists have a strong set of ideas and the social workers have a pretty clear organizing principle, but I didn’t really feel like public administration had it, exactly. So, I said to Vince, “I want to know more about this thing called pragmatism because I would like public administration to have a clear organizing principle, from my perspective. His office was on the way to the bathroom and I stopped in and said, “Can you tell me more about pragmatism?”.

All: [Laughter]

Anthony: But, don’t take too long because I have to pee.

All: [Laughter]

14:30

Patricia: Well, on the way back, maybe. Anyway, he started giving me books and articles to read. The first one, and Vince seemed to be perfect because he was the chair of the philosophy department, so he was a public administrator. He also was a lawyer, so he understood the law and public administration is about implementing the laws. Where do we get the authority to do implementation? It’s through laws. And he studied under Betty Flower as a pragmatist, and he was just so willing to mentor me through the early period of whether or not pragmatism did offer public administration some kind of organizing principle. That, besides making it work, which I think that’s pretty important, but there was democratic theory and Dewey’s wonderful notions of democracy. Then, I started looking at, aside from Pierce, and Pierce did work for the National Geodetic Service.

15:34

Anthony: That’s right.

15:35

Patricia: In a survey of the coast. So he was a public administrator and from my perspective what he was interested in was making sure the ships didn’t hit shoals. Sort of pragmatism kind of came from the pragmatic perspective of how do you know whether you’re a success in your survey of the coast? It’s because the ships arrive and they don’t wreck.

All: [Laughter]

16:01

Anthony: That's a pretty good measure, right?

Patricia: So that, in a way... I sort of saw that as what Pierce was doing and there was roots in public administration. And then Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. - My gosh, he's one of the most important legal theorists, not to mention he's a Supreme Court Justice.

16:25

Eric: That's right.

16:26

Patricia: And Jane Addams suddenly got in there. I mean, what? I thought. And Dewey, with his interesting children. Dewey seemed like an amazing person. He was interested in democracy and democratic classrooms, and suffrage, and was such a public philosopher. All of those ideas. And so there was a sort of flexible organizing principle. It seemed to tie into what public administration could be and actually, after I'd done quite a bit of studying, I finally came up with that definition that I just gave you because it was understanding Dewey. And, actually, Hickman and what products are -- sort of flipping on its edge the notions of Plato in terms of the hierarchy. Maybe the people who are concerned with the products have some import... Not just the people with the ideas.

17:38

Eric: Ah ha.

Patricia: So, with his book on technology, anyway -- Hickman's book on technology.

17:45

Eric: Well, Pat we're over time for this first segment. We have to ask you an important question that we always ask in the first segment. And, we'll come back to pragmatism, and especially with regard to Jane Addams, in a moment, but we gotta ask you this question that Anthony always likes to ask.

18:00

Anthony: Oh, yeah. I love asking this question. Actually, you're a perfect person to ask because you necessarily... you didn't come to philosophy the same way most academic philosophers come to it. The question is simply this: What is philosophy?

18:13

Patricia: Well, from my perspective, it's about ideas -- the study of ideas. And it's how ideas shape our lives, and then how our lives shape ideas.

18:23

Eric: That's awesome. How ideas shape our lives and how our lives shape ideas. That's fantastic. Well, everybody we're going to come back. We have lots more questions. We want to hear lots more from Pat Shields, but fortunately we have three more segments to do that. This is Eric Weber. My co-host is Anthony Cashio, and you've been listening to Philosophy Bakes Bread. We'll be right back

18:43

[Music playing]

18:53

Anthony: Welcome back, friends, to Philosophy Bakes Bread. This is Anthony Cashio and Eric Weber here talking today with Pat Shields about feminism and peace, Jane Addams' legacy. We figured that we'd begin the second segment talking about Jane Addams' feminism and what relation that had, if any, to her publicly engaged work. And in the next segment we'll ask you, Pat, about whether, and how, that may have led to her advocacy for peace, for which she was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize in what, 1931?

19:23

Patricia: Yes

Anthony: Sound like a good plan, Pat?

Patricia: Yes. That sounds good.

19:26

Anthony: Well, Pat, we have actually had a few episodes focusing on Jane Addams. She's sort of quickly become one of our favorite historical thinkers on Philosophy Bakes Bread. But, each person introduces her as a figure differently and some listeners may not have heard this

episode, so let's start with a big question: Who is Jane Addams? Why do we need more people to learn about her today?

