

Chapter 1 : Social Politics | Scourge of Progressivism

Key Difference - Pragmatism vs Progressivism Pragmatism and progressivism are two schools of philosophy or else traditions of philosophy between which a key difference can be identified. Pragmatism is a philosophical movement that emerged in the s that highlighted the importance of practicality and experience over principles and doctrine.

Early Feminist Contributions to American Pragmatism Women were significant partners in the development and articulation of classical American pragmatism. These women bring added dimensions to pragmatism; they remind us of the issues that were subsequently left behind as American philosophy became more exclusively technical and academic. For most of these women, pragmatism was a philosophic practice used to accommodate their new academic and political engagement with the world, as well as a method of reforming politics and culture. The pragmatist approach to philosophy that brought theory and practice together helped these women trust in and learn from experience and intellectually engage in a host of social reform movements. Recovering these women thinkers also allows us to hear new or excluded voices in the philosophic conversation, in some cases resulting in opening up the definition of philosophy itself. Thus, it should not be surprising that many of the women whose work has been brought into the feminist-pragmatist discussion were college-educated activists rather than professional academic philosophers; nevertheless, scholarship has shown that their work had an enormous impact on the development of pragmatist thought. A historical look at how these women affected what became known as pragmatism demonstrates the interactive and relational nature of philosophizing. The history of pragmatism is recent enough that we can more easily recover and recognize the women who participated in forming this uniquely American school of thought, formerly considered only through the work of such male thinkers as William James, Charles Sanders Peirce, George Herbert Mead, George Santayana, and John Dewey. The work of women who were in philosophic and activist dialogue with these philosophers, and who were original philosophers in their own right, has until recently disappeared. In the Progressive Era, many of the college-educated social reformers in the Chicago area lived at Hull House or were associated with the University of Chicago, such as Julia Lathrop and Florence Kelly. Some of the Hull-House reformers, such as Sophonisba Breckinridge and Edith and Grace Abbott, held academic positions, but did most of their academic and activist work in the realm of social reform. Early feminist pragmatists included the following women: Jane Addams “ was a central figure in the development of pragmatist thought. Her pragmatist philosophies emerged from her experiences working in the poverty-stricken immigrant neighborhoods of Chicago, from her collaborations with the talented women who lived at Hull House, as well from reflection on texts and direct dialogue with philosophers of her time including John Dewey, William James, Leo Tolstoy, and W. Addams published eleven books and hundreds of essays, writing on ethics, social philosophy, and pacifism, in addition to analyzing social issues concerning women, industrialization, immigration, urban youth, and international mediation. Emily Greene Balch “ was a member of the first graduating class at Bryn Mawr, engaging in graduate studies at the University of Chicago and the Harvard Annex, and ultimately teaching at Wellesley College for over 20 years. While trained as a sociologist and an economist, evidence of pragmatist philosophy is abundant in her work. This is particularly true in her support of social democracy and in her fundamental faith that the social environment was capable of transformation through philosophical reflection and action. Her commitment to pluralism and economic justice led her to work on suffrage activism and global racial justice. She received the Nobel Peace Prize in Ella Lyman Cabot “ struggled to be a philosopher in the male-dominated philosophies of early 20th century. She took classes at Harvard and Radcliff with James and Royce. She wrote seven books on ethics and education. Mary Whiton Caulkins “ studied under pragmatists William James and Josiah Royce at Harvard, primarily working in psychology which was then a sub-field of philosophy. In , Caulkins became the first woman president of the American Psychological Association and in became the first woman president of the American Philosophical Association. While not generally categorized as a pragmatist philosopher, her influence as a female philosopher created a pathway for other women philosophers. Elsie Ripley Clapp “ was a student of classical pragmatists, taking over fourteen courses from Dewey at Columbia, working as his

graduate assistant, and collaborating on research projects with him for years see Seigfried Dewey publicly acknowledged Clapp for her contributions to *Democracy and Education*, but only in the introduction, not attributing to her any particular ideas in the body of the text. At his retirement in 1930, Dewey suggested that Clapp should be appointed to teach his courses at the Teachers College, but she was not offered the position by the college. She went on to collaborate with Eleanor Roosevelt on significant rural education projects of her time. Anna Julia Cooper " was an educational reformer, particularly focused on the education of African-American women. Her writings about the dual oppressions of race and gender are considered one of the foundations of contemporary feminist theories of Intersectionality. She had been raised in Michigan by her pioneering grandfather, attending a Baptist seminary after completing high school. Her lifelong interest in education led her to be a school teacher. Mary Parker Follett " began her work in local community centers in the Boston area; she then took the lessons she learned about integrative democracy to the workplace, becoming a well-known management consultant. Like Jane Addams and many of the feminist pragmatists of her era, her philosophy was developed out of her deep engagement with issues in her Boston community, and from observing how people interact in public life. Follett published three books and many essays and speeches. Her work has gained new significance in contemporary management theory, and in modern leadership studies. Gilman stayed at Hull House for about a month in 1892 where she lectured and explored the settlement culture. Gilman was particularly concerned with the industrial and economic conditions of women, both in the home and in the workplace. She is the author of nine novels, including the feminist utopian novel *Herland*, and ten works of nonfiction, including *Women and Economics*: Lucy Sprague Mitchell " was born in the generation after Jane Addams, and was a student of the classical pragmatists. As a feminist educator she both defined and reflected the progressive era philosophies of reform and social change through educational progress. In 1945, Mitchell became the first dean of women at the University of California at Berkeley where she encountered the sexism that was pervasive in the academy in that era. After moving back to New York, she began a 60 year career in child-centered education, combining educational scholarship in both research and practice, with founding and administrating innovative programs. Ella Flagg Young " was a lifelong education and then administrator in the school system in Chicago, and later was a professor of education at the University of Chicago. In particular these contributions included: According to Joan K. Smith , Young began taking classes from John Dewey at the University of Chicago in the fall of 1892; at that point she had over 30 years of experience in teaching and administration. She published three books on education. Likewise, feminist pragmatists are examining the role of women and gender in the canon of pragmatist philosophy. As Seigfried noted , Dewey was a supporter of many feminist causes. Why does this matter? As Nancy Tuana has said, Paying attention to the workings of gender within the texts of philosophy will make visible the complexities of the inscription of gender ideologies. Tarver and Sullivan As we will see, these important critiques have not deterred feminist pragmatists from seeing the value in and building upon the work of these classical pragmatist thinkers. Pragmatist Feminist Philosophical Themes Contemporary feminists are also implementing and extending pragmatist philosophies as a foundation for feminist theory. These feminist philosophers working in the pragmatist tradition point out that pragmatism offers a valuable, although often unrecognized, resource for feminist thinkers, especially as it is developed in the work of women pragmatists and activists. We see this particularly in feminist pragmatist writings on experience, epistemology, education and social action. For feminist pragmatists, pluralistic communities have epistemological value and provide the base for an inclusive problem-solving approach to social issues. The pragmatist understanding of education as a social and political force, as a major aspect of how society and individuals are shaped, has been echoed by contemporary feminists who analyze our educational curriculum and methods of teaching. Both pragmatism and feminism are more likely to bring social context to the forefront of philosophy, opening space for realities in flux, for emergent situations to be shaped and reconstructed by their context. Pragmatists emphasize that we must include particular and individual experiences in a pluralistic discussion of multiple realities, and that all parties involved in an issue also be involved in the problem-solving process. In its privileging of theory, some philosophic texts leave us with the impression that ideas normally originate from ideal and often solitary theoretical thinking that is then diffused into the general culture. However, in the case of many women

