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Introduction

The aim of this paper is, on the one hand, to bring to our attention unusual achievements of three women sociologists, and, on the other hand, to contribute to a long standing discussion of the role sociologists as public intellectuals. These two objectives seem to be rather timely in the context of today’s pessimistic view of the status of sociology and mourning of the absence of public intellectuals (Turner 2006). By focusing on Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch and Alva Myrdal’s outstanding contribution to the public life and their ability to overcome disciplinary boundaries, I hope to demonstrate what social scientists can offer in the role of
public intellectuals and to enhance our understanding the nature of sources of intellectuals’ public standing.

What is really unique about the case of the three women sociologists discussed in this paper is that all three of them won the Nobel Peace Prize; Jane Addams received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931; Emily Greene Balch was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1946 and Alva Myrdal was honoured in 1982. The Nobel Peace Prize, more than one hundred year old, the best-known and most highly respected international peace prize, provides recognition of individuals who have made outstanding efforts to transform their respective societies to accept the idea of international peace and justice. Its laureates vary from peace activists, politicians, diplomats, and priests to members of various international humanitarian organizations. Taking into account that from the beginning of the Nobel Peace Prize until today (1901–2007) there were no more than dozen recipients who could be classified as public intellectuals, that only 12 women (and 82 men and 21 organizations) were honoured and that there is no Nobel Prize for sociology, the achievements of Addams, Myrdal and Balch seem rather unique.

Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch and Alva Myrdal are still better known in their public roles than for their contribution to sociology, yet these Nobel Peace Prize Winners are ‘Founding Sisters’ of sociology. Thus, with American sociologists celebrating one hundred years of their association, the visibility of Jane Addams and Emily Balch, charter members of the American Sociological Society, is growing, while the debate of the future of the welfare state has inspired a new interest in Alva Myrdal, seen as one of the pillars of welfare state theory (Holmwood 2000). Moreover, as today’s discussion of public sociology often emphasises a need to rethink the meaning of the public sphere and that of the discipline of sociology, examples of these three public intellectuals and sociologists are of enormous illustrative value.

In what follows, I will present Jane Addams, Emily Balch and Alva Myrdal’s lives and achievements in order to find what was so inspirational about them and what were the sources of their public authority. Because it is rather impossible in a short article to reconstruct the three sociologists’ contribution to the discipline, I will only sketch their main areas of interests and will focus on the way in which these women combined the roles of leading public intellectuals, reformers and scholars.

1 In all three cases, the Nobel Prize was shared. Jane Addams, who got the Nobel Peace Prize as ‘Sociologist; International President, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom’, shared it with Nicholas Murray Butler. Balch, who got it as ‘Formerly Professor of History and Sociology, Honorary President, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, shared the prize with John R. Mott. Alva Myrdal, who got it as a ‘Former Cabinet Minster; Diplomat, Writer, shared it with Alfonso Garcia Robles (htto://nobelprize.org.index.htm).

2 Deegan (1999) who is the recognized authority on Addams and other women sociologist, in her introduction to Women in Sociology: A Bio-Bibliographical Source Book, while discussing women who set precedents in sociology, presents in Table 1.2. Addams, Balch and Myrdal as Nobel Peace Prize Winners Who Are Founding Sisters. Stating that all three women’s contribution ‘dramatically influenced the world’, Deegan (1999:8) further notes that the Nobel Peace Prizes reflects ‘the powerful application of their ideas’.
Jane Addams: ‘A One of the Most Important Female Sociologists’ (Deegan 2007:3)

Jane Addams (1882–1935) was a sociologist, social reformer and social worker who favoured a democratic inclusion, pacifism, internationalism, feminisms and pluralistic society (Madoo Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 1998). She became one of America’s leading social critics and activist who ‘helped make “progressivism” and “social justice” respectable causes to be taken seriously’ by excelling in the three roles; as a founder and head of Hull House (a settlement in a Chicago immigrant neighbourhood), as a leader of reform and as a public intellectual (Levy and Young 1965: vii). Addams was ‘one of the first, and remains one of the most important, among a group of social thinkers committed to communicating to a general audience that we have come to call “public intellectuals”’ (Bethke Elshtain 2002a :xxv).

Until the 1990s Jane Addams, while acknowledged by social workers as a major thinker and professional model, has been absent in the history of both a sociology and philosophy (Deegan 1986:8). Her publications° have remained unknown and not included into the histories and definitive works of both disciplines. Although Dewey and Addams ‘influenced each other and generously acknowledged their mutual obligation’ (Lasch 1965: 176), her specific contribution to the development of pragmatism as a philosophical theory has not been discussed because ‘philosophers relegate Addams to sociology, while sociologists relegate her to amateur reformism, at best to the status of a social worker’ (Seigfried 1996:45). While philosophers can claim ‘as mitigating circumstance the fact that Addams identified herself as a sociologist, rather than as philosopher’ (Seigfried 1996:45), sociologists’ lack of interest in Addams’s contribution to their discipline is harder to explain. The absence of sociologists’ interests in Addams, despite the fact that she considered herself a sociologist and was ‘a central figure in applied sociology between 1892 and 1920 and led a large and powerful cohort of women whom she profoundly influence’ (Deegan 1986:313, 2007:7), can be contributed to the dominance of her image as cofounder of Hull House, reformer and social worker as well to the fact that she can not be confined to any one discipline. ‘She is an exemplary case of how pragmatism, like feminism, internally disrupts artificial and counterproductive disciplinary boundaries’ (Seigfried 1996:45).