19:48

Patricia: Well, Jane Addams was one of the leading public philosophers of her time. She was born in 1860 and she died in 1935. She's known for her work in the settlement movement and leading the settlement house known as "Hull House" in the Chicago neighborhood. Personally, I got interested in her because she was listed as one of the founders of pragmatism in one of the encyclopedia of philosophy books that I had read, and I wanted to see how her ideas might influence pragmatism and how it's applied to public administration. So, one of the most important books for me was Charlene Seigfried's *Pragmatism and Feminism: Reweaving the Social Fabric*, because that explained how pragmatism was connected to feminism, but also Jane Addams was among the women -- the leading feminist pragmatist. So, that made me want to explore her feminism and move into really get to know Jane Addams. And, I would say, I got some insights when I finished the book on Jane Addams and looking at her as a pioneer, and how she was a feminist. What I really would say brought feminist standpoint to philosophy. I saw this as really her reaction to paternalism. You could almost see her notion of feminism as concentric circles, which are barriers for her -- and yet they also are ways of... She stays within and moves without. Her father was the banker and he was the owner of the mill in a small town in Illinois, Rockford. And, he had a strong social ethic and he also really believed women belonged in the household. That was the idea at the time. And so, her mother died when she was 3 and it's a tragic story. Her mother was 49 years old. She was seven months pregnant. Her husband was in the capital, and this was in the heart of the Civil War. He was a State Senator. And, as the good, sort of, "Lady of the Manor", or the prominent woman who was a caring woman, she went during a snowstorm to help deliver the baby of a mill worker and on the way, she slipped and this led to her death and the baby's death.

22:55

Eric and Anthony: Oh no, wow.

22:56

Patricia: So, Jane was three years old and this happened to her and this set up a very close dynamic with her father. And then when she was eight or nine years old, he remarried and she had a contentious relationship with her step-mother. So she was in this sort of world of wanting to be close to a beloved father and also wanting to escape. And I think this kind of set up a dynamic for her of seeing the importance of the law, but also the need to transcend it. And then when she went to college... and this was new. Rockford College was just opened up, or seminary, had just opened up for women. She realized that something was going to be changing with women. Even her junior oration, well, I guess I'll step back a minute. I think she discovered there that she really could thrive in an environment where there was a lot of women

learning. Because she was the valedictorian, she was the president of the class, she was the president of the debate club, and she was also the editor of the newspaper.

Anthony: Wow, she did everything, huh? Right

Eric: Right.

Patricia: Right.

24:17

All: [Laughter]

24:18

Patricia: I think the class, though, might have been fifteen people. So it's not... But, still the point I'm trying to make is that here she was developing skills for writing because she ended up eventually writing eleven books. She was a famous speaker and she learned in the debate club -- she worked with speaking. And, she was a good thinker to be the valedictorian. All of these things... In a way, she transferred this kind of environment where she really thrived into a Hull House. And if you can think of a transferring of that environment, I think that began to make more sense. When she was 20 years old, her junior oration, it was called *Bread Giver*, was the name of the speech and she talked about how women's role was going to change over their lifetime. That women would claim the same right to independent thought and action as a man. She knew this at 20, and she wanted to make it happen and do it in a world where she could thrive -- which ended up being Hull House, I think. So, if you go back to the concentric circles, one of the first books that she wrote was *Democracy and Social Ethics*. And, this book she talked about the world beyond the family. And, in fact, the experience of Hull House was a way for women who were trapped in the ethic of the family, in the private ethic, to expand their world and their service to the world. And this was kind of the heart of her feminism.

26:25

Eric: I want to follow up on something you said because some of our listeners will know about Hull House, but some of them if they haven't heard our past episodes on Jane Addams won't know what Hull House is. So, what would you say is Hull House for those who haven't heard of that?

