

**CIVILIZATIONS' ORIGIN: A THOUGHT CONNECTION BETWEEN
THOMAS PAINE AND JANE ADDAMS**

An Undergraduate Research Scholars Thesis

by

GARION FRANKEL

Submitted to the LAUNCH: Undergraduate Research office at
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the designation as an

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH SCHOLAR

Approved by
Faculty Research Advisor:

Cary J. Nederman, Ph.D.

May 2021

Major:

University Studies - Society, Ethics, and Law Concentration

Copyright © 2021. Garion Frankel.

RESEARCH COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION

Research activities involving the use of human subjects, vertebrate animals, and/or biohazards must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate Texas A&M University regulatory research committee (i.e., IRB, IACUC, IBC) before the activity can commence. This requirement applies to activities conducted at Texas A&M and to activities conducted at non-Texas A&M facilities or institutions. In both cases, students are responsible for working with the relevant Texas A&M research compliance program to ensure and document that all Texas A&M compliance obligations are met before the study begins.

I, Garion Frankel, certify that all research compliance requirements related to this Undergraduate Research Scholars thesis have been addressed with my Research Faculty prior to the collection of any data used in this final thesis submission.

This project did not require approval from the Texas A&M University Research Compliance & Biosafety office.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|----------------------------------|------|
| ABSTRACT..... | 1 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | 2 |
| CHAPTERS | |
| INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 1. THE STATE OF NATURE..... | 9 |
| 2. REASON AND HUMAN NATURE..... | 16 |
| 3. THE RISE OF CIVILIZATION..... | 22 |
| 4. NORMATIVE CIVILIZATION..... | 30 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 38 |
| REFERENCES | 41 |

ABSTRACT

Civilizations' Origin: A Thought Connection Between Thomas Paine and Jane Addams

Garion Frankel
Department of Philosophy
Texas A&M University

Research Faculty Advisor: Cary J. Nederman, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science
Texas A&M University

As a result of ideological opposition or the reduction of his writing to mere propaganda, the legacy of Thomas Paine within mainstream political theory has remained largely unexplored. Never a friend to the elite or powerful, Paine's torch was carried by the common men, trade unionists and socialists, who found in him a kindred spirit. While his reputation and character have been restored in recent decades, scholars still do not assign his legacy enough value.

One avenue of investigation that is not present in the literature is a connection to sociologist Jane Addams, who served as an honorary vice president for the Thomas Paine Monument Association. In particular, Addams' political anthropology bears a number of distinct similarities to that of Thomas Paine, and she applied many of these views through her work at Hull House. Beyond the purely historical connections, these similarities in their respective political anthropologies can also be revealed through thorough examination of both thinkers' accounts of pre-civilization (or the state of nature), the rise of civilization, and how civilization ought to be treated normatively. In this thesis, based on the above revelations, I find that Thomas Paine was a discernible influence upon the political anthropology of Jane Addams.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Contributors

I would like to thank my faculty advisor, Cary J. Nederman, Ph.D., for his guidance and support throughout the course of this research. Without his assistance, and just as importantly, his patience, this work would not have been possible. I consider myself blessed for having the opportunity to study under a scholar of his caliber.

I would also like to thank, Linda Radzik, Ph.D., and my academic advisor, Marco Valadez, for pushing me to participate in the honors program to begin with. It has changed my life for the better, and completely altered my plans for my career and the rest of my life in general.

Thanks also go to my friends, who have so graciously endured my constant babbling about random political theory or some historical figure they have never heard of. Their emotional support has been invaluable during this process.

Finally, thanks to my parents for their unending generosity, unconditional love, and constant support. Nothing I have achieved in this world would have been fathomable without them, and I couldn't have asked for a better upbringing.

All work conducted for the thesis was completed by the student independently, with assistance from the faculty advisor.

Funding Sources

No funding was received in support of this research.

INTRODUCTION

In the last two hundred years of scholarship in political theory, perhaps no figure has been as unduly maligned as Thomas Paine, which is unsurprising considering his affinity for rhetorically eviscerating men and institutions of authority and esteem. Paine has always been rightly recognized by historians as a Founding Father of the United States for the critical roles *Common Sense* and *The American Crisis* played in the American Revolution, as well as for his undeniable influence on figures like Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Rush, and Mary Wollstonecraft. However, Paine, for nearly a century after his death in 1809, was the victim of seemingly relentless ad hominem attacks. Some were likely motivated by Paine's scathing open letter to George Washington in 1796, labeling him an "incompetent general and elitist president who had betrayed Paine [by] not protecting him when he claimed American citizenship when arrested by France" (Grimm). Others were provoked by "Paine's scathing criticisms [in *The Age of Reason*] of religion, in general, and of Christianity, in particular," which were unsettling to a deeply religious United States in the midst of the Second Great Awakening (Marker). Two of the vilest critiques came from George Chalmers, a Tory in the service of a vengeful British government, and James Cheetham, a New York journalist and Republican radical who had ended a friendship with Paine after a series of personal arguments (Bernstein 894). Instead of engaging with Paine's work substantively, both men attacked Paine's character and upbringing. Paine, the son of a Quaker stay-maker, was no genteel figure, which, according to his enemies, represented a lack of virtue. To Chalmers and Cheetham, "no good ideas could ever come from so corrupt and degraded a source" (Bernstein 894). As such, even modern scholarship is still exploring the true depths of Paine's legacy.

Often, Paine's political theory is taken to be a more radical version of John Locke (which is decidedly not the case), or is simply discounted entirely due to Paine's negative historical reputation (Bernstein 876). But Paine never meant to be an object of affection for academics, nor was he interested in virtue outside what was expected of a good citizen. As those in power ignored or mocked him, "many American trade unions, slavery abolitionists, suffragettes, socialists and civil rights groups claimed Paine as their key inspiration" (O'Neill). Though thinkers such as Karl Marx and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon likely had little direct engagement with Paine's works, they came into contact with and were presumably affected by the radicals and trade unionists who did (Weisser 14). Even Abraham Lincoln was an avid follower of Paine's politics and deism in his youth, though his admiration for Paine was kept secret in order to protect his political career (Brookheiser). In 1892, this undercurrent developed into a mainstream movement with the publication of Moncure D. Conway's biography of Paine. "Though at times too fiercely defensive of Paine's character, Conway's biography of Paine and his comprehensive edition of Paine's writings became landmarks still regarded as authoritative more than a century after their first appearance" (Bernstein 895).

Curious scholars began to investigate Paine's political theory, notably his political anthropology, but many, including Columbia University's C.E. Merriam, Jr., still considered it impossible to view him as a "great political thinker" (Merriam 402). Merriam, in particular, saw Paine as an activist and "agitator" who exerted influence through "popular rather than scientific" means (Merriam 402). That being said, this impossibility was not universally agreed on at the time, and much later works such as Robert Lamb's *Thomas Paine and the Idea of Human Rights* have served to elevate Paine's reputation as a legitimate political theorist to a great extent (Philp). To these scholars, Paine was not only "a visionary *and* a scientist" (Kiley 1), but a

theorist with a political anthropology¹ that was not only distinct from Locke, Hobbes, or Rousseau, but also uniquely insightful in terms of normative civilization (Widerquist and McCall 216-217).

Evidence of disagreement can also be found in the Thomas Paine National Historical Association (TPNHA), of which Conway was the inaugural president, the first of numerous late nineteenth century “Paine societies” that were devoted to the preservation of Paine’s reputation, lost remains, and political works (Conway). Despite their academic background, many Paine societies became heavily involved in local community affairs, commissioning statues, founding museums, and even naming streets after Paine in New Rochelle, New York, where Paine lived between 1802 and 1806 (“History of the Thomas Paine Cottage Museum”). Conway himself was a journalist and focused more on Paine’s historical reputation than the impact of his political theory, but his reintroduction of Paine to mainstream academic discourse proved to be the catalyst for positive scholarly re-engagement with Paine’s works (particularly the *Rights of Man* and *Agrarian Justice*) on a theoretical basis, especially in the early decades of the twentieth century. Though this re-engagement was not enough to substantively change the ambivalent academic attitude toward Paine on a large scale, the study of Paine no longer was a threat to a scholar’s career. This shift allowed Paine societies to grow an academic wing, and begin to engage in scholarly discourse in their own right.