Still, there have been, in both philosophy and sociology, attempts to retrieve Addams’s heritage. In the end of 1990s Seigfried (1999:215) proposed to recover Addams’s pragmatism theory that could speak ‘for such contemporary issues as the manner of inclusion in society of diverse persons, marginalized by gender ethnicity, race and sexual orientation’. In sociology there have been at several attempts to

° Jane Addams wrote prolifically on a wide range of issues for scholarly journals and for mass-circulation magazines, such as Ladies Home Journal (‘a politically serous magazine at the time’), McClure’s and American Magazine (Elshtain Bethke 2002a:xxv).

Some of her most important books are; Democracy and Social Ethics (1902), Newer Ideals of Peace (1907), Spirit of Youth and the City Streets (1909), Twenty Years at Hull House (1910), Peace and Bread in Time of War (1922), The Long road of Woman’s Memory (1916). Recently her writings have been collected in Bethke Elshtain (2002a, b) and in Addams (1960).
rediscovery of Addams’s legacy for the discipline. In the 1960s the interest in Addams was renewed by the emergence of radical left historians and feminists who were the first to raise the issue of Addams’s radicalism, to discuss Addams’s view of the role of women and addressed the issue of class and gender in her writing (Knight 2005:406–7). Yet the main bibliography of Addams, published by Davis in 1973, ‘lost the significance of Addams as a social thinker and the middle class feminisms that turn her into a leading social activities’ (Knight 2005:408). The following decades have seen the increasing interest in Addams as a sociologist. Deegan, in her book Jane Addams and Men of the Chicago School (1986), has initiated Addams’s scholarship with her presentation of Addams’s theory as ‘feminist pragmatism’. She has made the strong case for Addams as ‘a social theorist of major propositions’ and as a unrecognized founding mother of the Chicago School of sociology (Deegan 1986:13). According to Deegan (1986:310), Addams’s significance as a major theorist was neglected in the decades following her death as ‘symbolized the discarded values and acts of an old-fashioned age’. Addams’s social thought was underanalysed and her way of doing sociology criticized as she was defined as a pacifist, social reformer and applied sociologist whose sociological analyses of articulated unpopular approach to sociology.

The second wave of interest in Addams came in the 1990s, when Addams’s relevance for contemporary sociology was rediscovered by Ross (1998), who calls Jane Addams’s approach ‘interpretative sociology’, as well as by other authors who analysed her influence on the course and development of sociology (Lengermann 1998; Lengermann and Niebrugger-Brantley 1996; McDonald 1994; Reinharz 1992). The recent inclusion of Addams into the elitist group of the greatest sociologists in Fifty Key Sociologists, edited by John Scott (2007), marks the beginning of the third way interest in her work. The volumes opens with the presentation of Addams’s as ‘one of the most important female sociologists who ever live’ (Deegan 2007:3). It builds Addams’s portrait as feminist pragmatist and ‘a recognized world leader with a sweeping mind, personal charisma and an innovative intellectual legacy’(ibid). Deegan (2007:7) develops argument that Addams’s status in sociology is connected with her contribution to Chicago pragmatism, as well as with Addams’s engagement with sociological work in Britain, including empiricism, social survey, social settlements, Fabians socialism and the Arts and Crafts movements’. Presently, despite the fact that her ‘legacy in sociology is particularly hidden within the mainstream literature in the discipline’(Deegan 2007:7), several sociologists (Feagin 2005; Feagin 2001; Sennett 2003; Schram 2002) notice Addams’s relevance to our discipline. Sennett (2003), for example, stresses the importance of the notion of social character in Addams’s approach as well admires her as ‘a secular cosmopolitan, who believed that the settlement house provided a model for social participation which could be applied across the defences of nations, races, or ethnic groups’ (Sennett 2003:135). Feagin (2005:6) presents Addams as one of ‘the first public sociologists, who worked hard to link social research and social justice issues’. He sees Jane Addams as a key founder of U.S sociology, as one of the first U.S sociologists who dealt conceptually and empirically with social problems of the industrialized cities. ‘Addams and colleagues accented a new sociological tradition that developed empirical data in order to better deal with the issues of both social theory and public policy’ (Feagin 2001:7).
Yet despite the fact that the number of works bringing Addams’s ideas back to sociology has been on increased, there is still no comprehensive study of her contribution to sociology or a general overview of her social theory (Deegan 2003). In short, despite all these attempts to re-introduce Addams to modern sociology, the significance of her heritage continues to be not appreciated within the mainstream sociological literature. Her intellectual contribution is still not a part of works through which new members are inaugurated into academic discipline of sociology.

The recent review of the main American textbooks written over the twentieth century, which aims to illustrate changes in our sociological stock of knowledge about the founders of the discipline, shows rather remarkably lack of depth in presenting Addams’s contribution and even more frequent a total omission of her name (Hamilton 2003). Addams’s input to sociology is only suggested in the main American sociological textbooks. For example, in Macionis’s (1999: 14–15) textbook, classified by Hamilton (2003) as the text number one, Addams was mentioned as one of ‘early sociological pioneers’ and her contribution is described as now recognized as ‘important and lasting’ (in Hamilton 2003: 290). In the textbook number two, Henslin (1999: 17), under the headings ‘Sociology in North America’, devotes two paragraphs to Jane Addams, while in Diana Kendall’s (2001) work (the ‘number four textbook’; in Hamilton 2003), Addams is mentioned without any information provided about her contribution to the discipline (Hamilton 2003: 289).