activists, like Jane Addams, it is evident that public and political activism shaped the character of the philosophy. Pragmatist philosophers often made these same points in their critiques of positivism. Currently feminists and pragmatists share an effort to radically change oppressive political and social structures, an effort that finds resonance with the early feminist-pragmatists. Jane Addams and other feminist reformers like Charlotte Perkins Gilman were continuously involved in fighting oppression, especially of women, children, and minorities. They are both committed to an epistemology that is based in experience and relationality. Feminist-pragmatists point out that the search for universalized ideals bankrupts ordinary experience and robs from philosophic thought the creativity of thinking with and through complex networks of experience and interaction. In *Pragmatism and Feminism*, Seigfried highlights aspects of pragmatism that make it useful to feminist epistemology, noting both fields share a critique of dualism. The four dimensions of this rationalist approach include: The depreciation of doing and making and the over-evaluation of pure thinking and reflection; the contempt for bodies and matter and simultaneous praise of spirit and immateriality, the sharp division of practice and theory, and the inferiority of change and superiority of a fixed reality. This desire for universals, she says, leads all the way back to Plato. This pluralistic sense of refusing to constrict reality to that which is defined by logic or language helps feminists as philosophers propose an alternative vision of philosophy. Such epistemological translation work is essential for feminists and pragmatists, given that in both fields theory is inherently about changing the world. Jane Addams embodied this intersection of pragmatism and feminism in her efforts to interpret across class and cultural boundaries; through this interpretative and activist work she sought to reconstruct the social order and increase justice for women and the underprivileged. For her, a motivation to understand truth would compel her to seek it out in the world of action. As a public philosopher, reformer, and activist embedded in her community, Addams was called to act under inherently messy, dynamic, and ambiguous situations see Fischer , , and Lake , This interpretive activism opened opportunities for reconstruction, redefining relations between the public and the expert, students and the instructor, the governed and the governors. Similarly contemporary feminist thinkers have changed the academy and the larger culture by re-analyzing and reconstructing the ways that we think, the hierarchies of knowing, as well as the social conventions that have defined gender. With both feminism and pragmatism we can consider philosophizing contextually as a creative force, reacting to as well as reconstructing our multiple environments. Wicked problem scholars and community change-agents Valerie Brown and Judith Lambert also employ a feminist pragmatist epistemology in their *Collective Learning for Transformational Change: A Guide to Collaborative Action*. Brown and Lambert, for instance, argue that sustainable and just transformational change on our collective social problems requires we begin by first sharing our values. Since our core values tend to shape our perspective and our actions, recognizing the range of values involved explicates the complexities. Their model also emphasizes individual narratives and legitimizes a range of knowledge, including individual, community, specialized, organizational, holistic, and collective knowledge cultures For her, as well as for other educators like Lucy Sprague Mitchell, education is not seen as standing apart from life, but rather blending seamlessly into the fabric of experiences and providing a meaning-making function. Addams understood that while education informs experience providing historical context as well as skills , it must also interact with and change in response to current social needs. In general, early pragmatist-feminist writing consistently demonstrates a distrust of educational theories that are disconnected from experience. Addams was involved in educational reform in the Chicago Public Schools, and later was a member of the Chicago School Board. However, her philosophy of education has had more enduring impact on adult education theory and practice, primarily as a result of her innovations at Hull House. In working with adults, she integrated arts, literature and history into industrial life; later she celebrated the arts and culture that was already present in the lives of her industrial immigrant communities. This pragmatist philosophy of education continues to have a global influence. Dewey is often cited as the catalyst for experiential learning and civic engagement practices. Kolb, like many others, extends this philosophy of education, emphasizing learning as a spiral cycle of reflective action and engagement Brown and Lambert ; Norton Other contemporary feminist philosophers of education draw on the pragmatist tradition, especially the work of early pragmatist women, in their conceptualization of education as a political and emancipatory

practice. Possibly because of its interest in the relationship between theory and action, philosophy of education has always occupied a privileged place in pragmatist philosophy, and feminist pragmatist writing reflects this. Feminist philosophers, such as Elizabeth Minnich and Jane Roland Martin, have critiqued the content of college curriculum as well as the methods of education.

God, War, and Progressivism. a professor at Columbia University and the progenitor of "pragmatism," a philosophy that sounds like what it is. Dewey dropped.

The rest is just noise. Because what are democracies and republics if not vessels for facilitating free association and cooperation? Allied victory over totalitarianism was above all a triumph of capitalism over socialism, yes, but it was also vindication for a way of life over that of the martial collective operating with scientific efficiency and with one communal voice, visions shared by Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Mussolini and Roosevelt. Let the left and right argue over dogma; we disinterested observers are here with the science! But there is no algorithm that unlocks the secret to the free society. Marx and the socialists were ostensibly defeated with the end of the Soviet Union. Rather, in their obscurity they re-evaluated where they had been successful and vowed to rise again against capitalism, through means other than purely economic. Thus do we see the utterly socialist aims of modern environmentalism, third-wave feminism and other movements of the anticapitalist left. Identity politics is just Marxist classism dressed up as enlightened diversity. The ultimate aim of Marxist-socialist theory was to give agency to disaffected and disadvantaged classes of people, and to encourage them to rise up and be heard in a world ostensibly dominated by rapacious capitalists. But as the economic prescriptions favored by these classes and their advocates proved utterly disastrous, it was inevitable that the focus would shift from economics to culture. For it is just as easy to agitate on behalf of those superficially marginalized by race or gender as it is to do so on behalf of the poor. There is always more oppression to fight, and always another injustice in need of eradicating. Thus is the great progress made on behalf of racial, gender, sexual and religious minorities deemed insufficient. Thus does critical theory emerge and meld with postmodern instincts to treat truth as malleable. This is how modern academia comes to regard Israel as the enemy and Hamas as the victim. Culture warriors understand a fundamental truth of human nature: Culture, on the other hand, is ubiquitous. It is impossible to be indifferent towards culture because one is forever awash in it. And those who instigated the culture war in this country understandably became addicted to the psychic satisfaction that comes from expanding access to natural rights hitherto denied to certain people. It makes sense then, that this social vanguard would continue looking for victims to unshackle, but at some point you just run out of victims, at least as far as the law is concerned. This is how such absurdities as YesAllWomen and trigger warnings enter the lexicon. And this new century of ours is particularly vulnerable to outright implosion if social politics continue to define us. In one respect, it is not hard to see why: The cult of diversity has become so strong and pervasive that among young people in the 21st century it is now obviously safer to tow the line of superficial tolerance. And yet, our future leaders are overwhelmingly consumed by the cult of physical shallow diversity. Culture matters, and caring about injustice is basic human nature. Much of the social progress that has been made in America and around the globe owes a debt to our friends of leftwing persuasion, even the virulent anticapitalists among them. But you must have a limiting principle, and leftists simply do not. The American Revolution was about restoring limiting principles to society, whereas the French Revolution had the Terror, the guillotine and ended in Napoleonic despotism precisely because there was no philosophical appreciation for such principles. The Jacobins believed they could remake the world entirely anew, that the past was irrelevant, tradition useless. The same phenomenon is again taking place today, only it is confined blessedly for now to the culture wars. Increasingly, these battles are bleeding into our politics, and that is a problem. If millennials continue to define themselves politically over the social issues they care about, this republic will be lost. The basic truth that 20th century tyrants understood about this country is even more profound today: America can never be destroyed by conquest, but only from within. The kids need to get over themselves and their identity politics and understand that there is so much more to the relationship between citizen and state than a fleeting promise of more free stuff, like contraception. Only our natural rights are sovereign and unassailable, and it is only the government that can infringe on those. So this curmudgeonly millennial will end with a plea to his fellow generation: We are all equal under the law and free to live cordially in a pluralistic society that allows for

wildly disparate opinions and perspectives.

Chapter 3 : From Pragmatism to Progressivism, 1 of 2 (Allen Guelzo) on Vimeo

Pragmatism is not a set of doctrines, but a way of approaching philosophy. The notion was first advanced in a paper by Charles S. Peirce in 1877, and American psychologist and philosopher William James brought Pragmatism to the attention of thinkers in the United States in 1890. After that, it became a major philosophical movement in the U.S.

Stacy Edwards 4 Comments Shortly after the Civil War, a group of American elites, armed with current European philosophies and purported science, formulated a new political movement and ideology. It was not designed to operate alongside the government and principles of the Founding Fathers, but to replace them. Rather than pursue violent overthrow as their more virulent European contemporaries, these elites preferred a more gradual, democratic approach to replacement. As elites, they already had the advantage of influence in the US educational system. Supported by political leaders of both parties including presidents, their ideas and policies rapidly took hold, entwining with our laws and government policies, choking out the system designed by the Founders. That movement and ideology is Progressivism. If some descriptions in this post seem blunt, I do apologize as it is not my intention to offend, but Progressivism has operated by stealth and misdirection for many years. This topic is far too broad to be covered in a single post, but I believe the five facts addressed here will make a good introduction. The first two are provided by individuals who are not Progressives. A Primer on the Idea Destroying America, Progressivism stands for the proposition that freedom, liberty, voluntary cooperation and the free market are not enough. To best improve life, the state must intervene and impose its will by brute force to achieve different and presumably better results. At the bottom of progressivism is a quasi-religious belief in state action force over individual choice. Progressivism as an intellectual movement emerged between 1870 and 1900 as a response to the multitude of problems associated with the industrialization of the U. Progressives believed that formal legal freedom alone – the negative protections against government intrusions on personal liberty – were not enough to provide the effective freedom necessary for citizens to fulfill their human potential in an age of rising inequality, paltry wages, and labor abuses. Changed conditions demanded a changed defense of human liberty. Writing at the height of the New Deal reform era, John Dewey explained the progressive view of liberty as a continuation of historic movements for human liberation: At one time, liberty signified liberation from chattel slavery, at another time, release of a class from serfdom. During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries it meant liberation from despotic dynastic rule. A century later it meant release of industrialists from inherited legal customs that hampered the rise of new forces of production. Today it signifies liberation from material insecurity and from the coercions and repressions that prevent multitudes from the participation in the vast cultural resources that are at hand. Progressives challenged excessive individualism in social thought and politics, promoted an alternative to laissez-faire economics, and replaced constitutional formalism with a more responsive legal order that expanded American democracy and superseded the economic status quo with a stronger national framework of regulations and social reforms. Progressives sought above all to give real meaning to the promise of the Preamble of the U. Drawing on the American nationalist tradition of Alexander Hamilton and Abraham Lincoln, progressives posited that stronger government action was necessary to advance the common good, regulate business interests, promote national economic growth, protect workers and families displaced by modern capitalism, and promote true economic and social opportunity for all people. In the famous formulation of progressive thought often associated with the progressive theorist Herbert Croly, this meant using Hamiltonian means national action to achieve Jeffersonian ends liberty, equality, and opportunity. In terms of its political values, progressivism throughout the years stressed a range of ideals that remain important today: For sake of brevity, I am including only four The common good, broadly meaning a commitment in government and society to placing public needs and the concerns of the least well-off above narrow self-interest or the demands of the privileged. Pragmatism, both in its philosophical form of evaluating ideas based on their real world consequences rather than abstract ideals, and in more practical terms as an approach to problem solving grounded in science, empirical evidence, and policy experimentation. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. Their