One Paine society, a sister group to the TPNHA, that fostered ideological engagement with Paine was the Thomas Paine Monument Association (TPMA), which was founded by author and religious radical Joseph Lewis. Lewis wrote on Paine extensively and even claimed that Paine was the true author of the Declaration of Independence (Marotta 187). Among other

¹ Political anthropology in this thesis will refer to the analysis of the evolution of human societies, particularly from pre-civilization to civilization.

activities, Lewis and the TPMA claimed credit for the statue of Thomas Paine in his birthplace of Thetford, England. The organization counted intellectual titans like Clarence Darrow, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, George Creel, Margaret Sanger, and Jane Addams among its honorary vice-presidents (Marotta 187-188).

Of these figures, Jane Addams is of the most interest. On the surface, Addams, as reformist as she was radical, is an unlikely candidate to claim Paine as an ideological influence. Operating firmly within the pragmatist and progressive traditions, Addams argued that there exists a moral obligation to understand, engage, and form relationships with others (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 9). To that end, Addams, along with her friend and paramour Ellen Gates Starr, founded Hull House in 1889, a settlement house designed to promote social interaction and engagement in the humanities for members of Chicago's working class. Addams would simplify these lofty goals by referring to them as the three Rs: research, reform, and residence ("1890-1900: The Three R's"). As such, Hull House required a "thick" concept of democracy to be successful, one that far outgrew the underlying assumptions about natural rights under which the American Constitution operates. Knowledge, to Addams, was something to be acquired through empathy and lived experience rather than abstract conceptions of human nature. This "thick" democracy, acting as a way of life rather than a form of government, would adjust to the needs of the community. Therefore, much of Addams' *Newer Ideals of Peace* emphatically rejected notions of "the rights of man" in favor of the contemporary "duties of humanity" and lampooned many of America's Founding Fathers who relied so heavily on the former (27). This is quite the departure from Thomas Paine, a champion of natural rights, the title of whose masterwork as, after all, *The Rights of Man*.

However, Addams' stern focus on the present did not mean that she did not value history, nor did she ignore political anthropology as a subject. Though she never published a formal treatise on either topic, a recognizable political anthropology is present in bits and pieces throughout her many works. Without one, her argument why humans have a fundamental, social need to understand each other could hardly be sustained. It is here where a connection to Thomas Paine can be drawn. Though Paine wrote on political anthropology more extensively than Addams, he, too, did so in numerous works, and his views changed as he matured as a theorist. The Thomas Paine that wrote *Common Sense* (1776) was not the same person or theorist as the one who wrote *Rights of Man* (1791-1792) and *Agrarian Justice* (1797). Addams also refined and changed many of her political views throughout her lifetime, but her political anthropology retained its core principles and overall cohesiveness. It is the case that, as Addams was an honorary vice president of the Thomas Paine Monument Association, she almost certainly would have been intimately familiar with and fond of Paine's works. I contend that overlaps of their respective political anthropologies are likely no coincidence. Despite this evidence of overlap and association, any relationship between Addams and Paine remains entirely unexplored in scholarly literature.

In this thesis, I will argue that Thomas Paine exercised intellectual influence on Jane Addams in terms of her political anthropology, as demonstrated historically through Addams' honorary vice presidency in the TPMA. Theoretically speaking, the two thinkers share many similarities in their descriptive views of pre-civilization, their descriptive analyses of how early civilizations functioned, and their normative arguments concerning what civilization ought to look like. Once my analysis is complete, I will then offer avenues for future research further connecting Paine to Addams.

The mature (1790s and beyond) version of Thomas Paine, as in the one present in *Rights of Man* and *Agrarian Justice*, is whose political anthropology bears the most similarity to that of Jane Addams. Therefore, it presumably would have been of the most interest to her academically, meaning only primary and secondary source material written by and about this particular version of Paine should be considered. Since, as mentioned previously, Addams directly addressed her political anthropology sparsely (but consistently), it is appropriate to utilize any of her scholarly work written after she began her time at Hull House.

1. THE STATE OF NATURE

Prior to the 1960s, anthropology as a field, but particularly political anthropology, was dominated by colonialist thought. The study had always been infatuated with power and politics in “primitive” societies, an infatuation that was deeply linked with Enlightenment-era political theory. Despite the fact both Thomas Paine and Jane Addams held comparatively progressive viewpoints for their respective times, they were by no means exempt from the very colonialist variant of materialism that dominated scholarly discussion. One of the predominant interests in this early materialism, born out of Enlightenment empiricism, sought to consider how humans lived before the rise of governments. This form of human interaction formed the core of later arguments asserting both what is “natural” for humans to do and how people engage with one another without the force of government. This pre-civilized existence is called the “state of nature,” and most thinkers considered it to be an abstraction. The first articulations of the state of nature were developed thousands of years ago by the Chinese political theorists Mozi, Xunzi, and Liu Zongyuan (Ho 134), but the most famous theories originated in the French, British, and American Enlightenment, to which Thomas Paine was a vital contributor. As we will come to discover, Addams’ later empiricism² was not as far removed from the state of nature (specifically Paine’s conception of it) as one may think, and this interpretation of the state of nature was critical in her later derivation of human nature. In this chapter, I will discuss and reveal similarities between Paine and Addams’ perceptions of the state of nature, particularly in regard to how people act towards one another in a pre-governmental state.

² Pragmatist epistemology was unique, but closely related to John Stuart Mill’s empiricism.

Paine wrote extensively about the state of nature earlier in his career, most notably in *Common Sense*. In the decade-and-a-half between *Common Sense* and *Rights of Man*, Paine's interpretation of human nature, which is intrinsic to the state of nature, became much more favorable. What was once evil and conniving could suddenly be perfect if the right conditions were present. In *Common Sense*, Paine identified government as being the result of man's wickedness, and it was this wickedness that formed the basis of his later arguments in the pamphlet. Human goodness was secondary. By the time of *Rights of Man*, Paine thought differently. While government was still a *necessary* evil, it was man's corruptibility (caused by government) that was in the background of man's potential perfectibility (Foner 91). However, despite this change in Paine's perception of human nature, there is nothing that indicates the structure of the state of nature changed — only the conclusions that one could draw from it. If anything, his anthropological work in *Rights of Man* and *Agrarian Justice* was built on top of his argument in *Common Sense*, effectively both reinterpreting and reinforcing it with more detail and analysis. Therefore, it is still consistent with the scholarship of late Paine to include his writings concerning the state of nature in *Common Sense*, provided that only the structure and qualities of the state of nature are considered, and not its implications and assumptions regarding human nature. Those can be found in *Rights of Man* while still being consistent with his previous description of the state of nature.

What makes Paine's state of nature unique compared to his relative contemporaries is that his state of nature was no abstraction. To illustrate his state of nature, Paine “[supposed] a small number of persons settled in some sequestered part of the earth, unconnected with the rest...[would represent] the first peopling of any country, or the world” (Paine 7). These pre-civilized societies, Paine believed, could and do exist in contemporary times. He pointed Native

Americans out in particular (Johansen 282), but unlike other theorists of the Enlightenment, he did not view the Native Americans as intrinsically inferior beings; he did not share the white man's burden of John Locke. In later stages of his Paine's writing, he went as far as to praise their way of life in comparison to the poor of Europe, further expanding on the idea that that state of nature was not a bleak and destitute landscape filled with widespread human suffering.