In last years, apart from the renewed sociological interest in Addams, several books have been published that focus on Addams in her as role reformer, public intellectuals and citizen. Brown Bissell (2004) shows Addams’s growing embrace of an ethic of democratic humanitarianism, Knight (2005) traces a process that led to Addams’s activism on behalf of workers in immigrants, children and world peace and her public reform agenda, while Bethke Elshtain (2002a: xxv) presents her as one of the first and most significant American public intellectuals. Topics of papers presented at the Conference ‘Exploring Jane Addams University of Dayton (November 8–9, 2002), which were mainly concerned with Addams’s views on such issues as care, ethics, labour and democracy, emotions, love an peace, world citizenship, social justice, charity, also reflect the fact that Addams’s importance expands beyond boundaries of sociology. Addams’s version of pragmatist feminism, her ‘interpretative sociology’, her contribution to our understanding of democracy, cosmopolitanism, progressive education, memory, social justice are all essential contribution to social science in general.

Addams’s career as a sociologist was especially connected with her close relationship to the University of Chicago. Her collaboration with Dewey, Mead, Small and Thomas as well as urban sociologists was mutually beneficial. She contributed to the creation in the Chicago University both sociology and social work as academic disciplines, while many researchers adopted Hull House as a social laboratory for urban sociology. She liked to speak on college campuses and gave a series of lectures at several universities (for example, in 1890 she gave a series of lectures at the University of Chicago on social ethics and some courses through the Extension Division of the University of Chicago) and several presentations for the American Sociological Society (Deegan 1986: 10). Yet she resisted all attempts to
make her a permanent member of any university faculty (ibid), while accepting many honorary degrees and rewards from several universities.4

In 1895, as a result of the collaboration with the University of Chicago, Addams and her colleagues in the settlement published *Hull House Maps and Papers*, the pioneering study of a working class neighbourhoods in American city. With this sociological survey Addams and her collaborators ‘created American urban sociology as the empirically rigorous study of the conditions of urban life’ (Bethke Elshtain 2002a:xxv). *Hull House Maps and Papers* stimulated further research on Chicago and other cities and over years provided Addams with data on urban conditions to press for further reforms (Deegan 1986). With the publication of this fundamental survey of Hull-House neighbourhood, Addams became an active researcher. She described herself as a ‘writer and lecturer’ (Knight 1997: 96) and ‘came to think of herself as a scholar, even as a sociologist’ (Davis 1973:102). Addams’s ability to connect thought and action, scholarship and reform was appreciated by Albion Small, the first editor of *American Journal of Sociology*, in which early volumes Addams published five articles (Hamilton 2003:289) and in which five of her books were positively reviewed.5 In following decades

Addams remained an excellent ‘interpreter of practical sociology’ (Levine 1971:90) as she believed that only through ‘affective interpretation’ of others’ needs and motives’ social justice could be achieved (Addams in Brown Bissell 2004:6). Already her first book, *Democracy and Social Ethics* (1902), was a good example of Addams’s interpretative social thinking and her ability to combine a powerful cultural and political critique with a constructive vision of American democracy. She trusted that democracy, seen as a social way of life, could be enhanced by working class aspiration for democratic political powers and social justice. Responding to the dominant social conflict of her day, she stressed the need for social classes to engage in ‘mutual interpretation’. Seeing democracy as a central foundation of all human action, Addams (1902: 12) argued that ‘the cure for the ills of Democracy is more Democracy’.

For Addams, democracy and education were significant mechanisms for organizing and improving society. She believed that history does not only change by violence means. She insisted that humanity, with a help of non violent methods could solve its problems and progress to a more peaceful and cooperative existence. While Hull-House served as a forum for education and democracy (Deegan 2007), the essential role in the coordination of emotional commitment and in initiating

---

4 Addams was the first woman to receive an honorary doctorate from Yale University (1910), which was followed by numerous honorary degrees, including degrees from Wisconsin University Northwestern University, The University of Chicago, and University of California and so on. She was also awarded Bryn Mawr’s M.Cary Thomas Prize (1931) and the Pictorial Review award to ‘the woman who in her special field has made the most distinguished contribution to American life’ (Alonso 1994: 215).

5 For example, Addams’s book *Spirit of Youth and the City Streets* (1909), which deals with the problem of juvenile delinquency, was very positively reviewed by William James who wrote in *American Journal of Sociology*: ‘Certain pages on Miss Addams’ book seem to me to contain important statements of the fact that the essential and perennial function of the Youth period is the reaffirm authentically the value and the charm of Life. All the details of the little book flow from the central insight or persuasion. Of how they flow I can give no account, for the wholeness of Miss Addams’ embrace of life is her own secret. She simply inhabits reality, and everything she says necessarily expresses its nature, she can’t help writing truth’ (quoted in Davis 1973: 155–56).