flowery description of pragmatism hides the Progressive rejection of fixed standards of right and wrong, good and evil for concepts relative to their time and place in history. According to Progressive pragmatism, moral standards must not be based upon concrete principles, but must adapt to the movement of history. My personal definition of Progressivism is that it is a chimera. As you will see in this post, the Progressive utopian goal is an illusion, a fabrication of minds that consider mankind to be God. Progressivism is a hybrid philosophy and ideology consisting of parts of fascism, socialism, humanism, Social Gospel, American Pragmatism, Nietzsche, Hegel, Rousseau, and more. Progressives took the egg of the nation founded upon the beliefs and Constitution of the Founding Fathers and infused it with some of the most oppressive, godless ideology and political movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Their hope is to create a nation that retains the appearance of the once free United States of America but that is in fact a nation governed by unelected elites imposing their beliefs and will upon its citizens and ruthlessly suppressing all dissenters. Progressivism as a movement began and rose to prominence sometime between and As a political ideology, it remains a dominant political force in America today. Between and , those shared beliefs were aggressively supplanted by the Progressive viewpoint. The primary differences between Progressivism and the rest involve strategy rather than substance. American Progressives chose democratic gradualism over the violent revolution often preferred by their European cousins. Another difference concerns the degree of collectivism and social change. Progressives then and now come from both political parties. Suppose they were born so, you know they are not. Progressives believe that freedom is a gift of the state, not of God. The concept identifying Progress with movement through time simultaneously points to a final goal, an end to time and change, the End of History. He not only supported Jim Crow in the South, but he brought it to the North barely a month past his inauguration in and only a year after his bid for the African-American vote in As an Arch-Progressive, Wilson championed eugenics and racial theory. Secure in his new science and his conviction that African-Americans were racially inferior to whites, he instituted a segregation of the civil service as public policy that lasted 35 years. It became the norm in the South only after receiving sanction from Progressives in the North. Those who once boasted that it had secured for the negro the rights of humanity and citizenship now listen in silence to the proclamation of white supremacy and make no protest against the nullification of the Fifteenth Amendment. Those Progressive beliefs are still influential to foreign policy today, including the belief that the primary, if not exclusive use of force in foreign affairs should be to promote the freedom and welfare of other peoples. Yet the Progressive concept of promoting the freedom and welfare of other peoples is not as altruistic as it sounds. When force becomes necessary, government has both the right and duty to use it with prudence. A people has the right to assert its political independence. This universal right arises from the principles that peoples should be governed by their own consent. Because of the purpose of the social compact, civil government, once established has the right and duty to defend the nation and secure the natural rights of its own citizens. While claiming the rights of self-defense and independence for ourselves, the United States has a duty to recognize them in others. This demands a prudential degree of respect for the domestic affairs of other peoples or nations. When it becomes necessary, the most justifiable ground for intervening militarily in the affairs of other peoples and nations is prudential consideration of what is necessary for our immediate or long term security. One prominent Progressive intellectual, Charles Merriam, described the Progressive rationale for replacing the natural rights foundation of American foreign policy with ethical idealism and historical evolution. He wrote that historical evolution reveals that some peoples or societies have evolved at a faster pace and others are less historically advanced. Therefore, men are not born free and have no natural right to liberty. Freedom must be achieved over the course of history. It belongs only to a people who have arrived at a specific level of cultural, intellectual, political and moral development. Woodrow Wilson agreed with this ideology. Some peoples may have it, therefore, and others may not. In addition, according to Progressive ethical idealism, nations such as the United States that had evolved to a higher stage of civilization possessed an ethical duty to help the less civilized to catch up whether they wanted to or not. It is a dominant , replacement ideology. The Progressive movement also targeted the Christian faith with its emphasis on the relationship between the individual and a Divine Supreme Being for destruction. Christianity is a major threat to an all-powerful government designed to determine the rights and

privileges of its citizens. Although Progressivism is essentially American, as stated above, Progressive ideology originated in Europe. Charles Darwin is well-known as a British naturalist, geologist and biologist with his contributions to the theory of evolution. What is less known about Darwin is that his degree was not in science, but in theology from Cambridge. Its leaders included Christian ministers such as Walter Rauschenbusch and Washington Gladden in addition to economists such as Richard T. Ely, founder of the Christian Social Union. Many of these Progressive thinkers received their degrees and ideology from Germany. The term living Constitution is still used by Progressives today. Progressives determined that the individual must be subordinated to the collective, namely the national, political and social order. Such subordination of the individual was deemed essential to progress and reform. Many Social Gospelers tried to reconstruct the image of Christ, portraying Him as a socialist. While socialism was portrayed as the embodiment of selfless concern for others, Christianity was portrayed as selfish and egotistical. The all important relationship of God to man was replaced by ministering to material suffering in the world. Religious obligation replaced service to God with service to humanity. Another belief Social Gospelers shared with Marxists is determinism. Philosophical determinism is defined as a theory supporting that all events and moral choices are determined by previously existing causes. This resulted in the Progressive effort to remove constitutional limits on the power of the federal government. For the last three decades, major cultural vehicles of attack have been postmodernism, multiculturalism, and relativism. Therefore, the postmodern era is also known as the post-Christian or post-theological era. According to the postmodern view, there is no unconditional Truth that transcends historical cultures, groups or individuals. Truths are subjective and relative to the perspective of the perceiver. This postmodern viewpoint is called perspectivism. He was also popular with twentieth century tyrants such as Hitler, as well as Columbine killer Eric Harris. There is no Truth transcending history. The realization of the first two should not be met with despair, but with courage and the will to create. The majority of people are weak and cowardly, preferring the delusions of supernatural religion. Nietzsche claimed Christianity was hostile to life itself and that Christianity is a religion of slaves and its morality is a slave morality. These postmodernists believe that traditions and values of Western Civilization such as Judeo-Christian morality, constitutionalism, the rule of law, capitalism, etc. Further, postmodernists believe that power possessed by political elites includes the power to define language and thereby define truth and reality itself. The term no longer refers to the study and understanding of cultures besides your own.

Chapter 4 : The Pragmatism of Prolonged War - Media Monitors Network (MMN)

Roots Pragmatism & work Progressivism & development 5. Era of Reform & Scientific revolution & Industrial revolution & Civil rights & Election & Questioning attitudes fostered by the Enlightenment & Naturalistic humanism & Idealism vs. Realism 6.