In this state of nature, humankind would exist in a "state of natural liberty" (Paine 7), and each person was responsible for ensuring their own justice. This state of natural liberty included the practice of natural rights, which Paine argued were derived from creation, inherent to human existence, and practicable without a state to defend them, in contrast to civil rights, which required the force of a government to defend them. More concretely, Paine considered natural rights to be "intellectual rights, or rights of the mind, and also all those rights of acting as an individual for his own comfort and happiness, which are not injurious to the rights of others" (Lamb 59). While Paine was, at heart, an individualist, he did argue that humans living in the state of nature would seek out society, which existed before government was ever created. These rights were rooted in the fundamental and natural equality of humankind, and existed without consideration for tradition or generation, though their application in a later constitution could vary based on the particular society. Paine argued that without society, it would be difficult if not impossible to build a dwelling, procure, transport, and erect timber, battle hunger, and survive disease (Paine 7). For these reasons, society, in contrast to government, was a "blessing" that was a source of happiness and prosperity for humans (Paine 6).

However, Paine's state of nature was fraught with serious concerns. He maintained that while individuals possessed all of their natural rights in the state of nature, these rights could not always be adequately protected against violence or injustice, necessitating that "the first settlers

in any region quickly abandon the state of nature and form themselves into a society for mutual assistance and protection” (Boller 67). While this violence and injustice was perhaps not quite as extreme as the ones illustrated by Thomas Hobbes or (to a much lesser extent) John Locke, it was enough to necessitate the development of a formal government and illustrate the limits of human perfectibility. Humanity may have the possibility to become perfect, but enough will fail to achieve perfection that it requires the establishment of formal safeguards. In this sense, the foundations of society were a general dependence on others and common interests. Despite Paine’s unrelenting mistrust of government, he was no anarchist. A constitution outlining the rule of law, rather than the propagation of war or force, would be the instrument of justice in this new social state, which necessitated the creation of a government to enforce it.

Addams, on the other hand, appears to have been largely skeptical of the existence of abstract rights, and an account of the state of nature was not critical to the success of her scholarly work. As she was concerned first and foremost with the trials and tribulations of industrial society, any commentary directed towards the state of nature or abstract rights in general was limited and typically served as a critique of Enlightenment ideals³. However, Addams did clearly demarcate a line between civilized and uncivilized, noting that “civilization is the substitution of law for war” (*Newer Ideals of Peace* 219). Like Paine, Addams detested war, seeing it as a waste of youth and an avenue for motivations rooted in self-interest to dominate decision-making. She viewed civilization as a way to escape war’s horror rather than a tool to perpetuate it. A truly civilized society would be one with the ability to engage without organized violence — a fact she thought many people had forgotten (*Newer Ideals of Peace* 219-

³ John Dewey, Addams’ dear friend and ideological soulmate, did allow for the existence of “natural freedoms” prior to the growth of civilization (Boller 70). Considering the depth of the two’s relationship, it is possible Addams may have shared similar views.

220). It is reasonable to deduce that Addams developed her view of the state of nature from Paine. Paine's state of nature, being social and communal while also retaining Lockean elements, is distinct enough that its influence is detectable in Addams' thinking. An obvious distaste for violence as a barbarous quality is a feature that both thinkers share, and, considering her honorary vice presidency in the TPMA, it is unlikely that Addams developed her account in a vacuum. Paine was not a pacifist in the same manner as Addams, but he did not need to be in order to have some measure of influence on her account of the state of nature. Their account of peace being the end (or one of the ends) of civilization was the same, they would merely have disagreed on whether war was a means to the end of peace, with Paine arguing yes and Addams arguing no.

Another defining feature that Paine described within the state of nature was "the unity and equality of man" (Paine 463). According to Paine, "Man is all of one degree, and consequently...all men are born equal, and with equal natural rights, in the same manner as if posterity had been continued by creation instead of generation" (Paine 463). This argument for natural equality was nothing new. Outwardly similar arguments had been proffered by Thomas Hobbes and John Locke beforehand, but Paine's natural equality had a quality that made it distinct. Instead of relying on Hobbes' psychological egoism, or Locke's *tabula rasa*⁴, Paine predicated his natural equality on the basis that "the world is as new to a [newly born man] as it was to the first man who existed." He thereby expanded Locke's argument for sensory knowledge into a full body of lived experiences. Therefore, for Paine, "There never did, there never will, and there never can exist a [person or government which possesses] the power of

⁴ Locke argued that the human mind was a blank slate, or *tabula rasa*, upon birth, and that knowledge was gained through sensory experience.

binding or countrouling posterity to the end of time” (Paine 438). While this is, in the end, a normative argument, it is descriptive in the sense that Paine observes natural equality as existing through lived experience. In this light, Paine’s view of generations as people who have the same rights and standing as all others before them, but different laws resulting from their varying needs and experiences, bears a great deal of similarity to Jane Addams’ own understanding of what “natural” human equality entailed.

When discussing human equality, Addams was not shy in critiquing the eighteenth-century thinkers with whom Paine is often associated, often pejoratively labeling them as “reformers” (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 42). To Addams, these reformers had a fundamental inability to advance their thought beyond the state of nature. She accused them of developing an “essentially unprogressive human nature in all the empty dignity of its inborn rights” (*Newer Ideals of Peace* 32), failing to adequately apply and adapt those abstract rights to the needs of modern generations. Instead, Addams demands that mankind “throw down unnatural divisions” and incorporate moral idealism as a “force of progress” (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 42). Moreover, these demands rely on lived experience as an essential source of both information and governance, with law and policy progressing with the times as part of her “thicker” democracy — guidance firmly in line with what Paine proposed in *Rights of Man*, where he argued that it was wrong for a generation to firmly bind the future to their whims. Even closer to Paine was her argument that while humans may have different characteristics, the similarities are far more numerous, and that those similarities represent human equality (Curti 241).

In Addams’ mind, Paine may have represented an exception to the above generalization of eighteenth-century thinkers. While Paine was deeply committed to natural rights and postulated that all civil rights are derived from some natural right (Paine 464), he was also highly

critical of nations that relied on old principles, decrying states that indulged in “the vanity and presumption of governing beyond the grave” (Paine 438). Moreover, Paine’s rights were not abstract concepts — they were essential and living components of his wider political theory, living alongside generational advances (Lamb 25). Paine struggled throughout his life to reconcile his natural rights doctrine with his equally vigorous belief in lived experience as a core element of his political anthropology. The latter is reflected in the thought of Jane Addams. Addams was deeply committed to a politics born out of lived experience, and, based on her intellectual relationship with John Dewey, she may not have rejected the concept of natural freedom entirely, meaning that Paine’s mockery of generational binding could possibly have been met with amusement on the part of Addams. With similar logical commitments and lines of reasoning, it seems plausible that Paine influenced Addams in this regard.

2. REASON AND HUMAN NATURE

However, the state of nature would be of little concern if it did not have serious implications for human nature and human reason. Few thinkers ever developed a comprehensive political anthropology without accounting for their impacts on humans themselves. For some, the source was a divine gift or wisdom, while for others (especially after Charles Darwin's publication of *On the Origin of Species*), human nature was centered in natural processes like evolution. While Paine was definitely more in line with the former perspective, and Addams with the latter, this does not mean that the core aspects of their thought are mutually exclusive. As a matter of fact, Paine's approach to reasoning was a substantially similar but somewhat archaic version of materialism or standpoint epistemology. In this chapter, I will begin by establishing Thomas Paine's version of human nature, particularly in terms of virtue and human interaction, and theoretically link it to that of Jane Addams. Then, I will address how their perspectives on human nature relate to their application of reason. Finally, I will address their noticeable shared perspective on said reason, and how for both thinkers, reason and human nature acted in tandem with one another. This section is meant to provide a bedrock for the appropriation of these qualities to interpret "primitive" civilization.

Paine's vision of human nature was central to his political anthropology and formed the descriptive basis on which he later developed his normative claims. Paine thought that the core of human nature was the capacity to reason, which he evaluated as an evolution of a divine gift. From a divine perspective, reason was treated in a manner similar to rights, as well as existence itself, as having come "from the hand of his Maker" (Paine 462). Despite it being the case that Paine ruthlessly criticized religion (especially Christianity) in *The Age of Reason*, he was no

atheist. On the contrary, Paine's defense of reason would be incoherent without his deism, which was influenced by multiple Christian groups (particularly Quakers and Presbyterians), as human reason was both a gift from God demonstrated within the ability to "see something in the world" and a mechanism to "grasp the existence of God and know His character" (Lamb 197).