 Springer
social change, according to Addams, is played by remembering. She was one of the first sociologists to document the importance of memory in human life and memory’s power to challenge existing conventions. Being always interested in female insight, in the nature of women perception, sensitivity and intuition, Addams, through her conversation with migrant women who experience hardship at work and in their family life, discovered various functions of memory in human life. Her ideas about the working of memory were developed a decade before the publication of Maurice Halbwachs’s ([1926]1950), a father of sociology of memory, main work on collective memory. Some Addams’s thoughts, such as her idea of narrative as providing the mechanism for thinking about past or her claim that discourse about the past brings us into contact with the experiences or perspectives of others, strike a chord with those aspects of Halbwachs’s approach that are behind the popularity of his theory even today. Addams’s deep appreciation of the importance of the relations between memory and justice is a further evidence of her relevance to today’s discussion of terms in which the value of memory should be evaluated.

*The Long Road of Woman’s Memory* provides much evidence of Addams’s pioneering and interesting thinking about memory and about a power inherent in memory which she saw as ‘Protean Mother, who first differentiated primitive man from the brute; who makes possible our complicated modern life so daily dependent on the experiences of the past’ (Addams 1917:xv). Addams, touched by many tragic reminiscences told her by European women who experienced the horrific realities of WWI, reconstructed their memories in order to illustrate a pain of their inner struggle as they ‘had found themselves in the midst of that ever—recurring struggle, often tragic and bitter between two conceptions of duty one which is antagonistic to the other’, that is duty to the State and their families (Addams 1917:118). Addams’s during her conversation with women noticed their tendency to an idealization of their past and this observation led her to suggest the importance of memory as a reconciler to life and as an integrator. Memory, in its function as an integrator of the individual experience into larger unities, ensures an enlargement of the horizon and offers an interpretation of life, thus allowing locating and explaining individual experiences in the context of wider social trends. While listening to their reminiscences, Addams (196:85) was surprised, not so much by the fact that memory could integrate the individual experience into a sense of relation with more impersonal aspects of life, as by the fact that ‘larger meaning had been obtained when the fructifying memory had had nothing to feed upon but the harshest and most monotonous of industrial experiences’.

For Addams memory plays an important role the process of social change as remembering is a moral act requiring moral clarity and memory helps to adjust moral standards hardened into customs and habits, into a new reality. She described the dangers of failing to make this adjustment and insisted on the role of memory in the adjustment. ‘Our chief concern with the past; is not what we have done, not the adventures we have met, but the moral reaction [we have] to bygone events’(Addams 1917:101). Yet Addams provided evidence of memory’s activity not only as a challenger of existing conventions but also as a selective agency in sustaining tradition and in social reorganization. Addams’s theory, like Mead’s theory, can be interpreted as the conceptualization of memory as a means of upholding the existing order and as a motor of change. She, in a similar vein to
Mead (1929: 235), believed that in the context of change, conditions of insecurity could be routinized by the reconstruction of the past in such a way as to assimilate it into a meaningful flow of events. Addams, a feminist pragmatist who claimed that past arose in such a way as to enable ‘intelligent conduct to proceed’ against situational problems (Mead 1932:xiii, 29), believed, like Mead, that memory is selective and that people use the past to give meaning to the present.

Stressing the importance of memory in assign meaning to the present, while privileging memory as the means for transcending subjectivity, is another Jane Addams’s achievement. Her interdisciplinary treatment of memory points out to the fact that narratives that are dramatized and shared with other people provide a break from mundane life and caused excitement and sociability. Jane Addams (1917: xii) recognized that we are all under ‘the domination of that mysterious autobiographical impulse’, by which she meant that all human beings are naturally narrative and narrativity is crucial to good life. This suggestion, that a basic condition of making sense of ourselves is that we grasp our lives as narrative and have an understanding of our live as ‘an unfolding story’, resembles Charles Taylor, Alasdair MacIntyre or Ricoeur’s observations. Addams’s insistence that life narratives are based in memories is as result her understanding that without memory the self is lost and that memory ensures the depth of human existence.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Addams’s reputation grew due to successes of Hull House programs and her increased visibility as a social reformer, social critics and scholar. Hull House not only initiated her relationship with universities, helped to bridge the division between the academy and the wider community and introduced Addams to the reform movement but also enhanced her understanding of the importance of women involvement in public life. Addams’s involved in the women movement intensified with her active international efforts for world peace. Addams was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931 for her work ‘for peace and human brotherhood’ (Koht [1931] (2005:1). The same year, New York Time claimed that she was ‘the only saint America has produced’, or, as the Chicago city council announced, ‘the greatest woman ever lived’ (Bethke Elshtain 2002a:21). At her death in 1935 Addams was America’s ‘best- known and most widely hailed female public figure…. The mourning at her death was international’ (Bethke Elshtain (2002a :212). Many praised her greatness, for example, Walter Lippmann wrote that she was ‘not good but great’ (in Davis 1973:291), others saw her as ‘a channel through which the moral life of her country flowed’ (Spanish 2002:5).

Addams’s significance grew out of her gift for interpreting and understanding social reality and for putting her ideas on the national agenda (Bethke Elshtain 2002a; Knight 2005). She communicated to American people some of the problems and difficulties facing immigrants in the cities and tried to convince the nation that ‘the welfare ideology, and ultimate the welfare state, were both right and practical’.