Ralph Raico, Leonard Liggio, Ron Hamowy, George Reisman, and others less well-known, most all of them students at the famous seminar given by Ludwig von Mises, who imbibed the wisdom & the jokes & the man whose intellectual vision laid the foundations for the revival of the pro-liberty trend in American politics and intellectual life. The Life of Murray N. Rothbard Prometheus Books, New York. Suffice to say that, without Murray & yes, I was on first-name terms with him while he was alive & the libertarian movement would have existed only as a subset of the much larger conservative movement, and then only in a radically reduced anodyne form, a mere shadow of the vital and growing force it is today. What fascinated Rothbard, I think above all else, was the history of ideas & not just economic ideas, but in a more general sense the trends and ideologies that shape the minds of men. His great work, really the capstone of his storied career, was his History of Economic Thought, which dealt with much more than economics. For Rothbard saw that history as a vast mosaic of human invention and belief, with the one overwhelming influence on human civilization to be that of religion. Now Murray was, himself, not a religious man: I would classify him as an agnostic bordering on outright atheism. Yet that did not affect his view that the influence of religion on socio-economic and political thought was not only enormous, but also largely misunderstood or else completely ignored. The reason, of course, was that secular intellectuals in the West had nothing but contempt for religion, all religion, and so missed important trends or else misinterpreted their origins and meaning. What this meant is that sin had to be stamped out, completely and entirely, and what better instrument for this formidable task than the government? And so the pietists, concentrated in New England and the immediate borderlands in Ohio, upstate New York, etc. Opposition to all immigration was a major plank in the pietist platform, which was embodied, politically, by the Republican party. They opposed immigration because the immigrants were overwhelmingly Catholics, who had their own schools, and their own laissez-faire attitudes toward such things as alcohol the Italians loved their wine, while the Germans preferred beer. This was intolerable as far as the pietists were concerned, and they campaigned tirelessly to keep the new immigrants in their place by outlawing their private schools, funneling their children into public institutions, and setting up the Know-Nothing American Party, which sought to keep immigrants out of the country, or at least keep them in their proper place. Another problem for the pietists was that these immigrants were voting, and especially in the big cities their votes defeated pietist Republican candidates and instituted a more easygoing regime. However, I must resist it and go on to focus on the foreign policy aspect of all this & really the deadliest consequence of the progressive-pietist trend in American politics, and the most tragic. Prohibition, child-labor laws, regulations that allowed big business to cartelize the economy or try to do so, with limited success. By this time, the explicitly religious aspect of this movement was downplayed by increasingly secularized intellectuals, who had left God behind in their zeal to create a utopia on earth. Thus the Social Gospel was born. And it was inevitable that, having succeeded to a large extent in this country, the Social Gospelers would turn their eyes abroad: As Rothbard puts it: World War I created a pietist paradise in the United States & a bloody charnel house in Europe, where the war was fought. The whole world was their oyster, as Rothbard points out, and they took full advantage of the opportunity to crack down on their enemies at home: The playing of German music in the symphony halls was forbidden, and the private German language schools were closed down. Prohibition, their favorite hobbyhorse, was imposed with new force: Catholic immigrant women would not bother to vote, and this would give the progressives a major advantage at the polls. Straight, a partner in the firm of J. Dewey dropped his pacifism the moment the guns sounded in Europe and agitated for US entry into the war on the grounds that it would turn the country toward socialism. And his comrades at The New Republic were even more explicit. We shall turn with fresh interests to our own tyrannies & to our Colorado mines, our autocratic steel industries, sweatshops and our slums. A force is loose in America. Thus,

Lippmann argued “ successfully ” that he would best serve the cause by working for the War Department. The chickenhawk is not a new species. During the war, the entire society was mobilized to defeat the Satanic Kaiser and his unholy minions: When the war was over, however, and the chains of regulation were relaxed if not broken, the progressives and their allies tried to preserve the new system, with mixed results. And that is a remarkable achievement indeed. But please note that my tweets are sometimes deliberately provocative, often made in jest, and largely consist of me thinking out loud. You can buy *An Enemy of the State*: Rothbard Prometheus Books, , my biography of the great libertarian thinker, here. Read more by Justin Raimondo.

Chapter 5 : God, War, and Progressivism - calendrierdelascience.com Original

Progressivism is often associated with reconstructionism (in the broad sense) and more specifically with John Dewey's pragmatism and experimentalism. Rooted in the philosophical school of pragmatism, progressivism is the counterpoint to both essentialism and perennialism.

This column was written by Christopher Hayes. Everybody agrees on this. He really wants to get things done. But just what does that mean? That goes without saying. The man was just elected president of the United States. Head-in-the-clouds idealists do not, as a rule, come to control the American nuclear arsenal. So we are left to interpret. Several factors make the project difficult. The onrush of events, with the tidal waves of economic distress, make it nearly impossible to predict policies. On the front page of the Times, in a "news analysis" a recurring feature that might as well be titled "Conventional Wisdom Digest" , David Sanger pointed to the likely appointments of Hillary Clinton and Timothy Geithner as suggesting that "Mr. Obama is planning to govern from the center-right of his party, surrounding himself with pragmatists"--that word again! Last spring, after sewing up the Democratic nomination, Obama seemed, through a mix of statements and votes, to take a sharp turn toward the center. This earned him the ire of many progressives. Obama adviser Cass Sunstein took to the pages of The New Republic to defend his onetime University of Chicago law school colleague from charges of flip-flopping. This, Sunstein contends, is particularly salient in the wake of the Bush years. To some, it means a kind of left-wing Bushism--the mirror image of the Bush administration, with its rigidity, its insistence on enduring political divisions, and its ruthlessly Manichean approach to political life. But in his empiricism, his curiosity, his insistence on nuance, and his lack of dogmatism, Obama is indeed a sort of anti-Bush--and perhaps the best kind. Not the substance of ideology but the fact that he was too wedded to it, too rigid and dogmatic. Many, like Sunstein, have drawn a lesson from the past eight years that is not about the failure of conservatism--neo or otherwise--or the dangers of the particularly toxic ideological disposition of the Bush administration, of larding public dollars on your cronies and friends, of exacerbating inequality while gutting regulatory oversight, of eviscerating centuries-old common law protections or of starting pre-emptive wars. No, through a kind of collective category error, they have alighted on a far more general moral to the story: And it is by this twisted logic that the crimes of the Bush cabinet are laid at the feet of the blogosphere, that the sins of Paul Wolfowitz end up draped upon the slender shoulders of Dennis Kucinich. But privileging pragmatism over ideology, while perhaps understandable in the wake of the Bush years, misses the point. For one thing, as Glenn Greenwald has astutely pointed out on his blog, while ideology can lead decision-makers to ignore facts, it is also what sets the limiting conditions for any pragmatic calculation of interests. Same goes for the Iraq War, which many "pragmatic" lawmakers--Hillary Clinton, Arlen Specter--voted for and which ideologues across the political spectrum, from Ron Paul to Bernie Sanders, opposed. This, despite the fact that so many willed themselves to believe that the benefits would clearly outweigh the costs. Particularly at times of crisis, when a polity succumbs to collective madness or delusion, it is only the obstinate ideologues who refuse to go along. Waxman asked Greenspan, "Do you feel that your ideology pushed you to make decisions that you wish you had not made? You have to--to exist, you need an ideology. The question is whether it is accurate or not. But more destructive than his ideological rigidity was the delusional pretense shared by so many observers that he was operating without any ideology whatsoever. Ironically, there are quite a few on the left who hope and many on the right who fear that Obama will be able to pull off a similar trick. Ideology is always most potent when least visible, when smuggled beneath the cloak of "pragmatism. Either way, there will be moments in the next four years when a principled fight will be required, and if there is an uneasiness rippling through the minds of some progressives, it arises from their doubts about just how willing Obama will be to fight those fights. Does Obama have such a list? Pragmatism in common usage may mean simply a practical approach to problems and affairs. What unites the two senses of the word is a shared skepticism toward certainties derived from abstractions--one that is welcome and bracing after eight years of a failed, faith-based presidency. Lincoln was, most historians agree, deeply pragmatic in the first sense. As the cable news networks have reminded us ad nauseam, Lincoln

brought political foes and countering viewpoints into his cabinet, creating a "team of rivals" that many see as a blueprint for Obama. When Kroft asked Obama if this was the case, he replied that Lincoln was "a very wise man. They had driven a wedge into white America, and they did it because they had become infatuated with an idea. They marched the nation to the brink of self-destruction in the name of an abstraction. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. Having witnessed, and in some cases experienced firsthand, the horror of violence and irreconcilable ideological conflict during the Civil War, William James, Charles Peirce and Oliver Wendell Holmes were moved to reject the metaphysical certainty in eternal truths that had so motivated the abolitionists, emphasizing instead epistemic humility, contingency and the acquisition of knowledge through practice--trial and error. This tradition is a worthy inheritance for any president, particularly in times as manifestly uncertain as these. Dewey developed the work of earlier pragmatists in a particularly fruitful and apposite manner. For him, the crux of pragmatism, and indeed democracy, was a rejection of the knowability of foreordained truths in favor of "variability, initiative, innovation, departure from routine, experimentation. He sought to ameliorate the excesses of early industrial capitalism, not to topple it. Nonetheless, pragmatism requires an openness to the possibility of radical solutions. It demands a skepticism not just toward the certainties of ideologues and dogmatism but also of elite consensus and the status quo. This is a definition of pragmatism that is in almost every way the opposite of its invocation among those in the establishment. For them, pragmatism means accepting the institutional forces that severely limit innovation and boldness; it means listening to the counsel of the Wise Men; it means not rocking the boat. But Dewey understood that progress demands that the boat be rocked. And his contemporary Franklin Delano Roosevelt understood it as well. It is common sense to take a method and try it: But above all, try something. The millions who are in want will not stand by silently forever while the things to satisfy their needs are within easy reach. Our times demand no less.