Importantly, Paine does not use God "to derive any specific moral duties...beyond the protection of rights and the (subjectively interpreted) obligation to serve Him" (Lamb 197). It would then follow that reason acts as God's gift, a tool to enable humans to see and interpret nature in all of its magnificence. This sense of reason as a divine tool informs Paine's argument regarding how humans utilize reason to interact with the world around them.

Earlier in his life, Paine adopted a pessimistic approach to human nature, seeing government (particularly authoritarian forms of government) as an example of its pitiful state. But by the time he wrote *Rights of Man*, Paine's depiction of human nature had warmed considerably, believing that reason could be used to achieve human perfectibility. To reason properly, as he demonstrated through his analysis of the changing "natural dispositions" of France and England towards one another (Paine 595), Paine argued "certain facts, principles, or data, [need to be reasoned] from," which then "must be established, admitted, or denied" (Paine 461). In essence, one had to experience the world and its inhabitants, as well as be properly educated in how to process one's experiences, in order to understand it accurately. The world changed over time, and to an extent, so did people, though their fundamental rights and nature did not. Since governments created through superstition or conquest rather than reason (to be discussed later) inhibit the proper application of reason, it can be concluded "that man, were he not corrupted by governments, is naturally the friend of man, and that human nature is not of itself vicious" (Paine 595). In this sense, a person, a friend by nature to other people, could also

use their reason to live their lives in the image of God — in other words, a virtuous life.

“Although Paine does not provide an exhaustive account of the virtues we would expect to ascribe to a Deity, there are some qualities that he does emphasize,” including but not limited to “truthfulness, honesty, mercifulness, justice, and generosity” (Lamb 184-185).

Most important among these was civic virtue, which referred to active participation in government and public life. Though Paine treated civic virtue as a right rather than a duty, it essentially functioned as a duty, and any person who desired to live in the image of God had an obligation to perform in civic life. This was a common belief at the time, but was most often attributed to the aristocracy or the clergy. Paine, however, known to view both groups with disdain, applied this principle altogether more democratically via his *res publica* (Belchem), which will be elaborated on later. Thus, Paine does not only consider both genuine human compassion and relationships formed for motivations other than self-interest to be possible, he considers them to be natural. Paine did not believe that humans were perfect by design, or even were likely to ever achieve perfection, but he did take an extremely objective view of human perfectibility as a possibility (Foner 91). People could achieve perfectibility if they followed their reason to the letter, and engaged with their fellow citizens in civic life, rather than through self-interest or the dictations of their passions. This was not necessarily a *telos*⁵ for human existence, as Paine was primarily concerned with duty in the context of rights, but it could certainly be considered a goal or an ideal for humanity.

Even though Jane Addams was neither personally religious (despite her upbringing by a Quaker-raised father) nor interested in a large treatise on divine reason (Curti 243), she deduced through her experiences that religion should not be rejected, as it frequently served as an

⁵ A *telos* refers to an ultimate objective or purpose.

important public good, a fascination she referred to as “cosmic patriotism” (*Newer Ideals of Peace* 237). Among other things, “cosmic patriotism” could be a source of human righteousness and serve as a tool for establishing a moral order. However one defined this cosmic force, Addams believed “it may yet be strong enough to move masses of men out of their narrow national considerations and cautions into new reaches of human effort and affection” (*Newer Ideals of Peace* 237). She thus highlights a function of reason even if reason alone did not serve as a guide for humanity. Reason was but one tool for humanity and was useless when all human emotions and passions were denied in order to worship at its altar. Moreover, contrary to many of her allies and contemporaries, Addams was not at all hostile to Christianity, especially when it was applied to service towards others and good moral behavior. Addams found, true to her Quaker background, that a particular source of positive cosmic patriotism was the Bible, noting that no reason to pursue peace among men was “so modern, so fundamental and so trenchant, as the address which was read from the prophet Isaiah” (*Newer Ideals of Peace* 237).

From this righteousness, Addams derives her perspective on human nature. She used the term often in her writing, but, as was common in her time, she never gives an explicit definition of it. That being said, her meaning becomes clear through her works. Addams was extremely fond of Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species*, and her conception of human nature heavily incorporates the theory of evolution. For example, Addams recognized the “nature and role of sex in the life of the individual, but she also saw its relation to civilization. In her view of human nature, play and recreation are basic needs which brook denial only at heavy cost. Fighting is of course a part of human nature, but so is cooperation” (Curti 241). Furthermore, she pinpointed that “in the process of evolution, of survival through adaptation, he came to have impulses that

set him apart from other animals in somewhat the way that the human hand enabled him to claw his way to a civilization denied his less well equipped fellow creatures” (Curti 245).

While Addams’ account of human nature is by no means identical to Paine’s, his influence is still detectable throughout her works, and clearly contributed to how she viewed human nature as a whole. For instance, she placed particular emphasis on children and how they develop into the world around them. She described their “presumably innate tendency of children to seek in ceremonial expression a sense of identification with man's primitive life and kinship with the past,” at least until they grew old enough to understand their place in their own world (Curti 242). Perhaps this sense of identification was a form of lost history, or it may have even held a biological component, but Addams considered it to be a defining component of childhood, particularly early childhood. This loneliness could also be rectified with love and compassion from others (not simply their parents) around them — which can be argued is in line with Paine’s fundamental assertion that man is a friend of man.

Paine’s influence becomes even more overt when Addams ponders “man's primordial concern for group feeding of the young and the sense of responsibility for helping those in need...[which] might check and control the more recently acquired habit of mass killing of one's own kind” (Curti 246). Peace, then, was an achievable end, since human nature already called for it. While Paine was not a pacifist in the manner of Addams (his enthusiastic support for the American Revolution making that a mere statement of fact), that does not preclude his vision of a generally peaceful human nature from having influenced her. Paine loved and desired peace, and he was no warmonger. He simply thought war was an occasional necessity to a greater extent than Addams. Moreover, it is clear that Addams viewed society as a blessing much in the same manner that Paine did, one with enormous benefits to humankind. As Paine was one of the

first to universalize human goodness, peace, and equality within the state of nature as well as in a more cosmopolitan state, whether Addams directly drew this analysis from Paine is irrelevant. It would have come from him in some form or fashion either way.

Although Addams was not as devoted to reason as Paine, its influence on their respective perspectives on human identity is evident. While both thinkers clearly rejected Christianity on a personal level, they apply their Quaker tendencies similarly. It is possible that Addams might have developed her application of Christianity to political anthropology in complete independence from Paine, but, at minimum, she would have found in him a kindred spirit. Whether God was real (Paine) or an abstract concept with a firm basis in reality (Addams), their common argument held that people view (whether or not they are correct being largely irrelevant) reason as a gift or creation of God, and a relatively positive perception of human nature develops accordingly. When combined with their similar visions of the state of nature and natural equality, the relationship is evident. At this level, human emotion, passion, and sympathy are not the enemies of reason, but legitimate partners.

3. THE RISE OF CIVILIZATION

Thus far, it has been established that the political anthropologies of Thomas Paine and Jane Addams intersect when it comes to the state of nature and human nature. This similarity was born out of how they applied religious commitments in the pre-civilized state. It is certainly possible that this likeness is coincidental. But no legitimate political anthropology can tie itself to the state of nature for all posterity, and Paine (in *Rights of Man*) and Addams (In *Newer Ideals of Peace*) were each critical of those thinkers who struggled to remove themselves from the past, whether this be in the form of a formal state of nature or an overreliance on culture and tradition. Subsequently, Paine and Addams both developed objective accounts of how humans transitioned from an uncivilized to civilized state (though Paine's account was far more overt and elaborate than that of Addams), specifically relying on a material understanding of history for their analyses. In this chapter, I will explain Paine's material understanding of history, and describe the foundation of governments on superstition, conquest, and reason (particularly the former two). Then, I will delve into Addams' account of the historical method, its inquiry into the relationship between property and feudalism, and how her account correlates with Paine's. Finally, I will attempt to outline an approach that Paine and Addams jointly utilized to interpret the historical development of civilization. This context of the transition between uncivilized and civilized is essential to understand the normative argument Paine and Addams make regarding civilization later.