6 In 1915, when women peace activists founded the Women’s Peace Party, Addams, who viewed femininity as central to women’s role as peacemakers, became it president and chaired its large peace conference in The Hague (Addams et al. (2003)). When the USA entered the war, in 1917, Addams did not change her pacifist stance and virtually overnight, she ‘who has been an American heroine, repetitive of all the best of American democracy, was transformed into a villain by her opposition to the war’ (Davis 1973: 251). For her uncompromising stance in the name of mediation, war enthusiasts denounced her as a dangerous and ‘an unpatriotic subversive out to demasculinize the nation’s sons’ (Alonso 1994: 208).
She believed that public intellectuals had a duty not only to criticize but also to affirm. ‘They could not just tear down. They, too, had to build’ (Addams in Bethke Elshtain 2002a:xxix). Addams also assumed that that writers and public intellectuals had a duty to instil in ‘the educated a sense of social responsibility’ (Eyerman 1994:118). Thus Hull House was not a philanthropic effort but the undertaking out of ‘the duties of good citizenship’ (Addams [1893] 2002:45). Jane Addams’s ability to imagine and to bring into being ‘the astonishing institution’, without which many would be much worse off (Bethke Elshtain 2002b:254), made her voice more respected and thus engaged in conversation with a public which shared her civic concerns. ‘The voice of the Hull-House public served as a check on narrow, specialised, and monolithic points of view. It was from this rich venue that Addams launched herself into the public debates of her time’ (Bethke Elshtain 2006:88).

Addams’s uniqueness is a result of her idea of civic activism, her attempt to operate in a middle ground by challenging the usual division between liberal and conservative views, by searching for a way to close the gap between private and public. Addams distinguished herself from other progressive intellectuals by insisting that the secret of success in all social action is cooperation and by stressing the importance of every citizen’s participation in the democracy for a general welfare. Her ambivalence about the consequences of industrialization, as illustrated by her ‘the most discerning studies of industrial society to be found in the literature of social criticism’ (Lasch 1965:xiv), also set her apart from those celebrating the progressive spirit (Bethke Elshtain 2002a:xxxii). She was a promoter of reforms through direct action but argued that action must be preceded by thought, that “the activities of life can be changed in no other way than by changing the current ideas upon which it is conducted” (Addams [1910]1925: 243).

Adams’s rich heritage for social sciences and her contribution to the development of the welfare ideology and welfare state have been slowly rediscovered. The realization that Addams ‘helped to shape American sociology in a fundamental way’ (Deegan 1986:323), is only a first step towards establishing her as a central figure in sociology.

**Emily Greene Balch: a pioneering sociologist of immigration**

Emily Greene Balch (1967–1961), who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1946 for her persistent fight for peace and for her efforts in promoting international cooperation, is another forgotten women sociologist (Feagin 2001). She was professor sociology and political economy at Wellesley College between 1886 and 1918, during which time she wrote her major academic works and established her reputation as a scholar of immigration and a social science analyst who promoted the integration of social theories with social activism. Balch, like Addams, attended the first meeting of the American Sociological Society held at Providence, Rhode Island, December 27–29 1906, where she took part in the discussion on ‘Western civilization’ (the ASA webpage archives). Deegan (1986:317) claims that Balch was not recognised by male sociologists, evidence of which is, accroding to Deegan (1986), the fact that when Balch spoke on the topic of war and militarism at the ASS
meeting in 1915, over twenty male sociologists declined an invitation to comment on her address.

Balch came to contact with sociology during her undergraduate years in Bryn Mawr where she studied it with Frank Giddings ‘who stressed altruism I and talked about the common of ethical society (Palmieri 1996 :193). In her undergraduate essay, titled ‘The disadvantage of conventionality’, Balch wrote, on the one hand, about the need for conformity at the level of society, while stressing, on the other hand, that in larger questions and in all moral issues ‘unconventionality must snap the chain and substitute a new and higher practice’ ( quoted in Palmieri 1996:193).

In 1889, Balch was awarded Bryn Mawr’s highest honour, the European Fellowship, which she used to study economics at the Sorbonne in Paris. The results of her research on public relief for the poor in France were published by the American Economic Association as Public Assistance of the Poor on France. Already in her first book, Balch showed her ability to combine historical and economic analysis with an organizational analysis. Although her study of the development of care for the poor was recognized as a significant work, ‘it did not become part of the classic literature in sociology’ (Deegan 1983:101).

On her return to Boston in 1891, Balch worked as social worker with as a group of social reformers and sociologists. Her contacts ‘with members of the Boston sociological group whose methods and personalities’ had an impact on her future (Randall 1964:84). Her fieldwork in Boston and her reforming activities, alongside of ‘this group, which Emily called the “Bostonian aristocracy of goodness and public spirit”’, taught her how to address social problems caused by the processes of industrialization and urbanization (Randall 1964:84–5). Inspired to pursue an academic career, Balch took course in the Harvard Annex in 1893 and in the University of Chicago (Stenersen et al 2001:140). Finally, in 1895–6 she went to Berlin to study the German social welfare system and the public employment exchange, where she attended Simmel’s lectures (Deegan 1983:103).