Chapter 6 : Pragmatism - Wikipedia

Progressivism had a large part in all of these as it was a continuation to industrialization after the Civil War. It was also a fight against corruption and inefficiency in a democratic government. Pragmatism brought the American public face to face with the question of evolution as well as suggesting that the end justified the means.

Bertrand Russell 7. Hilary Putnam 8. Searle Leading educational proponents include: Bestor, Herman Horne, Hyman G. Aristotle believed that all things possess an essence or nature that has potential to be actualized. Inherent in this essence of nature, everything in that natural world or created by human agencies is unique in that each is striving toward an end consistent with its nature or essence. The defining characteristic of human beings is their ability to ask general questions and seek answers to them through observation and analysis. For example, we can observe in each acorn a natural inclination depending on the conditions to become an oak tree. Realism believes in the world as it is. It is based on the view that reality is what we observe. It believes that truth is what we sense and observe and that goodness is found in the order of the laws of nature. Truth can be discovered through observation and logic inductive and deductive. The scientific method of discovery is a prime example of how a realist will discover what is real and good. As a result, schools exist to reveal the order of the world and universe. Students are taught factual information—facts that can be verified, measured and observed. Essentialism developed into a conservative educational theory that arose in the s in opposition to progressive education. This movement came to mean that education was to teach basic or essential skills. They also stressed that the best preparation for life is learning about the cultures and traditions of the past. Essentialism of the s--William Bagley 2. Academic critics of the s, 3. Neoconservatism of the s as evidenced in *A Nation at Risk* where the core requirements for high-school students call for a curriculum based on intellectual disciplines. Educational theory of Essentialism The educational theory of essentialism is, like perennialism, based in the philosophical thoughts of idealism and realism. Essentialists argue that 1 schools should be academic rather than social agencies, 2 curricular organization should be based on carefully selected and well-defined skill and subjects, 3 the teacher should be an authority figure, and 4 learning should be teacher directed. Unlike perennialism, however, essentialism began as an educational rather than a philosophical movement. Essentialism is a conservative educational theory that arose in the s in opposition to progressive education. With recurring regularity, various movements in education have urged a return to teaching of the essential or basic skills. Although there have been advocates for a return to "fundamental education" throughout the history of American education, contemporary American education has witnessed, according to Gutex , four important movements: Basically, essentialism emphasizes the authority of the teacher and the value of the subject matter curriculum. Ornstein , notes that for the essentialists, "education involves the learning of the basic skills, arts, and sciences that have been developed in the past. Mastering these skills and subjects prepares the student to function as a member of a civilized society. In addition, the student also should acquire the behavior needed for successful living. The learning of the essential curriculum requires discipline and hard work. The leading spokesperson for the committee was William C. Bagley, who wrote the "Essentialist Platform. The essentialist critique attacked tendencies in American education that were regarded as weakening the academic standards of the schools. Among the essentialist criticisms were the following: These are the "required tools" of a liberal education and the most reliable aids in meeting the requirements of both personal and social life. It is the task of the school to channel the accumulated experience of humankind into organized, coherent, and differentiated disciplines. Only after mastering these basic disciplines can the student be expected to use them to solve personal, social, and civic issues. They attack educators who emphasize "process" over content. They maintain that history should be taught as a separate subject and not submerged in the ill-defined social studies. Also, English should be revitalized as the study of literature and not watered down in the language arts. Some common themes to be found in all variations of the essentialist positions are: Americans have largely lost sight of the true purpose of education, which is intellectual training. With the rigor of our educational programs and teaching methods discipline, respect for legitimate authority , declining steadily for decades, 2. We must teach our students that intellectual

achievement requires hard work and disciplined attention. Like the perennialists, realists and essentialists believe that the best preparation for life is learning about the cultures and traditions of the past. Essentialism influences educational thought in the following ways: Schools should be academic rather than social agencies, 2. Curricular organizations should be based on carefully selected and well-defined skill and subjects--basic skills, arts, math, history, and science--from the past, 3. The teacher should be an authority figure, 4. Taught as separate subjects, 5. Learning should be teacher directed, 6. Use of scientific approach--inductive logic, 7. Emphasize content over process, 8. Excellence in education is based on external criteria, 9. Fact-base or objective base approach to knowledge, Divorced from personal experience emotion, passion, feelings, etc --external sense-related reality Antiphilosophical--discourages search for wisdom. This is a conservative educational theory that arose in the s in opposition to progressive education. Educational theory of Perennialism Perennialism views truth as unchanging, or perennial. It views nature and, in particular, human nature as constant, as undergoing little change. Beneath the superficial differences from one century or decade to the next, the rules that govern the world and the characteristics that make up human nature stay the same. They decry what they see as a trend to rely too much on experimental science and technology and thus ignore enduring truths. They argue that the growing status of scientific experimentation has led to a denial of the power and importance of human reason. Perennialists favor schools that develop the intellect of all learners and prepare them for life. This preparation is best accomplished when individuals have mastered the truths discovered through the centuries. Such wisdom is seen as important regardless of the career or vocation an individual ultimately chooses to follow. Since truth is universal and unchanging, a genuine education is also universal and constant. It should contain cognitive subjects that cultivate rationality and the study of moral, aesthetic, and religious principles to cultivate the attitudinal dimension. Like idealists and realists, perennialists prefer a subject matter curriculum. The perennialist curriculum includes history, language, mathematics, logic, literature, the humanities, and science. The content of these subjects should come from the classical works of literature and art. Mastering the subject matter of these learned disciplines is regarded as essential for training the intellect. The separate subjects that the perennialist might support are those that are broadly defined as the classical liberal arts. The perennialist points out that what the essentialist considers "essential" is constantly changing. They believe that vocational education represents a sellout of the true educational purpose of the school to the narrow interests of business and government. This concern is directed not only at public schools, but at colleges and universities as well. In the eyes of perennialists, courses with these emphases divert students away from a "genuine education" that would emphasize a mastery of lasting truth. If they could, perennialists would ban all research and practical training from colleges and universities and turn these responsibilities over to technical institutes. The perennialist shares with the essentialist the idea that the primary goal of education is to develop the intellect. However, in the perennialist view learners should pursue truth for its own sake, not because it happens to be useful for some vocation. This pursuit of truth can best be accomplished through the study of the great literary works of civilization. Perennialists are especially attracted to courses in the humanities and literature. These classics are viewed as important because they deal with universal issues and themes that are as contemporary today as when they were written. In summary and according to George F. Kneller, perennialists have six basic principles: Despite differing environments, human nature remains the same everywhere; hence, education should be the same for everyone. Education is not an imitation of life, but a preparation for it. Students should study the great works of literature, philosophy, history, and science in which men through the ages have revealed their greatest aspirations and achievements. Adler, and Allan Bloom. Educational theory of Behaviorism Rooted in the philosophical schools of realism, behaviorism or behavioral engineering is an educational theory that is predicated on the belief that human behavior can be explained in terms of responses to external stimuli. Dean Webb states, "the basic principle of behaviorism is that education can best be achieved by modifying or changing student behaviors in a socially acceptable manner through the arrangement of the conditions for learning. For the behaviorist, the predictability and control of human behavior are paramount concepts. The control is obtained not by manipulating the individual but by manipulating the environment. The basic principles of the theory of Behaviorism are as follows: All behaviors are both objective and observable. All behaviors are caused. As

natural organisms we seek positive reinforcement and avoid punishment.

Chapter 7 : Progressivism in the United States - Wikipedia

Same goes for the Iraq War, which many "pragmatic" lawmakers--Hillary Clinton, Arlen Specter--voted for and which ideologues across the political spectrum, from Ron Paul to Bernie Sanders, opposed.