Since the crux of my argument in this chapter will center around concepts extremely similar to historical materialism, it is important to outline what this method of analysis entails. At its core, historical materialism "analyses the hidden mainsprings that underpin the development

of human society from the earliest tribal societies up to the modern day,” and argues that “those who deny the existence of any laws governing human social development invariably approach history from a subjective and moralistic standpoint” (Woods). Prior to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who, in the mid nineteenth century, created and popularized historical materialism and attempted to incorporate the scientific method into political theory, many theorists viewed history to be “a series of accidents” without any form of general explanation (Woods). However, despite dying a decade before Karl Marx was born, Thomas Paine’s account of political anthropology incorporated a vast number of the hallmarks of historical materialism, to the point where I will henceforth refer to it as a material understanding of history. I do not attempt to argue that Paine anticipated Marx and Engels, nor do I attempt to argue that Marx and Engels were influenced by Paine. Addams, on the other hand, was deeply familiar with Marx (Graham), and incorporated much of his terminology into her own political anthropology. Still, other aspects of her account are much closer to Paine than they are to Marx, and she also incorporated the “historical method” seen in anthropological studies of her time.⁶

Paine’s account of how civilizations were formed was methodological and to a certain extent chronological. He argued that “[civilizations] may be all comprehended under three heads. First, Superstition. Secondly, Power, Thirdly, the common interest of society, and the common rights of man” (Paine 466). The first two descriptions, which will be elaborated shortly, were mostly descriptive in nature, while the latter, which for the sake of clarity will be referred to as “reason,” was primarily normative, and thus will be discussed later. In many areas of Paine’s writing, it is difficult to distinguish his descriptive arguments from his normative ones. Even

⁶ The historical method, similar but separate to historical materialism, was an anthropological mechanism used to outline the development of “lower civilizations” to “higher civilizations.” It was typically used to justify racism and colonialism. While Addams’ account did include racist assumptions, her argument in sum was egalitarian.

when he merely stated facts, he did so with such ferocity and passion that the descriptions almost became normative. This is especially the case when he discusses government by conquest. In addition, for the purposes of this chapter, it is important to note that Paine did consider the young United States and, at the time, the infant French Republic to be governments that arose through reason, so there was a small descriptive element to that argument.

The first form of government in Thomas Paine's material interpretation of history was centered on priests and religion. In Paine's mind, during this phase of history, "a set of artful men pretended, through the medium of oracles, to hold intercourse with the Deity, as familiarly as they now march up the back-stairs in European courts, the world was completely under the government of superstition" (Paine 466). Paine was intensely disdainful of this use of religion, seeing it corrupting God in order to further human self-interest. He mocked its practitioners by noting that "the oracles were consulted, and whatever they were made to say [by power-hungry men], became the law; and this sort of government lasted as long as the superstition lasted" (Paine 466). Needless to say, Paine held these governments founded upon priestcraft in the utmost contempt, and this aspect of his political anthropology contributed to his hatred of organized clergy, which he detailed extensively in *The Age of Reason*.

The second form of government in Paine's proto-historical materialism were those created by conquest, and it is here where Paine focuses a substantial portion of his analysis. The example Paine repeatedly refers to when discussing government by conquest is William I "The Conqueror," Duke of Normandy and King of England, "whose government...was founded in power, and the sword assumed the name of the scepter" (Paine 466). To Paine, these forms of government could only last as long as the power behind them lingered, but he cautioned that the monarchs and aristocrats who controlled these systems would do anything in their ability to

prevent their usurpation. These conquerors, in Paine's mind, "held [the] power of war and peace in [themselves], and [their] descendants have ever since claimed it under [them]," often using God or an obscure charter in an attempt to legitimize their rule (Paine 466-474). As an example, Paine argued that it was "easy to conceive that a band of interested men, such as Placemen, Pensioners, Lords of the bed-chamber, Lords of the kitchen, Lords of the necessaryhouse, and the Lord knows what besides," under the guidance or jurisdiction of the conquerors, "can find as many reasons for monarchy as their salaries, paid at the expense of the country, amount to" (Paine 520). Since these forms of government intrinsically did not protect the natural and civil rights of its citizens, the people had a right to rise up in revolt against them in order to establish governments by reason, which will be explained in the final chapter.

It is evident that the systems Paine both describes and criticizes are priestcraft (church government) and what would come to be known as feudalism. It is important to note that "feudalism" was not a term used in Paine's time, being an invention of nineteenth century German historians, though it is clear he is primarily referring to the "kingdoms and communities" of medieval Europe. Modern scholarship largely rejects the use of the term, as it is essentially inaccurate, and not how medieval Europe, Japan, etc. referred to themselves.⁷ The reason I will be using the term "feudalism" in this thesis is because Jane Addams used the term frequently throughout her writing, and it is prominent within her political anthropology.

With that in mind, feudalism was of particular concern to Paine, as he considered the British government of his time, the one he spent so much of his life fighting against, to be the same feudal system that William the Conqueror instituted when he secured the English crown after the Battle of Hastings in 1066. All that had changed was that figures like Edmund Burke

⁷ See. Brown for more information.

had, through unwritten “constitutions” and the formal incorporation of tradition into politics, created a veneer of freedom that merely put a veil over the same system with the same power dynamics there always were. Therefore, while, as mentioned previously, Paine believed that the United States and revolutionary France had established governments predicated on reason, the feudal system was very much alive in both Britain and continental Europe, having expanded itself to incorporate greater economic and colonial breadth, often using “tradition” as its basis (Paine 520-521).

Addams approached her historical method from a similar position as Paine. It began with tribal forms of civilization, before progressing to feudalism, then a modified feudalism influenced by capitalism and the Enlightenment, before arriving at her normative argument for social democracy. The first or “lowest” form of civilization she identified was tribal in nature, based on Old World customs and traditions. While Addams’ theory, as mentioned previously, emphasized universal equality, her analyses of other cultures, especially at this level in her political anthropology, were racist. “Structuring the historical method was the assumption that civilization’s evolution was the story of cultural development from savage to primitive to civilized. This assumption is embedded in the language Addams uses to describe immigrants’ cultures of origins. Despite the obvious respect Addams had for her neighbors’ cultures, she still placed them early on the evolutionary scale” (*Cultural Pluralism* 20). This evolutionary scale highlights both the structure and fluidity of Addams’ political anthropology, as she correlated the complexity of culture with the complexity of social and political organization. She argued that while humans at this early stage of social evolution were *capable* of self-government, they frequently did not practice it, often referring to immigrants as “simple people” that were “still in the tribal stage of knowledge” (*A Function of the Social Settlement* 47). This understanding was

foundational to her arguments regarding sympathetic knowledge, which would in turn influence social, cultural, and political development. However, for Addams, these tribal hierarchical structures would become increasingly powerful over time, and eventually develop into so-called “feudal” societies.

Like Paine, Addams devoted much of her intellectual attention to the “feudal” component of her political anthropology, though she did not do so in a formal, scholarly work. Instead, she constructed this element of her political anthropology through a series of speeches and short essays, primarily directed at women’s clubs and other working-class groups. For Addams, feudalism was not some construction of a perceived virtue in servitude, but, much like Paine’s government by conquest, a very specific method of social organization based on hierarchy and reciprocal obligations (*Evolutionary Theorizing* 72). The feudal household, which, to Addams, was also representative of the system’s governance, “was essentially a small village...it contained many servants and artisans in addition to the resident aristocrat’s immediate family. Social status was assigned at birth” (*Evolutionary Theorizing* 72). This hierarchy would proceed up the chain until arriving at the king himself, a model she believed had been applied consistently for thousands of years, especially in Europe. Addams believed that this system provoked a “deep mistrust” and generally amounted to “centuries of slavery” (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 46).

While systems could vary, with lords and kings wielding varying degrees of authority, the theme of a few elites wielding broad amounts of power remained the same. Similarly to Paine, Addams thought that this system was unjust, and acted as a barrier for people understanding one another. Unlike Paine, Addams did believe that feudal systems could contribute to some moral good, even if the amount of good paled in comparison to that of the social settlement (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 29). This is because those domestic workers not

bound to a particular industrialist, much as some peasants were not bound to a particular feudal lord, “[had] complete control of [their] own time” (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 29).