26:39

Patricia: Well, Hull House was a settlement house. I think it was the biggest, or the most well-known settlement house. She came of age during the period when there was industrialization and cities around the United States, and particularly in Chicago where she

lived, vast immigrant communities had moved in and moved to Chicago. There's a lot of poverty. There's industrialization without, really, concern for the individuals who were working there. And, in recognition of these urban problems, the settlement movement developed homes or group homes, which -- the people came to the community. They tried to interact or... the idea was social progress, but from her perspective it wasn't, "We're going to tell you what you need," it's "We're going to learn from you and try to figure this out together." So, it was a community. And the Hull House had a campus where people lived at Hull House and they offered services like... There were all kinds of classes, there were actually dormitories for young women who worked in factories so they'd have a place to live. Because women, it was maybe too far for them to go to their homes which may have been in the rural areas, or who knows what reason, but there was plenty of reasons where there might have been single women needing a place to live and then to work. But, there were classes, there were drama classes, there were coffee houses, there was daycares, and there was even a museum -- a Labor Museum. This was sort of a hub in the neighborhood. From there, they wanted to in some sense transform the neighborhood so that it would be a better place to live. And for me, one of the images that makes it clear, that's very problematic, was the horse carcasses that were everywhere because garbage wasn't collected as well as it should have been. What do you do when a horse dies? And, children would play on the horse carcasses. So, if you have a world where children are playing on horse carcasses you can imagine that they may have some health problems.

29:20

Eric: That is pretty gross.

All: [Laughter]

29:23

Anthony: I'm just trying to imagine there... Just go outside and play with the horse, baby. They'll be fine.

All: [Laughter]

29:31

Patricia: I've seen some pictures of kids on horse carcasses because I wanted to see what.. But, I think it's a good image of there's just a lot of problems in this neighborhood. And, so she worked with the community and the Hull House residents and one of the first things they did was work on playgrounds. But also, what can we do -- and this was a period where there was a lot of corruption -- and how can we fix or recognize this corruption or stop it so that we can actually have cleaner streets. And she was involved in organizing the community to make that happen. She was also... there's a lot of scientific inquiry because the infant mortality rate was something

that she watched and after this organization and this change in their collecting of the garbage they were supposed to, the infant mortality rate was cut in half.

30:33

Eric and Anthony: Wow.

30:35

Patricia: So there was this notion of working in the community... She described Hull House, or the settlement movement, as an experimental effort addressing the problems of the great industrial cities. And so it was... Sometimes something would work, or maybe it wouldn't work but in an experimental effort.

30:57

Anthony: That's good. Well, Pat, you've kind of presented two really interesting aspects of Jane Addams' thought and work here. Right, we're working with... how you allocate that it's her feminine perspective on pragmatism as well as, sort of, the advocacy work she's doing with Hull House. Did Addams see those two connected in an important way? Like, did her feminism drive her work at Hull House or vice versa -- or was it an organic relationship there?

31:23

Patricia: I think it would be organic because she was constantly learning. She also was pretty close to John Dewey and I think her notions of inquiry and his notions of inquiry were influenced by the kinds of things that they would do at Hull House. Like develop the maps of the neighborhood, do all kinds of research on figuring out what the neighborhood was. But, you know, I think what her idea was to bring the feminine standpoint into understanding how to make progress or change in society.

32:07

Anthony: Excellent. I gotcha.

32:09

Patricia: So, there were a lot of clubs, women's clubs, and these clubs were helping to change or address the problems that were happening throughout the country. So, women couldn't vote but they could influence their communities through these clubs.

32:29

Anthony: Uh huh.

32:30

Patricia: And she took one of the ideas of this club called “Municipal Housekeeping” and helped to look at it as an idea. In fact, Sally Haslinger, she found a broadside written by Jane Addams which was talking about municipal housekeeping, which is thinking... and changing the model of government or of cities from what they saw as a citadel that would be protected by... They had to be concerned about invaders to a household. It should be run like a family. We need to care about the people inside our city. We need to keep things clean. Make our streets clean. Bringing feminine sensibility to looking at city management. And this is where her theories connect with public administration, but it’s a notion of caring about the people inside your city -- which is bigger than your household. Right? So, these concentric circles are moving from the home to the city and ultimately move out to the world with her work on peace.

33:50

Eric: That is fantastic. And, that’s exactly where we’re going with the next segment. We have to take a short break right here, but thank you all for listening to Philosophy Bakes Bread. This is Eric Weber. My co-host is Anthony Cashio and we’ve been talking with the wonderful Pat Shields. We’re going to come back with the next segment to ask about precisely that connection between feminism and peace. Thanks everybody for listening. We’ll be right back.