The tender minded tend to be idealistic, optimistic and religious, while the tough minded are normally materialist, pessimistic and irreligious. But this has not weakened religious belief. People need a philosophy that is both empiricist in its adherence to facts yet finds room for religious belief. For James, then, Pragmatism is important because it offers a way of overcoming the dilemma, a way of seeing that, for example, science, morality and religion are not in competition. To attain perfect clearness in our thoughts of an object, then, we need only consider what conceivable effects of a practical kind the object may involve—what sensations we are to expect from it, and what reactions we must prepare. This human witness tries to get sight of the squirrel by moving rapidly round the tree, but no matter how fast he goes, the squirrel moves as fast in the opposite direction, and always keeps the tree between himself and the man, so that never a glimpse of him is caught. The resultant metaphysical problem now is this: Does the man go round the squirrel or not? Pragmatic clarification disambiguates the question, and once that is done, all dispute comes to an end. So James offers his pragmatism as a technique for clarifying concepts and hypotheses. He proposed that if we do this, metaphysical disputes that appear to be irresolvable will be dissolved. When philosophers suppose that free will and determinism are in conflict, James responds that once we compare the practical consequences of determinism being true with the practical consequences of our possessing freedom of the will, we find that there is no conflict. As James admitted, he explained the pragmatic method through examples rather than by giving a detailed analysis of what it involves. He made no claim to originality: Peirce and James participated in these discussions along with some other philosophers and philosophically inclined lawyers. As we have already noted, Peirce developed these ideas in his publications from the s. As we shall see there were differences in how they understood the method and in their views of how it was to be applied. Later thinkers, for example John Dewey and C. Lewis, developed pragmatism further. This was tied to the study of the normative standards we should adopt when carrying out inquiries, when trying to find things out. Sections 2 and 3 will be concerned, primarily, with pragmatism in the narrow sense. Then, in section 4, we shall explore some of the views that are associated with pragmatism in the wider sense. The pragmatist maxim As we have seen, the pragmatist maxim is a distinctive rule or method for becoming reflectively clear about the contents of concepts and hypotheses: This raises some questions. What sort of thing does it recognize as a practical consequence of some theory or claim? Second, what use does such a maxim have? Why do we need it? And third, what reason is there for thinking that the pragmatist maxim is correct? Consider what effects, which might conceivably have practical bearings, we conceive the object of our conception to have. Then, our conception of those effects is the whole of our conception of the object. For all his loyalty to it, Peirce acknowledged that this formulation was vague: The principle has a verificationist character: This is clear from his later formulations, for example: The entire intellectual purport of any symbol consists in the total of all general modes of rational conduct which, conditionally upon all the possible different circumstances and desires, would ensue upon the acceptance of the symbol. We become clearer about the concept hard, for example, by identifying how there can be conceivable circumstances in which we have desires that would call for different patterns of action if some object were hard from those it would call for if the object were not hard. If I want to break a window by throwing something through it, then I need an object which is hard, not one which is soft. It is important that, as Peirce hints here, the consequences we are concerned with are general ones: Sometimes he writes as if the practical consequences of a proposition can simply be effects upon the believer: Peirce sees uses for his maxim which extend beyond those that James had in mind. He insisted that it was a logical principle and it was defended as an important component of the method of science, his favoured method for carrying out inquiries. This is reflected in the applications of the maxim that we find in his writings. First, he used it to clarify hard concepts that had a role in scientific reasoning: We shall discuss his view of truth below. It also had a role in scientific testing. The pragmatist clarification of a scientific

hypothesis, for example, provides us with just the information we need for testing it empirically. In later work, Peirce insisted that the maxim revealed all the information that was need for theory testing and evaluation EP2: The pragmatist clarification revealed all the information we would need for testing hypotheses and theories empirically. As Peirce described contemporary versions of this distinction, the highest grade of clarity, distinctness is obtained when we can analyze a concept for example into its elements by providing a verbal definition. This was provided by applying the pragmatist maxim. As well as treating the pragmatist maxim as part of a constructive account of the norms that govern inquiry, Peirce, like James, gave it a negative role. A more vivid non-logical example of using the concept to undermine spurious metaphysical ideas was in showing that the Catholic understanding of transubstantiation was empty and incoherent EP1: Here another difference between James and Peirce emerges. James made no concerted attempt to show or prove that the principle of pragmatism was correct. In his lectures, he put it into practice, solving problems about squirrels, telling us the meaning of truth, explaining how we can understand propositions about human freedom or about religious matters. But in the end, inspired by these applications, we are encouraged to adopt the maxim and see how well things work out when we do so. Since Peirce presented the maxim as part of the method of science, as a logical or, perhaps better, methodological principle, he thought that it was important to argue for it. Indeed, after , he devoted much of his energy to showing that the maxim could receive a mathematical proof. He used several strategies for this. In , he relied upon the idea that beliefs are habits of action: Applying the pragmatist maxim to the clarification of a proposition, he argued, involved describing the habits of action we would acquire if we believed it EP1: In the lectures on pragmatism which he delivered at Harvard in , he adopted a different strategy. He offered a detailed account of the cognitive activities we carried out when we used the method of science: His strategy then was to argue that the pragmatist clarifications brought to the surface all the information that was required for responsible abductive reasoning, and that our use of inductive and deductive arguments made no use of conceptual resources that could show that pragmatism was mistaken. Although he remained optimistic of success in this, he was never satisfied with his results. Pragmatist theories of truth These differences in motivation become clearest when we consider how both Peirce and James applied their pragmatist maxims to the clarification of the concept of truth. It possesses a form of unreflective clarity: It is at this stage that the concept of truth enters the discussion: So we have to turn to his remarks about truth to see how the kind of mind-independence captured in the abstract definition of reality is to be understood from a pragmatist perspective. This reflects a law which is evident from scientific experience: So with all scientific research. Different minds may set out with the most antagonistic views, but the progress of investigation carries them by a force outside of themselves to one and the same conclusion. This activity of thought by which we are carried, not where we wish, but to a foreordained goal, is like the operation of destiny. No modification of the point of view taken, no selection of other facts for study, no natural bent of mind even, can enable a man to escape the predestinate opinion. The opinion which is fated to be ultimately agreed to by all who investigate, is what we mean by the truth, and the object represented in this opinion is the real. That is the way I would explain reality. These thoughts, however, have been caused by sensations, and those sensations are constrained by something out of the mind. This thing out of the mind, which directly influences sensation, and through sensation thought, because it is out of the mind, is independent of how we think it, and is, in short, the real. It is explained in terms of this fated agreement of convergence through the process of inquiry rather than in terms of an independent cause of our sensations. It articulates a metaphysical picture that all pragmatists tried to combat. See Misak , 69f where Cheryl Misak emphasises that Peirce does not offer a traditional analysis of truth. Rather, he provides an account of some of the relations between the concepts of truth, belief, and inquiry, She describes this as a naturalistic understanding of truth, and calls it an anthropological account of how the concept is used. And his writings on this topic rapidly became notorious. They are characteristically lively, offering contrasting formulations, engaging slogans, and intriguing claims which often seem to fly in the face of common sense. We can best summarize his view through his own words: The true is the name of whatever proves itself to be good in the way of belief, and good, too, for definite assignable reasons. Expedient in almost any fashion; and expedient in the long run and on the whole, of course. Ideas € become true just in so far as they help us to get into satisfactory relations with other parts

of our experience. This suggests that a belief can be made true by the fact that holding it contributes to our happiness and fulfilment. This is unfair; at best, James is committed to the claim that the happiness that belief in Santa Claus provides is truth-relevant. It is easy to see that, unless it is somehow insulated from the broader effects of acting upon it, belief in Santa Claus could lead to a host of experiential surprises and disappointments. The pragmatist tradition So far, we have concentrated on the pragmatist maxim, the rule for clarifying ideas that, for both Peirce and James, was the core of pragmatism. When we think of pragmatism as a philosophical tradition rather than as a maxim or principle, we can identify a set of philosophical views and attitudes which are characteristic of pragmatism, and which can lead us to identify as pragmatists many philosophers who are somewhat sceptical about the maxim and its applications. Some of these views may be closely related to the maxim and its defence, but we shall now explore them rather as distinctive characteristics of the pragmatist tradition. Like some other philosophers, the pragmatists saw themselves as providing a return to common sense and the facts of experience and, thus, as rejecting a flawed philosophical heritage which had distorted the work of earlier thinkers. In each case, Descartes self-consciously made a break with the scholastic tradition, and, in each case, the outlook that he rejected turns out to be the outlook of the successful sciences and to provide the perspective required for contemporary philosophy. We are to try to doubt propositions and we should retain them only if they are absolutely certain and we are unable to doubt them. The test of certainty, as Peirce next points out, lies in the individual consciousness: And the examination of our beliefs is guided by reflection on hypothetical possibilities: See Hookway , chapters 2,3.

Chapter 8 : Pragmatism, Prudence, and Progressivism | Power Line

Progressivism and World War I Throughout American history, there remains continuity between eras and periods denoted only due to common themes and events. Thus when we study the era of progressivism and later WWI, we must not forget its relation to the period we just studied.

Universities Historians have debated whether a unified progressive reform movement existed during the decades surrounding the turn of the twentieth century. While some scholars have doubted the development of a cohesive progressive project, others have argued that while Progressive Era reformers did not march in lockstep, they did draw from a common reform discourse that connected their separate agendas in spirit, if not in kind. Despite these scholarly debates, historians of education have reached a consensus on the central importance of the Progressive Era and the educational reformers who shaped it during the early twentieth century. This is not to say that historians of education do not disagree—in fact, they disagree intensely on the legacy of Progressive educational experiments. What they do agree on is that during the Progressive Era the philosophical, pedagogical, and administrative underpinnings of what is, in the early twenty-first century, associated with modern schooling, coalesced and transformed, for better or worse, the trajectory of twentieth-century American education.