Where Paine’s influence, whether direct or indirect, comes in is when discussing his own era. Addams evaluated Enlightenment-era governments, and later capitalist systems, much in the same manner that Paine evaluated his own time (though she was far less forgiving, particularly of the United States). To Addams, the mercantilist and capitalist governments were still feudal, albeit expanded in order to encompass widespread private property ownership and greater political rights. Despite these changes, the hierarchical but ideally reciprocal relationships remained the same. That being said, Addams noted that the relationship between mistresses and servants, as well as capitalists and workers, were particularly feudal, and could serve as instruments of oppression when virtue was not expressed properly (*Hull House* 185-187). To Addams, the remedy, in her political anthropology, was a social democracy, which will be elaborated on shortly. For the purposes of this chapter, note that Addams considered Hull House to be a template for the wider social democracy she desired to construct, with the understanding that, as a pragmatist, Addams would have approved of any substantial reform.

In sum, while Paine’s material analysis of history and Addams’ application of the historical method are not the same (Paine did not think that governments by conquest were any more advanced than governments by superstition), they are similar enough to one another to delineate a joint approach when assessing the rise and development of civilizations. While Addams was more judgmental of early civilizations than Paine, referring often to their primitive habits and cultures, both thinkers drew a clear path from tribal civilizations to so-called feudal civilizations before arriving at their respective normative arguments. What makes the two thinkers unique, and arguably more similar to one another than anyone else, is that both

identified most governments of the Enlightenment (and in Addams' case capitalism) as an extension or development of feudalism rather than a separate method of social organization. This joint argument implied that the "modern" world was not as advanced, sophisticated, and virtuous as many thinkers of the era would have liked to believe. From this Paine-Addams perspective, the world still had a lot of work to do in order to ensure that people were the best possible versions of themselves, and civilization was still failing to achieve its essential obligations. The proper remedy then would come in the form of normative arguments.

4. NORMATIVE CIVILIZATION

It is in their normative arguments where Paine and Addams are perhaps the most closely aligned, even if their desired structures of government appear very different from one another on the surface. This is because, at their core, both of their ideal political systems had both extremely similar ends and a shared barometer for how the success of a civilization ought to be measured. Furthermore, both thinkers considered “benefit” in an unorthodox manner, viewing it from a universal perspective rather than one founded on elitism or simple majoritarianism. For a society to be just, it had to improve the moral and material condition of all of its members, as opposed to merely benefiting a majority or simply those who held political power. These unorthodox considerations were the backbone for normative arguments that differed substantially in structure but were united in the underlying understanding noted above. In this chapter, I will begin by contextualizing and then explaining what is known as Thomas Paine’s First Principle of Civilization, which served as his doctrine of universal improvement under a government. Then, I will describe Thomas Paine’s *res publica* (or representative republic), which he believed would satisfy the conditions laid out by the First Principle of Civilization. Then, I will sketch Jane Addams’ own principle when evaluating the justness of a civilization, and note its similarity to the First Principle of Civilization. Finally, I will detail Addams’ ideal “thick” democracy, which differed greatly from Paine’s *res publica* in structure, but shared with it numerous assumptions as well as a common purpose.

One component of Thomas Paine’s argument for the rise of civilization was that once a society removed itself from the state of nature, it could not return to it (Paine 398). But this posed a potential problem for the members of the society in question. If a particular individual

had been living well in the state of nature, and consented to the creation of a government as to provide “mutual assistance and protection” (Boller 67), the expectation was that their material condition would improve. For Paine, “to preserve the benefits of what is called civilized life...ought to be considered one of the first objects of reformed legislation” (Paine 397). As Paine emphasized repeatedly in *Agrarian Justice*, this did not occur some if not most of the time. After all, in Paine’s mind, “the condition of millions...is far worse than if they had been born before civilization began” (Paine 398). “Poverty,” Paine noted, “is a thing created by that which is called civilized life,” and “the life of an Indian⁸ is a continual holiday...compared with the poor of Europe” (Paine 397). The rich, however, obviously saw their material and social standing improve to a disproportionate extent. They were not among the millions who suffered due to the abandonment of the state of nature. Paine’s First Principle of Civilization, then, was envisioned as a simple measure to determine if a government was acting justly, or at the very least a goal for governments to consider when crafting policy.

Paine determined that “the first principle of civilization ought to have been, and ought still to be, that the condition of every person born into the world, after a state of civilization commences, ought not to be worse than if he had been born before that period” (Paine 398). Despite the fact that this argument was meant as contextualization for the wealth redistribution policies Paine would propose later in *Agrarian Justice*, it had enormous implications for his entire political anthropology — especially given the fact that Paine had not wavered from the political theory he had expressed a half decade earlier in *Rights of Man*. It meant that, as a normative prescription, governments had a moral obligation to improve the conditions in which

⁸ As mentioned in Chapter 1, Paine considered indigenous Americans to be living in the state of nature, though he did not mean this as a slight or an argument for inferiority. There is some evidence that he was fond of the Iroquois Confederacy. See *The Indigenous Influence Theory of American Democracy* by Jerry D. Stubben for more information.

their citizens lived. It was not sufficient for a government to ensure that some or most of their constituents saw improvements over the state of nature. Instead, all citizens had to see a marked improvement in order for the government in question to be considered just. Paine believed that this level of justice could only be achieved by a government founded upon reason, which he typically referred to as a *res publica*.

The *res publica*, translated as the “public thing,” constituted the origin of the term “republic,” but Paine saw fit to distinguish his *res publica* from so-called republics like Poland, the Netherlands, and presumably Rome, all of which lacked the genuinely representative components that Paine desired (Paine 565). He considered *res publica* to be “a word of [good origin], referring to what ought to be the character and business of government” (Paine 565). Paine did not claim that the *res publica*, or “republic” as he would use thereafter, necessarily had to be tied to any particular structure of government, but that “it most naturally [associated] with the representative form” (Paine 565-566). In Paine’s eyes, the people, those who would be liable for the expenses of government, should be the ones to control its actions and proceedings. The proper business of government, as mentioned previously in this thesis, was to defend the natural and civic rights of the people, accede to the First Principle of Civilization, and maintain free and open commerce. This put Paine at direct odds with monarchical and aristocratic forms of government, both of which were subject to heavy criticism in *Rights of Man*. But Paine also cautioned (in contradistinction to Addams) against direct democracy, fearing that a nation, either or both in geography and population, could become too large to sustain it. In the end, it is clear that the form of government Paine preferred was a representative republic, which he thought was best exemplified by the young United States — in whose founding he had been an extremely active participant.

Paine certainly had his qualms with the American Constitution. He was skeptical of the need for the Senate (Paine 586), and he wrote an entire essay arguing that veto power should not exist. It is fair to conclude, however, that it came the closest to his ideal constitution. His concern was in the enacting of laws, which he concluded was the role of the legislature, and the execution of laws, which, in the United States, existed within the purview of both the president and the judiciary (Paine 583-584). As the government ought to be concerned with protecting rights, Paine was also an enthusiastic advocate for the Bill of Rights (Conneen and Larsen), which he saw as necessary to prevent government from acquiring too much power. Finally, and perhaps most importantly for his political anthropology (and what, as we will discover, ties him to Addams), is his union between written constitutions and the importance of lived experience. A constitution, to Paine, should not bind generations to it forever. The world, as well as the people who live in it, change over time, and Paine thought constitutions should reflect that understanding. “Assemblies,” Paine determined, “legislate according to the principles and forms prescribed in [their] constitution; and if experience should hereafter shew that alterations, amendments, or additions are necessary, the constitution will point out the mode by which such things shall be done, and not leave it to the discretionary power of the future government” (Paine 469).