34:11

[Music playing]

34:17

Announcer: If you’re hearing this, that means podcast advertising works. WRFL is now accepting new applications for advertising in a selection of our original podcast series. If you, or someone you know, owns a business in central Kentucky and would be interested in advertising on WRFL’s original podcasts, please email development@wrfl.fm.

34:37

[Music playing]

34:54

Anthony: Welcome back to Philosophy Bakes Bread. This is Anthony Cashio and Eric Weber talking today with Pat Shields about feminism and peace, Jane Addams’ legacy. And we’re having an absolutely wonderful conversation. I’m learning just tremendous amounts about Jane

Addams, someone who I already thought I knew a lot about. In the second segment, we asked Pat about Jane Addams' feminism and we learned a lot about Hull House and the relationship between those two. In this segment, we're going to ask about Addams' advocacy for peace, right? We ended the last segment and Pat was giving us this beautiful image of sort of concentric circles of caring -- we care about the family, we care about the communities, we care about the city, and ultimately, we end up expanding this to thinking about the world. Right? So, we've had several episodes talking about Addams, but have said very little so far about her work for which she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931. So, why don't we get right to it.

35:48

Patricia: Great. Well, how did I get into looking at Addams and peace.

Anthony: Yes.

35:53

Patricia: Well, I felt for a long time in my career that I had like two hats and they never intersected. One was the military and the other was pragmatism and public administration. And then I began looking at peacekeeping and looked at, sort of, the oddity of peacekeeping forces being led by military forces, and so the peacekeeping forces were led by warriors and it seemed to me that was a weird disjuncture -- or, it didn't make sense to have a warrior mindset leading a transformation of a community from a warring kind of community to a peaceful community. And, by that time I knew quite a bit about pragmatism and it seemed to me that the warrior mindset was pretty rigid. Friend, enemy, victory, defeat. These things seemed completely separate. And, I knew Addams had written stuff on peace -- she had three books on peace -- and I also knew that there wasn't a lot written on her ideas of peace. Mostly, democracy. Her ideas of democracy. So, I had a faculty development leave and, I kind of took a leap, where I said, maybe I should just read up on peace, peacekeeping, and on Addams' ideas of peace and see if anything can be applied to the notions of peacekeeping. Inform ideas of notions of peacekeeping.

37:28

Eric: Sounds like a great idea.

37:29

Patricia: So, that's how I started and I was really influenced... and I was reading her books... She knew her ideals of peace where -- actually she talks about municipal housekeeping. Her first major chapter was survival of militarism in city government. Somehow that seems so... like it could be apt today.

Eric: Wow, yeah.

37:53

Patricia: Anyway, and her book about the *Women at the Hague*, which dealt with her work during World War I, with a peace conference that she led at the Hague in 1915. And, her book about post World War I, which is *Peace and Bread in a Time of War*. I read those and I read some of the peace literature and finally I came upon this really amazing article that, the title of the article was, *Peace Research: Just the Study of War*. What? How can... And they made the argument that there was this dominant definition of peace within the peace research community which was peace -- which was not as negative peace -- and that's the absence of war or the absence of violence. And, there's another definition of peace called "Positive Peace" that looked at the kind of community that you wanted to live in. A peace where there was justice, and freedom, and just... it's something that would be maybe more organic and evolving but certainly a lot richer than the idea of not war.

All: [Laughter]

Eric: Right.

39:21

Patricia: But, what had happened in peace research was that they had these big quantitative studies and they had these dichotomous dependent variable zeros -- peace and one is war. And, if you have that as your definition of peace then you're actually -- peace is studying war.

39:40

Eric: Ah.

Patricia: Or the... But, what that did for me is it gave me a platform -- Oh, Jane Addams, hers is positive peace. That's where she fits. And, so I studied her ideas and I said, well how can I make sense out of her positive definition of peace? And, one of the key things about the negative definition of peace that's problematic, is that it's short run. And, the peace should have a long-run perspective. But, what I came to was a term that captured Jane Addams' theory of peace, which I'll call "peace-weaving". But, I can maybe step back a minute and say that she -- through the women's movement, through her work with suffrage, during... She was involved with the peace movement in the 1890s. There are people like Andrew Carnegie and Ford. The peace movement was... The idea was that the peace movement was bad for business. So, business leaders were very involved in peace. And they also knew that maybe there should be a way for there to be... ways to arbitrate disputes. So, there's two meetings in the Hague, 1899 and 1907, where peace conferences -- where they made some important rules like international

courts. And in 1915, they were going to have another Hague conference, but then there was war and all their ideas that we were going to have eternal peace was kind of out the window.