Philosophical Foundations The Progressive education movement was an integral part of the early twentieth-century reform impulse directed toward the reconstruction of American democracy through social, as well as cultural, uplift. In short, the altered landscape of American life, Progressive reformers believed, provided the school with a new opportunity—indeed, a new responsibility—to play a leading role in preparing American citizens for active civic participation in a democratic society. John Dewey, who would later be remembered as the "father of Progressive education," was the most eloquent and arguably most influential figure in educational Progressivism. A noted philosopher, psychologist, and educational reformer, Dewey graduated from the University of Vermont in 1882, taught high school briefly, and then earned his doctorate in philosophy at the newly formed Johns Hopkins University in 1884. Dewey taught at the University of Michigan from 1886 to 1888, the University of Minnesota from 1888 to 1891, again at Michigan from 1891 to 1894, then at the University of Chicago from 1894 to 1904, and, finally, at Columbia University from 1904 until his retirement in 1930. During his long and distinguished career, Dewey generated over 1,000 books and articles on topics ranging from politics to art. For all his scholarly eclecticism, however, none of his work ever strayed too far from his primary intellectual interest: Through such works as *The School and Society*, *The Child and the Curriculum*, and *Democracy and Education*, Dewey articulated a unique, indeed revolutionary, reformulation of educational theory and practice based upon the core relationship he believed existed between democratic life and education. Because each classroom represented a microcosm of the human relationships that constituted the larger community, Dewey believed that the school, as a "little democracy," could create a "more lovely society. This dramatic change in American pedagogy, however, was not alone the work of John Dewey. In general, the received philosophical traditions employed by Dewey and his fellow Progressives at once deified childhood and advanced ideas of social and intellectual interdependence. First, in their writings about childhood, Frenchman Jean Jacques Rousseau emphasized its organic and natural dimensions; while English literary romantics such as William Wordsworth and William Blake celebrated its innate purity and piety, a characterization later shared by American transcendentalist philosophers Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau. For these thinkers, childhood was a period of innocence, goodness, and piety that was in every way morally superior to the polluted lives led by most adults. It was the very sanctity of childhood that convinced the romantics and transcendentalists that the idea of childhood should be preserved and cultivated through educational instruction. Second, and more important, Dewey and his fellow educational Progressives drew from the work of the German philosopher Friedrich Froebel and Swiss educator Johann Pestalozzi. Froebel and Pestalozzi were among the first to articulate the process of educating the "whole child," wherein learning moved beyond the subject matter and ultimately rested upon the needs and interests of the child. Froebel drew upon the garden metaphor of cultivating young children toward maturity, and he provided the European foundations for the late-nineteenth-century kindergarten movement in

the United States. Finally, Dewey drew inspiration from the ideas of philosopher and psychologist William James. By focusing on the relationship between thinking and doing, Dewey believed his educational philosophy could equip each child with the problem-solving skills required to overcome obstacles between a given and desired set of circumstances. According to Dewey, education was not simply a means to a future life, but instead represented a full life unto itself. Taken together, then, these European and American philosophical traditions helped Progressives connect childhood and democracy with education: Children, if taught to understand the relationship between thinking and doing, would be fully equipped for active participation in a democratic society. It was for these reasons that the Progressive education movement broke from pedagogical traditionalists organized around the seemingly outmoded and antidemocratic ideas of drill, discipline, and didactic exercises.

Pedagogical Progressivism The pedagogical Progressives who embraced this child-centered pedagogy favored education built upon an experience-based curriculum developed by both students and teachers. Teachers played a special role in the Progressive formulation for education as they merged their deep knowledge of, and affection for, children with the intellectual demands of the subject matter. Contrary to his detractors, then and now, Dewey, while admittedly antiauthoritarian, did not take child-centered curriculum and pedagogy to mean the complete abandonment of traditional subject matter or instructional guidance and control. In fact, Dewey criticized derivations of those theories that treated education as a mere source of amusement or as a justification for rote vocationalism. Although the practice of pure Deweyism was rare, his educational ideas were implemented in private and public school systems alike. During his time as head of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Chicago which also included the fields of psychology and pedagogy, Dewey and his wife Alice established a University Laboratory School. An institutional center for educational experimentation, the Lab School sought to make experience and hands-on learning the heart of the educational enterprise, and Dewey carved out a special place for teachers. Similarly, Colonel Francis W. Parker, a contemporary of Dewey and devout Emersonian, embraced an abiding respect for the beauty and wonder of nature, privileged the happiness of the individual over all else, and linked education and experience in pedagogical practice. During his time as superintendent of schools in Quincy, Massachusetts, and later as the head of the Cook County Normal School in Chicago, Parker rejected discipline, authority, regimentation, and traditional pedagogical techniques and emphasized warmth, spontaneity, and the joy of learning. Both Dewey and Parker believed in learning by doing, arguing that genuine delight, rather than drudgery, should be the by-product of manual work. By linking the home and school, and viewing both as integral parts of a larger community, Progressive educators sought to create an educational environment wherein children could see that the hands-on work they did had some bearing on society. Located some twenty miles north of Chicago on its affluent North Shore, the Winnetka schools, under the leadership of superintendent Carleton Washburne, rejected traditional classroom practice in favor of individualized instruction that let children learn at their own pace. Washburne and his staff in the Winnetka schools believed that all children had a right to be happy and live natural and full lives, and they yoked the needs of the individual to those of the community. Like the Winnetka schools, the Gary school system was another Progressive school system, led by superintendent William A. Wirt, who studied with Dewey at the University of Chicago. The Gary school system attracted national attention for its platoon and work-study-play systems, which increased the capacity of the schools at the same time that they allowed children to spend considerable time doing hands-on work in laboratories, shops, and on the playground. The schools also stayed open well into the evening hours and offered community-based adult education courses.

Administrative Progressivism While Dewey was the most well known and influential Progressive educator and philosopher, he by no means represented all that Progressive education ultimately became. In the whirlwind of turn-of-the-century educational reform, the idea of educational Progressivism took on multiple, and often contradictory, definitions. Thus, at the same time that Dewey and his followers rejected traditional methods of instruction and developed a "new education" based on the interests and needs of the child, a new cadre of professionally trained school administrators likewise justified their own reforms in the name of Progressive education. Professional school administrators relied on managerial expertise in order to efficiently supervise increasingly large public school systems. Significantly, the new administrators, borrowing the

language and practice of efficiency experts like Frederick W. Taylor, attempted to rationalize disparate school districts within one hierarchically arranged system of primary, middle, and high school institutions. Powerful school boards—often comprising elite business and civic leaders—hired professionally trained school superintendents to implement policies and to oversee the day-to-day operations of these vast educational systems. The superintendent, often a male, distanced himself from the mostly female corps of teachers, not to mention the students the school was intended to serve. In the name of efficiency, superintendents relied on "scientific," if often sterile, personnel management techniques, which had been developed by and for private industry and imported to the school setting by way of business-friendly school boards and through graduate training at the newly developed schools of education. In particular, the idea of differentiation became a new watchword in administrative Progressive circles, reflecting the burgeoning economic and status markers signified by the attainment of educational credentials. By differentiating the curriculum along academic and vocational tracks, school administrators sought to meet the needs of different classes and calibers of students, and to more tightly couple educational training with educational outcomes. While administrators justified this curricular innovation which was most often used in the high schools on the basis of equal opportunity for all students based on ability, it reflected a larger, more significant shift in the basic aims and objectives of American education. Where the school once provided intellectual and moral training, in the face of an increasingly diverse student population, Progressive administrators took their chief professional administrative responsibility to be the preparation of students for their future lives as workers in the American labor force. While this is a cynical view of the Progressive administrative drive, there is much justification for it. Founded in by a committee of educators and business and industrial leaders, the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education NSPIE helped organize vocational education programs in high schools around the country during the first several decades of the twentieth century. Vocational education, which critics conveniently, if incorrectly, linked to Progressive education, was expressly designed to train students for immediate employment following, and often in lieu of, graduation. On the other hand, administrative Progressives justified the rise of vocational tracks by pointing to the relatively miniscule college-going population and by proclaiming it as an effective means of assimilating newly arrived immigrants into American life and institutions. The interest in the efficient management of bureaucratic school systems and students was strengthened further by developments in educational psychology and intelligence testing. Thorndike, relying on data gathered from his study of 8, high school students in the early s, labeled his theory of intelligence psychological connectionism. Thorndike likened the mind to a "switchboard" where neural bonds or connections were created between stimuli and responses. He believed that students of higher intellect formed more and better bonds more quickly than students of lower intellect. By emphasizing the preponderant role of native intelligence through the statistical analysis of mass-administered intelligence tests, Thorndike and his fellow testers—H. Terman, and Robert M. Yerkes, among them—provided school officials and policymakers with scientifically incontrovertible evidence in favor of increased psychometric testing and pupil sorting. Precisely if paradoxically because of the malleability of the idea of Progressive educational reform, it was possible for both pedagogical and administrative Progressives to advance their radically different agendas in the name of democracy during the first several decades of the twentieth century. Life-Adjustment Progressivism Yet the internal contradictions and ideological inconsistencies of the pedagogical and administrative Progressives in many ways forecast the demise of the Progressive education movement. A system of education that championed both child-centeredness and individuated attention on the one hand, and explicit curricular differentiation through intelligence testing on the other, was perhaps destined to collapse; and with the introduction of life-adjustment education during the s and s, the Progressive education movement did just that. Life-adjustment education emerged on the scene during the s and witnessed its heyday during the early days of the cold war. Using commission reports published in and as its blueprint for action, the life adjustment movement succeeded in instituting its therapeutic curricula—geared toward the development of personal hygiene, sociability and personality, and industrious habits of mind—at thousands of schools around the country. The alleged anti-intellectualism of adjustment pedagogy, however, fueled even more criticism. According to Bestor, it was impossible to be a fully educated person in the absence of at least some exposure