As mentioned previously in this thesis, Addams’ disinterest in abstractions meant that, unlike Paine, she never elucidated a concept as clear and unique as the First Principle of Civilization. However, it is evident in her works that, likely due to her familiarity with Paine, she believed in a civilizational obligation akin to the First Principle of Civilization. Addams’ view of a civilization, in a nutshell, is encapsulated by a remark she made during a 1933 speech in Honolulu, Hawaii that claimed that “civilization is a method of living, an attitude of equal

respect for all men” (Waller). This method of living and equal attitude of respect, however, would not be possible (at least from a normative perspective) without civilizations improving people’s lives compared to what came before, as “the highest moralists have taught that without the advance and improvement of the whole, no man can hope for any lasting improvement in his own moral or material individual condition” (*Hull House* 127). But, the concept of “improvement” could not, for Addams, be based on an abstraction. If one were to evaluate a civilization based on an abstraction, one would be allowing themselves to “be content with a shadowy intellectual or aesthetic reflection of [the world]” (*Hull House* 64). Addams determined that social or “thick” democracy could serve to improve the moral and material condition of every member of a given society.

As was mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, Addams was far more skeptical of the representative republic than Paine. While Paine had the utmost faith that human reason would serve to maintain a representative republic, including that of the United States, and permit it to change as needed, Addams found it “difficult to hold [America’s] political democracy and to make it in any sense a social expression and not a mere governmental contrivance, unless we take pains to keep on common ground in our human experiences” (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 51). The American republic, Addams thought, had not sufficiently accounted for residual feudalism, as well as its transformation into capitalism.

Before delving further into Addams’ social democracy, it is important to note that, as a pragmatist, Addams preferred to eschew making the perfect the enemy of the good. She often noted that that quality was a common trait of the abstract theorists she so derided. She was a reformer, not a revolutionary or utopian in the manner of Paine. If a policy or program would push Addams towards her goals within the current system, she would be inclined to support it.

For example, Addams had a long and complicated relationship with U.S. president Theodore Roosevelt. While they had numerous differences and sometimes fiery disagreements concerning policy and philosophy, she was still a passionate supporter of Roosevelt's 1912 presidential campaign (Hest). Addams would continue to defend her support of Roosevelt long after the latter's defeat, even after their 1915 sparring match concerning America's involvement in World War I.

In essence, Addams viewed democracy as far more than an institutional arrangement. Democracy was not a set system that either existed or did not exist. Instead, democracy was, for Addams, a way of life rooted in "diversified human experience and resultant sympathy" (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 7), qualities that could be measured scientifically, and the source for the expression of social ethics⁹. Thus, the heart of democracy was, in Addams' mind, the "conviction that we are under a moral obligation in choosing our experiences, since the result of those experiences must ultimately determine our understanding of life" (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 7-8). The most important habits that would make a democracy successful were communication and mutual understanding, as they would appropriately and universally guide people towards civic virtue. As such, democracy was not only present in political situations. Since Addams argued that the core of democracy was the sympathy derived from common experiences, democracy then served as a component of nearly all interpersonal relationships, from the dynamics between factory owners and their workers to the relationship between parents and their adult daughters. The ills of society could often be traced to a lack of democracy, and the appropriate remedy was more democracy (*Democracy and Social Ethics* 8), which Addams pushed for relentlessly.

⁹ This is also called "sympathetic knowledge," a term Addams used frequently. For more information, see either of the Fischer entries in the bibliography.

Furthermore, as democracy prospered or suffered, so too would the fortunes of all people — whether it be materially or morally. The main principle of Addams' normative argument, then, was that a given society should try to maximize the amount of democracy within it in order to improve the moral and material conditions of all. The interrelated themes within this notion of democracy make it extremely difficult to label or compartmentalize, and this was no coincidence (Shields 21). In a similar vein to Paine's *res publica*, Addams' democracy could come in many forms and was not singularly associated with a set institutional structure, provided that whatever was chosen was not oppressive and represented people's experiences properly. Set structures resulted in "old-fashioned ways...no longer [applying] to changed conditions" (*Ballot for Woman Made Necessary*). Most important was that everyone who would be directly impacted by political decisions have a seat at the table, since it was a tall task to improve an individual's life if governed by those who did not know or understand them.

It is this commitment to the everyday experiences of regular people that unite the normative arguments of Paine and Addams. The First Principle of Civilization was not merely some abstraction — it stood as both a moral obligation and a barometer used to evaluate a civilization's success. While Paine was the one who sketched it, Addams held such a uniquely identical commitment that it is unlikely that its source was anyone but Paine. For both theorists, civilizations did not exist to satisfy the whims and desires of the elites, nor could its obligations be satisfied by improvements to a mere majority. They thought that civilization, the replacement of war with law, would fail if every person was not better off than they were in the state of nature. Paine and Addams differed in their interpretations of what a satisfactory civilization would look like, as Paine had a greater faith in rights and constitutions than Addams, yet they both desired civilizations firmly based on the lived experiences of a society's members. Without

this influence of lived experience, society would be bound to ancient abstractions or institutions that become outdated and oppressive (if they were not oppressive to begin with). This union of purpose indicates that, more than anything, Paine and Addams' political anthropologies were similar to one another, and distinct from other thinkers of their respective eras.

CONCLUSION

It is evident, in the end, that Paine and Addams utilized thoroughly similar approaches to political anthropology. In their respective inquiries as to how humans lived before the rise of civilization, their overall analysis was similar, with the state of nature being an equal and social place prone to outbreaks of violence, necessitating the formation of a government as a method of ensuring both peace and justice. The state of nature was, at least in-part, determined by the generally good nature of humankind, as well as the human tendency to apply reason (or “cosmic patriotism,” as Addams sometimes called it) to seek out social situations, value interpersonal engagement, and request assistance with daily tasks and challenges.

With the formation of governments, Paine and Addams then began to analyze the rise of civilizations. While Paine’s analysis is referred to in this thesis as a material understanding of history, and Addams’ analysis is referred to as a variant of the historical method, these two approaches were functionally almost identical. Their chronologies of history both began with tribal or religious societies before evolving into the durable, “feudal” societies that they each considered themselves to be living in (though Paine did argue that the infant United States had progressed past a feudal system).

To conclude their account of the rise of civilization, Paine and Addams zeroed in on their normative arguments. Their normative arguments differed substantially. Paine had great faith in his *res publica*, and was confident that institutional structures designed under that framework could change as needed. Addams, on the other hand, was skeptical of all abstractions, whether those be rights or documents based on those rights, and argued that only more democracy could remedy the ills of civilization. However, both Addams and Paine uniquely built their normative

arguments on a shared understanding that civilization ought to improve the lives of every single one of its members when compared to the state of nature, through what Paine called the First Principle of Civilization. Furthermore, both thinkers were concerned with generational change, and maintained that civilization should reflect the world as it is, rather than embrace the ideas of the past without change or question.

With the above revelations in mind, it becomes clear that Thomas Paine's influence in the nineteenth century was not as muted as originally thought. Based on Jane Addams' honorary vice presidency in the TPMA, as well as clear signs of Paine's influence in her political anthropology, it is evident that she was at least in some way affected by him. That being said, I make no claim that this thesis is an exhaustive account of Thomas Paine's influence on Jane Addams. Furthermore, it is entirely possible that Paine's influence on Addams, at least to some extent, existed through an intermediary theorist. These intermediary theorists could serve as excellent avenues for further exploration. I will briefly sketch three of these possibilities, without excluding others.

The first is Mary Wollstonecraft, who was the author of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* and one of the most important and influential early feminist writers. While serving as an editor for the *Analytical Review*, Wollstonecraft became involved in the same social circle as Thomas Paine (Brander), and his "Rights of Man" terminology became prominent within her own writing. It would be highly surprising if Addams, a prominent feminist, champion of the suffrage movement, and exceptionally well-read scholar, did not come into contact with Wollstonecraft's writing at some point in time.

The second is Abraham Lincoln. As was mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, a young Abraham Lincoln was a closeted but avid follower of Thomas Paine (Brookheiser).