In 1896, back in Boston, Balch accepted teaching position in economics at Wellesley College and in1900 became a member of the newly founded department of Economics and Sociology which course-work focused on sociological, political and economic issues (Deegan 1983:95–96). In 1900 she was asked to organize Wellesley’s first course in sociology (Abrams 1988 : 143). Her twenty two years in Wellesley College were rich in social pioneering in various areas of teaching, research and social activism. Balch’s teaching revolved around social and economic problems and sociological theory; she taught courses on general sociology, the labour movement in the nineteenth century, economic consumption, the role of women in the economy and social reforms. Balch (1920:xx) was, as she herself observed, perhaps the first college professor to devote a course to the subject of immigration, which was described as ‘a study of immigration into the United States, the race elements represented, and their geographical distribution, the social, political and economic influence of our foreign populations, the history of restrictive legislation, and the arrangements thus far provided for the reception and care of aliens’ (in Deegan 1983:97). Her other course, Socialism III, Balch presented as a ‘critical study of modern socialism, including the main theories and political movements. Special attention will be given to Karl Marx’ (in Deegan 1983:97). Balch’s courses were not only innovative in topics and content, her teaching also
included many practical subjects dealing with the issues of poverty, slums and crime. Her teaching had the advantage of a certain first-hand quality as she used her experience gained as a social reformer to expand her students’ social imagination (Randall 1964:111; Wasson 1987:48). She promoted fieldwork in the city Boston and introduced her students to both to theory and social activism (Palmieri 1996:198).

In 1903 Emily Balch published ‘A Study of Conditions of City Life’, a bibliography of literature of addressing issues of urban areas. ‘This extensive listing clearly pre-dates much of the concern with the same topic which later emerged at the famous ‘Chicago School’ of sociology’ (Deegan 1983:103). In 1905–06, in order to carry out her research on the Slav immigration to America, Balch took a sabbatical leave to travel through East and Central Europe. The study of Slav immigration also included the field work in the U.S. Balch’s first-hand inquiry in Europe and America resulted in a publication of a pioneering work describing the social character and consequences of the immigration from Bohemia and Eastern Europe. Our Slavic Fellow Citizens, published in 1910, is an original comprehensive sociological portrait of an immigrant community. The book was much acclaimed and remains a basic work in the field. Balch’s work served to undermine many prevailing discriminatory assumptions of her day. Schneider (2003), while reviewing the literature on women immigrants to the United States, notes that Emily Balch is one of the pioneers of women’s social science studies of immigration issues and that her book was the first attempt to investigate systematically a great stream of migration, its sources, its effects on the emigrants themselves, the country of their origin and their new country. Our Slavic Fellow is, according to Schneider (2003), one of the first major sociological book on immigration and an outstanding example of early scholarly research. Balch’s study not only pre-dated Thomas and Znaniecki’s The Polish Peasants in Europe and America (1918–1920), but also her ‘grasp of economic factors in immigration, firmly establishes her as a significant forerunner’ (Deegan 1983:104).

In 1906, Balch, who rejected Marxism but was sympathetic to ethical claims of socialism, informed the Wellesley College administration that she was a socialist. She was aware that she placed herself in a vulnerable position. In her journal, she wrote ‘Within the year I have decided to call myself a socialist and accepted appointment at Wellesley only on condition of the president knowing this. It will lead to some misunderstanding, of course, but hope to some better understanding too’ (Balch 1972:48). Although she feared for her position, yet her professional standing was already such that her political persuasion had no consequence at this point. The publication of Our Slavic Fellow Citizens as well as many earlier writings\(^7\) established her reputation as a sound social scientist (Abrams 1988:143).

\(^7\)Balch’s publications are: Public Assistance of the Poor on France (1893), Our Slavic Fellow Citizens (1910), Women at the Hague(with J. Addams and A. Hamilton)(1915), Approaches to the Great Settlement (1918), Occupied Haiti (1927), Refugees as Assets (1930), The Miracle of Living (poems) (1941) Vignettes in Prose (1952), Beyond Nationalism. The Social Thought of Emily Greene Balch (ed. by M.M. Randall) (1972)

For the full list of Emily Greene Balch’s publication see Balch (1972) which has a collection of documents, published and unpublished with comprehensive list of her publications. Also see also the website of Swarthmore College peace Collection and note 6.
In 1913 she received a new five year appointment as professor and as the second only chair in sociology in Wellesley's department of Economics and Sociology (Alonso 1994: 205). During the following years she became increasingly convinced of the need of great social change to correct the competitive and unjust economic system. In addition to her academic carrier, Balch retrained an active interest in reform, among many of her off-campus activities, she continued her concern with immigration issues ( Abrams 1988; Randall 1964). Apart from well over a hundred articles on women, labour, and social settlement, another genre of Balch's writings included pamphlets, petitions, and policy recommendation.8

The outbreak of WWI had a powerful impact on Balch not only because she saw it as 'a tragic break in the work', which to her appeared to be ‘the real task of our time: to construct a more satisfying economic order’, but also because it changed her own life (Balch quoted in Jahn [1946]2006:2). From the start of the war, Balch, a pacifist since 1898, decided to devote her energy to the work for peace. She joined Jane Addams in her efforts to keep the United States out of WWI and in her work for US mediation between the warring sides. In 1915 Balch obtained a leave of absence from Wellesley to participate in to the International Congress of Woman at The Hague. During the course of this women’s peace conference she played a constructive role by helping to prepare the mediation plan for ending the war (Paterson1959). In order to work for peace and to participate in the women’s peace movement, Emily Balch took another unpaid leave of absence from Wellesley in 1917–1918.