to traditional liberal studies. In this traditional view, most similar to the nineteenth century concept of education as mental discipline, Bestor was joined by other neotraditionalist educational luminaries, including Robert Maynard Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago and advocate of the great books curriculum, and James Bryant Conant, the highly respected and influential president of Harvard University. All three men agreed on the fundamental aimlessness and futility of life adjustment education in particular, and American high school education in general. With the communist threat looming ever larger, the neotraditionalists believed the future of American democracy depended on a return to traditional academic studies. Progressive education did not entirely disappear, however. What is the relationship between education and democratic citizenship, between teachers and students? Are school districts too large? To what extent is the school responsible for the emotional as well as intellectual development of its pupils? Do achievement tests provide valid and reliable measures of student learning? Is the core curriculum sacrosanct or amenable to change? These are just some of the questions Progressive educators attempted to ask and answer, and they are questions that educators still wrestle with at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Chapter 9 : Pragmatist Feminism (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Years of Pragmatism denial election of , both the platforms of the Progressive nation is wrestling with the agonizing consequences of another war.

Governmental and Legislative Reform: The first corruption to be attacked was that found in cities. Between and , reformers supported poverty relief, an end to the boss system, housing improvement, and pro-labor laws. Most were in it for economic reform in government. Progressive governors in the mid-west like Robert M. La Follette rose to bring political efficiency and election reform to their states. They found business reform and more equitable taxes and regulation of railroads. Though they were successes, these groups also struggled to break away from conservative courts. Nevertheless, these were steps in changing the political arena. New state laws aimed at promoting social welfare had a greater impact than government reform. Many states enacted factory inspection laws under the auspices that the state had to protect the safety of its inhabitants. Some state legislation provided relief to single working mothers. Nearly every state under pressure from the National Child Labor Committee set a minimum age for employment ranging from 12 to 16 and prohibited employers from working children more than eight to ten hours a day. These laws were hard enforced and many families needed the extra income. Several groups came together to limit working hours for women. Nevertheless, defenders of free enterprise came together to lobby politicians to withhold funds needed to regulate worker reform. They felt that government interference undermined individual initiative and the ideas of the survival of the fittest. Moral reform became an issue as well though some argued that moral regeneration could not be legislated but found in church work and humanitarianism. The Anti-Saloon League, formed in , intensified the long-standing campaign against drink and its effects. They made the excellent connection between drink and worker efficiency. The war on saloons forced many local governments to restrict the sale of drink. But consumption of alcohol increased after This convinced prohibitionists that a national law was needed. In prohibitionists convinced Congress to pass the 18th Amendment outlawing the manufacturing, sale, and transportation of alcoholic products. Not all American was happy but the 18th Amendment can be seen as an expression of the progressive urge to cleanse society and to elevate morality through reform legislation. There was a backlash as well on prostitution. Middle-class moralists, already fearful of the perceived connection between immigration and prostitution called government to investigate the fear of white slavery, which was the kidnapping of women by state and international rings to be used as prostitutes. Government reports revealed that poverty, ignorance, and desperation drove women, especially immigrants and blacks, into prostitution. But it also remarked that it was a male perpetuated problem. It would only change when the hearts of men changed. Though it did not show any international rings, it revealed that women were making the choice because of need for money. By , most states had outlawed brothels and the solicitation of sex. Like prohibition, the Mann Act revealed a belief that government could regulate morality. Reformers believed that the source of evil was not human nature but the social environment. And if evil was created by humans, it could be eradicated by human effort. Intervention in the form of laws could help build a heaven on earth. New ideas in Education, Law, and the Social Sciences: While legislation anchored the reform impulse, equally important changes in schools, courts, and settlement houses. With the growth in efficiency and scientific management as well as changing theories such as evolution, new forms of social organization were needed. The number of children in schools increased the number of schools by compulsory attendance laws. The development of the student became the focus of education rather than the focus on the development of the subject matter. Education would based on experience and not memorization. Progressive education was uniquely American in that learning should focus on real-life problems and that children should be taught to apply their intelligence and ingenuity as instruments for controlling their environment. Personal growth became the driving principle behind college education as well. Initially started to prepare a select few, by the late s, institutions of higher education multiplied. New academic professions sprung out of the movement towards a more affordable tuition and new areas of study were sociology and political science. With rise in educational institutions, the creation of separate but never equal black institutions arose from government land

grants to go with traditionally black institutions. Further women enrollment expanded though there was continual racism and sexism. The legal profession also embraced a new emphasis on experience and scientific principles. Many embraced the view that social reality should influence legal thinking. The Supreme Court backlashed against these reforms particularly when laws challenged the fourteenth amendment and the right of government to regulate. The judiciary did do some good by upholding laws for public safety and gave the federal government the right to sustain federal legislation like the Pure Food and Drug Act and the likes to protect the welfare of the citizens. In public welfare arose the National Consumers league NCL which fought for the rights of women on issues of suffrage and child labor laws. But it also focused on the licensing of food vendors and inspection of dairies. Awareness of health issues expanded greatly in this period. Challenges to Racial and Sexual Discrimination: The problems of African-Americans remained largely a regional one though racism existed everywhere. Nine out of ten blacks still lived in the South in and this had led to the formation of stricter Jim Crow laws. Nevertheless, leaders arose to attempt to combat this situation and to assimilate blacks into white society. Two leaders represented the two point of views. This sentiment had an appeal to middle class white liberals than sharecroppers. In , he forms the NAACP, which aimed to end racial discrimination by pursuing legal redress in the courts, the leadership was made up of progressives. Nevertheless, discrimination even in the federal government expanded in this period, particularly under Woodrow Wilson. It gave a sense of twoness to blacks, that of being an American but also a black one. For all to end, racial pride would have to be combined with national pride. The problems for African-American and their identity haunted Native Americans. The formation of the Society of Americans Indians SAI by educated middle class Indians worked for better education, civil rights, and health care. It also sponsored American Indian Days to cultivate Indian pride and offset Anglo images of tribal peoples seen in shows. Yet, its emphasis on racial pride was squeezed by the pressures of assimilation. It never could accommodate both sides and or diverse the population of Indians. It folded by the s torn by doubts and internal disputes. During the same period, the progressive challenge to established social assumptions also stirred women to seek liberation from the confines of hearth and home. Their struggle raised questions of identity like those faced by blacks: What tactics should be used? What should be their role? Could women achieve equality with men and at the same time change male-dominated society? This label was used to characterize middle-class women striving to move beyond the home into social-welfare, higher education, and paid labor. They saw legal and voting rights as indispensable for this move. Around , some those concerned began to use a new term to refer to their efforts, feminism. Feminists focused more explicitly on the identity as women, spoke of rights and self-development. Feminism, however, contained an inherent contradiction, arguing on the one hand that all women should unite in the struggle for rights because of their shared disadvantage as women, and on the other, that sex-typingâ€”differential treatment of women and menâ€”must wither because it resulted in discrimination. Thus feminists were advancing the self-contradictory position that women unite as a gender to abolish all gender-based distinctions. Feminism focused on economic and sexual independence. Feminists articulated that domesticity and female innocence were obsolete and attacked male monopoly on economic opportunity. Women should enter industry and domestics should be handled by paid employees. They also called for sex rights or a single standard for male and female behavior. A number of feminists joined the birth-control movement to foster the terrible conditions that took women with child who were unwed and poor. The leader, Margaret Sanger, was forced to flee the country because many thought she was undermining family and morality. Most states continued to disallow contraceptives but discussion had began. Feminist debates over work and class pervaded into the suffrage movement. The movement succeeded in with the ratification of the 19th Amendment. It came with a change as the leadership changed. Earlier leader like Stanton felt only upperclass women could lead, but the new leadership saw all women as workers and significant within the movement. Feminism altered the old suffragist societies. Feminists fostered suffrage earlier in western states by The War only propelled the movement further. Voting rights did not mean much if social views did not change. Further liberation would require another forty to fifty years. At first, the government was incapable of assuming such responsibility.