41:18

Eric: Yeah.

41:20

Patricia: This was when Addams and her feminism came to being... or came into fruition. Heck, women are affected by war. We should also be able to have input into what is going on in the international arena. And, they borrowed some techniques that they knew, that they'd used from the suffrage movement, and she actually was pretty well connected to the international suffrage movement, and they quickly put together a international conference of the Hague. But, this was women's conference. And, what they wanted to do was to end the war... to start mediation. That... and, there were resolutions. They had a set of resolutions, one of which was to have an organization -- something like the League of Nations -- where disputes could be resolved. They advocated for universal suffrage throughout the world, so that women could have a voice in international disputes -- in war and peace.

42:29

Eric: Pat, in that last regard, I definitely see a connection to her feminism. I wondered if you'd say a little bit more about how, if it did, her feminism inspired her advocacy for peace. Can you tell us a little bit more about that? You just touched on that a moment ago, but sort of what about feminism, you know, was...

42:49

Patricia: Well, or what about the feminine... feminist standpoint, or feminine standpoint, I think. That's how I might phrase it.

42:58

Eric: OK

42:59

Patricia: I think maybe if I went through what I meant by peace-weaving it would kind of come through.

42:05

Eric: Excellent. Great.

42:06

Patricia: Because the peace... First of all, I took the metaphor of weaving because it was expansive, and interconnected democratic community. It had a feminine sensibility, but it also transcends gender roles. Weaving connects strings. It's not homogenized. You... It's both strong and flexible. So, weaving captured, sort of the action and... It just captured something about her ideas of peace. But, her ideas of peace focused on relationships. So, if you look at negative peace, it has nothing to do with relationships.

43:52

Eric: Uh huh.

43:53

Patricia: But, we're going to be at peace. It's between... You have to have a conflict. You have to have more than one party and there's a relationship. So, it's relationships between individuals, families, groups, nations. It's not about the absence of conflict but rather how conflict might be worked out successfully. And this is... and also, her notion of peace-weaving wanted to avoid rigid moralisms where peace... And this very much is pragmatism... Is that you... There's fixated belief systems. If you're the enemy, and I... That friend / enemy dichotomy, then, and I'm right and you're wrong... If you're set in a world where you have strong rigid moralisms, that's a setup for really bad conflict, but if you can somehow ease those rigid moralisms then that can lead to peace. And so, one of the founding ideas here is sympathetic knowledge, or the ability to put yourself in another person's shoes. That you can actively understand another person's perspective. And her... One of the key ideas that I love with her is perplexity. And that's this being confused, or surprised, that you're able to put... When you're able to put yourself in someone else's shoes, you're willing to be surprised. You're willing to see from their perspective and that perplexity kind of opens you up. Because peace is about really transforming maybe an enemy into a friend. How are you going to do that? And so this notion of perplexity sets, sort of, the stage so that you can do that. Then, also the kind of community of inquiry where she was... And this is was informed a lot by her experiences in Chicago because these neighborhoods were filled with individuals who came from all kinds of backgrounds in Europe where they would be seen as enemies. And yet, to work on cleaning streets -- if you have a practical problem you can work on, then you can leave your moral certitude and say how am I going to solve this problem, and in the process, you can begin to put yourself in the other person's shoes. That's a forum for sympathetic understanding. And also, sort of her notion of participatory democracy. The community of interest... of inquiry is that... Anyone who is concerned with this problem should have a voice. And then, we should act and see whether or not that helps resolve it and if it does, fine. If it doesn't, try something else. Sounds pretty pragmatic, huh?

46:49

Eric and Anthony: Right. It sure does.

47:00

Patricia: Another one of her ideas was lateral progress. That, which is, how do you judge how well a society is doing? You could rejoice that, you know, the company is making millions and millions of dollars and has new products. But, if you're not looking at how well the most vulnerable are doing, that's what you should concentrate on if you're talking about how well your society is doing.

47:28

Anthony: Yeah.