While attending the International Congress of Women in Zurich in 1919, Balch was informed about the decision of Wellesley College not to renew her appointment. Although the news was not a surprise and although she, in her own words, ‘overstrained the habitual liberty of Wellesley college’, she ‘felt deeply about the loosing her researching job’(Balch 1972:79). The dismissal from Wellesley’s faculty for her anti-war views left her at fifty-two without an income, with her ‘professional life cut off short and no particular prospect’ (Balch 1972:79). Subsequently, Balch accepted an invitation to join the editorial staff of the Nation, weekly in which she soon began publishing articles in support of the struggle for peace (Balch1972:79). She continued her visible role as a pacifist by publishing Approaches to the Great Settlement (1918), which discusses ways to peacefully end the war.

After the end of WWI, Balch turned her emphasis towards women international pacifism as she discovered that this movement provided the most integrated framework for the expression of her beliefs (Wasson 1987:49). However, she still continued her interests in the issue of migration, for example, her book Refugees as Assets (1930) was an argument for the US acceptance of refugees from Nazi Germany for economic, cultural and humanitarian reasons. In 1935 Balch was elected honorary president of WILP International, the position in which she continued to serve until her death. She wrote many specific proposals in which she urged the League of Nations to recognize a need to reform, revise treaties and

---

she address not only diplomatic but also economic question and expressed her ‘planetary concerns’ in many proposals for setting up different supranational authorities for coming to accord on different matters and in her campaigns to promote international cooperation in non-political fields.

During WWII, Balch, despite her age, worked hard to provide support and help for moral and conscientious objectors and refugees from Europe. All her work during WWII earned her a reputation of being someone who in the time of distress can be both ‘good and intelligent’ (Randall 1964:368). In 1946 friends in university circles set up a ‘Committee to sponsor Emily Greene Balch for the Nobel Peace Prize’ (Stenersen et al 2001:141). Interestingly, Balch was recommended for Nobel Peace award by the president of Wellesley College and by many scholars, including John Dewey (Keene 1998:127). In his Nobel Peace Prize presentation speech, Jahn ([1946] 2006:1), a chairman of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, praised Belch’s contribution to giving to many proposals and reforms practical and realistic form and for teaching us that ‘reality we seek must be earned by hard and unrelenting toil in the world in which we live, but she has taught us more; that exhaustion is unknown and defeat only gives new fresh courage to the man whose soul is fired by the sacred flame’ (ibid : 5). In her Nobel lecture ‘Towards Human Unity or Beyond Nationalism’, Balch showed a strong sense of realism by advocating a gradual and pluralistic approach. She believed in the development of international unity, while recognizing that a world government could only be developed gradually. She found a way to capitalize upon her knowledge to devise ways in which people could become interested in international affairs and in finding solutions to such problems.

Balch’s imaginative proposals for gradual international progress through functional cooperation and rationalization of non-political matters are remarkable because of her key conceptions and methods were rooted in her scholarly knowledge. Emily Balch’s reoccupation with ideas of peace, liberty and freedom did not remain academic, she turned readily from theory to practice, from thought to action. ‘Though she never held any high public office and made her contributions largely outside governmental agencies, she managed through her tireless work of writing, travel, organization, and more uniquely by effective and continued letter writing to achieve a wide hearing and influence’ (Randall 1964:326).

Emily Balch was a ‘brilliant woman intellectual who bore the indefiniteness of her life with grace of stamina’ (Palmieri 1996:187) and who had real talent for organizing and restructuring organizational networks, which she could activate, without waiting for governments, to propose and carry out required reform. Throughout her subsequent careers as social work, sociologist, reformer, and peace activist, Balch was an effective advocate for international cooperation and unity. She entered sociology at the beginning of twentieth century with high hopes that it would provide her with resources to examine critically the social order of the day and to understand her civic responsibly and express it effectively in action. Her political philosophy of pacifism, her civic radicalism and her imaginative proposal for working together through international authorities towards ‘planetary civilization’ earned her reputation among American peace activists as of one of their intellectual leader (Bussey and Tims 1965).
Alva Myrdal: ‘A Writers of the Most Read Articles of the Social Sciences in Sweden’ (Ekerwald 2000:344)

Alva Myrdal (1902–1986), a laureate of 1982 Nobel Peace Prize, was one of the most influential of the 20th century Swedish public intellectuals who anticipated the centrality of gender issues to the development of welfare state. She was the social reformer, politician and social scientist, the internationally well known theorist of family and women friendly welfare policy, educator, one of the founders of the Swedish welfare state, diplomat, and the disarmament negotiator. She ‘changed society for women at the same time as she made important contributions to the social science’ (Ekerwald 2000:344). She researched family sociology, sexual politics, education and children care as well as the issue of peace and conflicts. Myrdal’s contributions to reforms of family planning, housing, and education system left the important legacy. Her writings and activities also provided powerful arguments for the peace movement in Sweden and internationally. ‘She was a writer of the most read articles of the social sciences in Sweden. In her research she analysed ingeniously empirical materials representing a broad spectrum of social affairs ranging from housing, education and child care to disbarment and international relations’ (Ekerwald 2000:344).