Paine's deism and account of politics would remain with Lincoln throughout the rest of the latter's life, and serve as a backdrop for Lincoln's later unionism. Addams, in turn, was influenced by Lincoln, in terms of both childish heroism and later scholarly thought. She credited Lincoln with illuminating the idea that "democratic government, associated as it is with all the mistakes and shortcomings of the common people, still remains the most valuable contribution America has made to the moral life of the world" (*Hull House* 42). Thus, Paine's potential influence here could be explored as well.

The third is Clarence Darrow, a prominent Chicago attorney and political contributor who lectured at Hull House on multiple occasions. Darrow, like Addams, was a member of the TPMA (Marotta 187-188), and the two had a close relationship that spanned many decades. In one letter written in 1932, Addams addresses him as "my dear Mr. Darrow" (*Letter to Clarence Darrow*). Considering the nature of their friendship, as well as their mutual involvement in the TPMA, it is theoretically possible that Darrow could have introduced Addams (or vice versa) to Paine in some meaningful way.

The true magnitude of Thomas Paine's legacy is still being evaluated, but, based on the historical record as well as a theoretical analysis, it is clear that Jane Addams' political anthropology furthered Paine's legacy.

REFERENCES

- “1880-1900: The Three R's.” *Global Institute of Social Work*, 2020, www.thegisw.org/copy-of-the-miseries.
- Addams, Jane. “A Function of the Social Settlement (1899).” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 13, May 1899, pp. 33–55. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1009169.
- Addams, Jane. *Newer Ideals of Peace*. Edited by Richard T Ely, The Macmillan Company, 1907.
- Addams, Jane. *Democracy and Social Ethics*. The Macmillan Company, 1907. *Project Gutenberg*, <https://iuristebi.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/democracy-and-social-ethics.pdf>.
- Belchem, John. “History - British History in Depth: Thomas Paine: Citizen of the World.” *BBC*, BBC, 17 Feb. 2011, www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/empire_seapower/paine_01.shtml.
- Bernstein, Richard B. “Rediscovering Thomas Paine.” *New York Law School Law Review*, vol. 39, 1994, pp. 873–929., digitalcommons.nyls.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1493&context=fac_articles_chapter.
- Boller, Paul F. “Thomas Paine and Natural Rights: A Reconsideration.” *Social Science*, vol. 52, no. 2, 1977, pp. 67–72. *Thomas Paine Friends, Inc.*, www.thomas-paine-friends.org/boller-paul_thomas-paine-and-natural-rights-a-reconsideration-1977-spring.pdf.
- Brander, Elisabeth. “Mary Wollstonecraft's ‘A Vindication of the Rights of Woman.’” *Becker Medical Library*, Washington University School of Medicine, 14 Mar. 2019, becker.wustl.edu/news/mary-wollstonecrafts-a-vindication-of-the-rights-of-woman/.
- Brookhiser, Richard. “What Lincoln Learned from the Founders – And What Leaders Today Can Learn from Them, a Historian's View.” *The Catalyst*, George W. Bush Institute, 2016, www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/leadership/what-lincoln-learned-from-the-founders-and-what-leaders-today-can-learn-from-them.html.

- Brown, E.A.R. "The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe." *The American Historical Review*, vol. 79, no. 4, Oct. 1974, pp. 1063–1088. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.com/stable/1869563.
- Conneen, Andrew, and Dan Larsen. "Civil Liberties and Civil Rights: No Paine, No Gain." *POLITICO*, 11 May 2012, www.politico.com/blogs/politico-prep/2012/05/civil-liberties-and-civil-rights-no-paine-no-gain-123230.
- Conway, Moncure. "The Adventures of Thomas Paine's Bones." *Thomas Paine National Historical Association Collection*, Thomas Paine National Historical Association, 2020, thomaspaine.org/aboutpaine/the-adventures-of-thomas-paine-s-bones-by-moncure-conway.html.
- Curti, Merle. "Jane Addams on Human Nature." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 22, no. 2, 1961, pp. 240–253. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2707835.
- Fischer, Marilyn. "Addams on Cultural Pluralism, European Immigrants, and African Americans." *Philosophy Faculty Publications*, 2014, pp. 1–32. *University of Dayton ECommons*, ecommons.udayton.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1120&context=phl_fac_pub.
- Fischer, Marilyn. *Jane Addams's Evolutionary Theorizing: Constructing "Democracy and Social Ethics"*. The University of Chicago Press, 2019.
- Foner, Eric. *Tom Paine and Revolutionary America*. Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Graham, Ruth. "The Nancy Grace of Her Time?" *Slate Magazine*, Slate, 9 Nov. 2010, slate.com/human-interest/2010/11/jane-addams-was-controversial-and-independent-minded.html.
- Grimm, Kevin. "Thomas Paine." *Digital Encyclopedia*, George Washington's Mount Vernon, www.mountvernon.org/library/digitalhistory/digital-encyclopedia/article/thomas-paine/.
- Hest, John. "Jane Addams." *Theodore Roosevelt Center*, Dickinson State University, [www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Learn-About-TR/TR-Encyclopedia/Family and Friends/Jane Addams](http://www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Learn-About-TR/TR-Encyclopedia/Family%20and%20Friends/Jane%20Addams).
- "History of the Thomas Paine Cottage Museum." *Thomas Paine Cottage Museum*, Huguenot and New Rochelle Historical Association, 2020, www.thomaspainecottage.org/history.html.

- Ho, Norman. "State of Nature Theory in Traditional Chinese Political and Legal Thought." *Northwestern Interdisciplinary Law Review*, VIII, no. 1, 1 Nov. 2015, pp. 131–152. SSRN, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2695854.
- Johnsen, Bruce. "Native American Societies and the Evolution of Democracy in America." *Ethnohistory*, vol. 37, no. 3, 1990, pp. 279–290. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/482447.
- Kiley, Michael M. "Thomas Paine: American Founder and Political Scientist." *Biography*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1985, pp. 51–67. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23539022.
- Lamb, Robert. *Thomas Paine and the Idea of Human Rights*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Marker, Jonathan. "Thomas Paine's Attitudes Toward Religion Impacted His Legacy, Author Says." *National Archives News*, National Archives and Records Administration, 18 Oct. 2019, www.archives.gov/news/articles/thomas-paine-attitudes-biography.
- Marotta, Theodore. "'A Monument in Every City?': Thomas Paine in Memoriam." *The Legacy of Thomas Paine in the Transatlantic World*, edited by Marcus Morris and Sam Edwards, Taylor and Francis, 2017, pp. 187–206.
- Merriam, C. E. "Thomas Paine's Political Theories." *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1899, pp. 389–403. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2139704.
- O'Neill, Brendan. "The Common Sense of Thomas Paine." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 17 Nov. 2010, www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/nov/16/history-us-politics.
- Paine, Thomas, and Eric Foner. *Collected Writings: Common Sense, The Crisis, and Other Pamphlets, Articles, and Letters, Rights of Man, The Age of Reason*. Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1995.
- Philp, Mark, "Thomas Paine", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/paine/>
- Shields, Patricia M. "Jane Addams' Theory of Democracy and Social Ethics: Incorporating a Feminist Perspective." *Women in Public Administration: Theory and Practice*, edited by Maria J D'Agostino and Helisse Levine, Jones & Bartlett Learning LLC, 2011, pp. 15–34.

Stubben, Jerry D. “The Indigenous Influence Theory of American Democracy.” *Social Science Quarterly*, vol. 81, no. 3, Sept. 2000, pp. 716–731. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/42863999.

Waller, Mary. “Addams' Living Legacy in Color.” *Jane Addams Papers Project*, 15 June 2018, janeaddams.ramapo.edu/2018/06/addams-living-legacy-in-color/.

Weisser, Henry. “Chartism in 1848: Reflections on a Non-Revolution.” *Albion*, vol. 13, no. 1, 1981, pp. 12–26. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4049111.

Widerquist, Karl, and Grant S. McCall. *Prehistoric Myths in Modern Political Philosophy*. Edinburgh University Press, 2018

Woods, Alan. “What Is Historical Materialism?” *In Defence of Marxism*, In Defence of Marxism, 14 Jan. 2016, www.marxist.com/an-introduction-to-historical-materialism/part-one-what-is-history.htm.