47:30

Patricia: So, I think you could see it's shaped by her experiences and her feminine standpoint because of this involvement and caring that is everywhere in this definition... In this peace-weaving. So, here's what I said peace-weaving is. It's about building the fabric of peace by emphasizing relationships. Peace-weaving builds these positive relationships by working on practical problems, engaging people widely with sympathetic understanding, while recognizing that progress is measured by the welfare of the vulnerable.

48:11

Eric: Perfect. I really, really like that. That's an idea of peace - as this positive peace and peace-weaving. Can I ask one quick, very quick, just clarificatory question: When Addams won the Peace Prize in 1931, was there a stated reason? Was it her work with the Hull House, or was it all the sort of life work?

48:29

Patricia: Well, right after the conference she and... there's the delegates of women from the conference who traveled to all the countries, including the United States, and met with the leaders trying to get them to end the war. So, it was a combination of... The most direct reasons, and actually I looked at the nominations, had to do with her work with the peace conference, with the delegation, and with the creation of the organization, which exists today, the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom. That was the organization... That was the genesis of... or the first conference was the genesis of this organization which is active today.

49:19

Eric: Yeah.

Patricia: So, that's... did that answer your question?

49:22

Eric: Yeah. Absolutely.

Anthony: Exactly what I was looking for. Yeah.

Eric and Anthony: Yeah. Exactly.

49:27

Eric: Well, thanks everybody for listening to this segment of Philosophy Bakes Bread. This is Eric Weber. My co-host is Anthony Cashio, and we've been learning a ton from the great Pat Shields. We'll be back with one more segment after a short break.

49:38

[Music playing]

49:50

Anthony: Welcome back, friends, to Philosophy Bakes Break. This is Anthony Cashio and Eric Weber and today we've been having an absolutely fantastic conversation with Pat Shields about feminism and peace, Jane Addams' legacy. In the last two segments we kind of talked about her work with sort of the feminist perspective as she brought it to... Jane Addams brought it to Hull House, and her ideas about peace, and peace-weaving, and it led to her work earning the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931. In this last segment, we're going to wrap it up with a final big picture question or two. We're going to ask about whether or not Pat thinks "philosophy bakes bread"?

50:28

Eric: [Laughter]

Anthony: I'm going to guess where she's going to go with that. And then end with a light-hearted joke or two. Maybe they'll even be funny. So that's our goal. Sometimes.

Eric and Anthony: [Laughter]

50:39

Anthony: And then we'll end with a question for our listeners to think about as we go about our day's business.

50:45

Eric: That's right. So, Pat, I want to ask you a question about feminism and Addams' inspiration in the world today. So, here's the question: If Addams were alive today, what do you think she'd be fighting for, such as with regard to women?

51:00

Patricia: Well, I think she surely would be fighting for immigrant rights and particularly women -- if you want to take with regard to women, there's a lot of women and children who are trying to immigrate from very bad places. And, she would try to figure out how to make their lives better. I think she would also be someone who'd be very concerned about climate change. That would be a big deal for her. I think she might be involved with the United Nation. I mean, there's a lot of things that the United Nation is working on which now incorporates women's perspectives in ways that it hadn't. So, I think she'd be working on that. And, that's kind of a legacy. The resolutions that they came up with in the women's conference, many of those resolutions -- you can see them actuated, but UN resolutions which involve women.

52:00

Eric: That's a great answer.

52:02

Anthony: I like it. I like it. You know when Addams began her work, women did not even have the right to vote. Right? But recently, as of our recording, we have a record number of women who recently got elected to the US House of Representatives. But only a little over 20% of the Senate is made up of women today. Right? So we have... a lot of progress is happening but more work to be done. What do you think are the prospects for greater parity in the next 50 years. What do you think Addams would have to say about that? Would she be kind of happy with the direction that things are going, and what advice might she give?

52:37

Patricia: Well I think that she would be happy with greater representation of women in the Congress, that is certainly true. But, I also think she would be pretty unhappy with the polarization that is part of... The rigid moralisms that are just everywhere.

52:58

Anthony: Right.

52:59

Patricia: The divided... the red state, blue state... She would be working to try to figure out how to have the purple state. But I do think that you could see it... that women legislatures tend to be a little less rigid, I think, in terms of how they vote. They're more likely to cross the aisle and I think that she would be happy about that. That's for sure.

53:30

Eric: Excellent. Excellent. So Pat, in recent years lots of positions in the military have opened up to women and there are still some positions that are not yet open to women, such as in the Navy Seals. And so, my question is: Is there a tension at the same time in advocating for women to have access to all of these positions and with thinking about feminism as the movement for peace?

53:56

Patricia: Yes. I think there's a big tension. And that probably would be something that might be incomplete. I don't think Addams really envisioned a lot of women in the military when she was thinking about all of this. And, I think you could see in Afghanistan and other places that women as part of the teams, which go into the community and speak to other women, I think that would be something that she would be very happy to see.

54:30

Anthony: Interesting. So even in the capacity as warriors... as you brought it up earlier... Women might be helpful in, you know, peace-making efforts even as soldiers. Is that right?

54:41

Patricia: Right. Right. You know, she was criticized for her ideas of peace partly because she had a hard time thinking that arming... militaries... made a lot of sense, in a way. But, I don't think she really thought that through completely. However, I find her ideas really useful in the importance of thinking in the big picture -- the long run. I mean if the military basically has a short run notion of peace as the end of war, but then, if the end of war -- if victory and peace are conflated, what happens next? One of the reasons we have had such an amazing post World War II peace is because enemies have become friends.

55:35

Anthony: Um, hm.

55:36

Patricia: But how do we do that? How do we think about that? It's a long run question.

55:41

Eric: Nice. A very good point. Yeah.

Anthony: I like that. In fact, that kind of sets us up for one of our... one of our final questions, which comes from the inspiration for our show: Would you, Pat, say that philosophy bakes no bread, as the famous saying goes? That, you know... that it's not practical? I kind of think we've argued against that the whole show, but we'll ask you just bluntly -- does philosophy bake no bread, or that it does bake bread and why and how... and can you explain?

56:08

Patricia: Well, if it didn't bake bread we wouldn't be talking today because... I actually have never taken a philosophy course in my life.

Eric and Anthony: [Laughter]

56:18

Patricia: I came to the conclusion that since I had a PhD I could learn something on my own, and was tutored by Vince Luizzi, but if it didn't have... offer ideas that would be useful in the world, I wouldn't be interested.

56:36

Eric: There you go. Alright. Fantastic. Well, Pat, in every episode we want to be sure people both see the serious side of philosophy, which we've touched on significantly, I think, as well as the lighter side. So we have a bit in this last segment that we call "Philosophunnies".

Eric: "Say philosophunnies"

Child's voice: "philosophunnies"

Eric: [Laughter]

Eric: “Say philosophunnies”

Child’s voice (again): “philosophunnies”

Eric and child: [Laughter]

57:05

Eric: So, we’d love to hear if you’ve got a favorite joke or a funniest fact, or a story to tell, about philosophy or about Jane Addams and what we’ve been talking about. Have you got a funny story or a joke you’d like to tell us?

57:16

Patricia: Yes, I do. I’d like to... One of my favorite Jane Addams’ pieces is her tongue and cheek speech where she talks about imagining a world where women were in charge and men were seeking the franchise, and what women might do to say *no*. So here’s a little bit of that. [quoting Jane Addams] “Let us imagine an absurd hypothesis that the political machinery were in the hands of women. Let us consider various replies which these citizen women might reasonably make to the men who are seeking the franchise. First, could not the women say, our most valid objection to extending the franchise to you is that you are so fond of fighting...”

All: [Laughter]

58:01

Patricia: [quoting Jane Addams] “... and always have been since you were little boys. You’d very likely forget that the real object of the state is to nurture and protect lives and out of sheer vainglory you would be voting away huge sums of money for battleships.”

All: [Laughter]

58:17

Patricia: [quoting Jane Addams] “Second, would not the hypothetical women note we have carefully built up a codifactory legislation for the protection of the workers in modern industry. We know that you men have always been careless about the house. Perfectly indifferent to the necessity for sweeping and cleaning. If you were made responsible for factory legislation, it is quite probable that you would let the workers in the textile mills contract tuberculosis through needless breathing the fluff.” Anyway, so that’s my...

All: [Laughter]

58:51

Patricia: I think it sort of captures a funny side of Jane Addams and incorporates what we've talked about today.

58:59

Eric: It sure does. That's excellent. Well, in every episode Anthony and I also gather a joke or two and we happened to find two that are basically kind of headlines or lines from publications that came out sounding kind of funny. And, one was from a church bulletin and the other one was a real newspaper headline. And, I thought they were pretty cute so... Anthony, want to read this first one?

59:20

Anthony: Yeah, this was a church bulletin and they printed it out and this says, [reading from bulletin] "The peacemaking meeting scheduled for today has been rescheduled due to a conflict."

All: [Laughter]

59:30

Eric: And then the real news headline, evidently this was actually printed in the newspaper. [reading from newspaper] "War dims hope for peace."

All: [Laughter]

59: 44

[Recorded laugh track with clapping plays]

59:46

Anthony: That is great. Well, last but not least, we do like to take advantage of the fact that today we have some powerful social media that allows for two way communication even for programs like radio shows. So, we want to invite our listeners to send us their thoughts about big questions we raise on the show.

1:00:00

Eric: That's right. Given that, Pat, we'd love to hear your thoughts about what question we should ask everyone for future segments that we call *You Tell Me*. Sometimes we have past

guests back on the show... Sometimes we just, you know, are able to air a voicemail that we get from a listener, and so on. Well, we want to pose questions for our listeners so, do you have a question to ask our listeners?

1:00:25

Patricia: Well, it would have something to do with resolving the rigid perspectives that dominate our political scene and how they might... think... how they might suggest we move to a world there's less rigid belief systems and we actually talk to one another.

1:00:46

Eric: Ewww.

Anthony: I like that a lot.

Eric: I do too. My goodness, that sounds like...

Anthony: How can we, sort of, move... peaceweaving...

1:00:54

Patricia: I mean, I think that it's hard to move people into perplexity when they have all of the answers.

1:01:00

Eric: Right. Very nice. Well, Pat, is there anything you'd like to plug about your journal or about your book that's come out? Anything you want to talk about that's upcoming or that you want the world to know about?

1:01:13

Patricia: Ok. Well, I think people might... If they want to learn more, my book on Jane Addams really does focus on her ideas and her contribution to the world of ideas.

1:01:26

Eric: Excellent. Well, check it out folks. We're going to have a link to the book on our show notes page for this episode when it comes out in the podcast.

1:01:34

Patricia: Oh. I know another one. I have a YouTube video that is sponsored by the journal, *Public Integrity*, which discusses Jane Addams' social ethics.

1:01:46

Eric: Excellent.

Anthony: That's awesome. Ok.

1:01:48

Patricia: It's about a 10-minute video.

Eric: Perfect. We'll put a link to that in the show notes as well. Fantastic.

1:01:53

Anthony: Alright, well thank you everyone for listening to Philosophy Bakes Bread. Your hosts today Anthony Cashio and Eric Weber are really grateful to have been joined by Patricia Shields, and we hope you listeners will join us again. Consider sending us your thoughts about anything you've heard today, that you'd like to hear about in the future, or about this specific question that Pat has raised for you. So how do we move into this state of perplexity where we can actually start talking to each other again. Nice.

Eric: An important question.

1:02:20

Anthony: That's a good one. It's a good one.

Eric: That's right folks. Remember that you can catch us on Twitter, Facebook, and on our website at philosophybakesbread.com, and there you'll find transcripts for many of our episodes. And, one more thing, folks, if you want to support the show and to be more involved in the work of the Society of Philosophers in America, SOPHIA, the easiest thing to do is to go consider joining as a member at philosophersinamerica.com.

1:02:40

Anthony: And, if you're enjoying the show, and we really hope you are, maybe take a quick second to rate and review us on Apple podcast, Spotify, or wherever you're listening to us today. You can, of course, always email us at philosophybakesbread@gmail.com and you can also leave us a short recorded message with a question or a comment, that we may be able to play on the show, at 859-257-1849. I want to take a second now to thank you again for this

wonderful conversation, Pat, and I hope you will consider joining us again sometime soon. I've learned a tremendous amount, so thank you for joining us.

Eric: Me, too.

1:03:13

Patricia: Well, thanks a lot for your encouragement.

Eric: It was a lot of fun talking with you.

Anthony: It was absolutely fantastic.

1:03:17

Patricia: I do feel very, even though I'm not trained as a philosopher, I feel very welcomed by the world of philosophy.

Eric: Good. You have trained yourself as a philosopher, I would say.

1:03:28

Patricia: Well, thank you.

Anthony: And we hope everyone listening will join us again next time on Philosophy Bakes Bread. Food for thought about life and leadership.

1:03:37

[Music playing]