Although now Alva Myrdal is perceived one of the most important Swedish sociologists, she ‘did not identified herself as sociologist’ as the discipline of sociology did not exist in Sweden when she studied at university (Ekerwald 2000:344). Alva Myrdal, who never finished her doctoral thesis (Lyon 2007:835), published many books and hundreds of articles,9 gave numerous lectures and speeches and directed research programs, such as the major project on racism (UNESCO in 1953). Though initially most of Myrdal’s writings and organisational work ‘were on part-time and voluntary basis with women teachers and reformers’ (Ekerwald 2000:421) and though she did not hold any important position until she was in her forties, her later career, included many prominent jobs, provided her with high profile international reputation and took her to many countries. She worked for many governmental commissions, was one of the first female ministers and woman ambassador in Sweden, the highest ranking woman in the UN Secretariat, chairman of UNESCO’s social science section. After 1949, when she headed the United Nations’ section dealing with welfare policy, Myrdal’s concerns for equality, social justice and public welfare became international in scope. Myrdal was a symbol of the fight for the progress of women towards greater equality in all spheres of public life. ‘She is the most influential intellectual in the Swedish Women’s movement’ (Ekerwald 2000:345). Her work as chief Sweden’s delegate at the Geneva Disarmament Conference 1962-1966 established her reputation as symbol of the achievements and ordeals of nuclear disarmament process. Yet Myrdal’s high profile public career meant that her contribution to sociology has been for a long time

9 Alva Myrdal’s publications include books written with Gunnar Myrdal, such as The Crisis in the Population Question (1934) and Contact with America (1941). She also published Nation and Family. New York: Harper and Brothers (1945), Women’s Two Roles with V. Klein. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul (1956), The Game of Disarmament: How the United States and Russia Run the Arms Race. New York: Pantheon (1976)
overlooked. ‘Academic outside the feminist field of studies have tended to overlooked her contributions, although if they were compared with studies by her contemporaries few would be able to compete with her in terms of argument, skilful analyse of broad empirical materials, broad and original social science thinking and an ability to change the way people look at t things’ (Ekerwald 2000:345).

Alva Myrdal was very innovative and creative thinker and writer, who combined clear vision about the problems of the world with humanism and optimism and left significant contributions to sociology. Myrdal, whose main frame of reference was the organized movements and the ruling Social Democratic party, also exemplified. mixture of patriotism and internationalism, which expressed itself in her advocacy of the global issue of poverty, human rights, refugees and in her promotion of reforms of the Swedish social system. She, together with her husband, Gunnar Myrdal, contributed to an understanding of the race problem in America and provided a reconceptualization of economic development in post-colonial Asia. The Myrdals also proposed solutions to many national problems, such as the problem of housing, population decline and the issue of family and children. ‘It can be said without exaggeration that no other social science-oriented public intellectuals have had a greater impact on issues that are still extant,—and now more likely to be treated under the rubric ‘globalization’,—than the Myrdals’ (Lyman and Eliason2001:439).

The Myrdals, both jointly and separately, not only ‘introduced and established American sociology in Sweden’, but also ‘influenced 20th century social thought, socioeconomic methodology, and public policy’ (Lyon 2001:515).

Alva Myrdal’s primary academic interest was in child welfare, family and the role of women. In 1934 the Myrdals published The Crisis of the Population Question, a book which had an important influence on social polices throughout Scandinavia and contributed to Gunnar and Alva’s growing reputation in the fields of population problems. In the context of the crisis in the Swedish population in the 1930 s, the Myrdals, with the help of the new functionalist social science, made the family an object of scientific investigation and administration and asserted that ‘the family structure as well as moral and ethical values was a function of social development’ (Eyerman 1994:158). The book was seen as ‘a manifesto of the Swedish Welfare’ (Ekerwald 2001:542) as it proposed radical reforms to improve conditions for the poor, for women and children and promoted equality of opportunity, publicized and politicized the role experts- intellectuals (Eyerman 1994:158).

Alva Myrdal in her own book on population issues, Nation and Family, which was published in Sweden in1941 (in English 1945) and which established her as an expert in this area, addressed many dilemmas connected with the relation between social rights of citizenships and women’s rights and provided a feminist account of the national welfare state, or what has come to be referred to as the ‘women-friendly’ welfare state’. While analysing of procreation in modern societies, Myrdal (1945:49–55) focused on sexuality, identity and social conditions and pointed out that it is impossible to separate personal or psychological from economic and social motives behind having a child. She asked what principles underline a responsible family policy in any country and looked at the measure that society ought to take in order not to only counter poverty and suffering but also to promote a way of life that people inspire to. Myrdal presented Sweden’s experience with social reforms as an experiment; one that other nations could examine and learn from. While s stressing
the democratic nature of the Swedish efforts to shape a family policy, she noted that only the population policy of democratic state can create ‘a new stronghold for married women’s fight for their right to work’ (Myrdal 1945:1231).

Among sociologists Alva Myrdal is probably best known for *Women’s Two Roles: Home and Work*, a book written with Viola Klein and first published in Britain in 1956. While Myrdal, using her many governmental and organizational contacts, collected data regarding women in the labour market, it was left to Viola Klein’s statistical precision to organize their presentation and interpretation (Lyon 2007) Klein, one of Britain’s first sociologists of women whose contribution is still largely unrecognized, used her ‘academic and research experience to synthesise the material in comparative tables and summaries, to empirically ground the practical policy recommendations’ (Lyon 2007:836). It took four years of collaboration conducted mainly by correspondence before Myrdal’s old draft manuscript on the policy consequences of the increased longevity of women was submitted to the Routledge’s International Library of Sociology. It was initially rejected as being ‘too American’ for the British audience due to its emphasis on empirical data, although later the book’s comparative framework was appreciated and perceived as its strength (Lyon 2007:837).

The attraction of *Women’s Two Roles: Home and Work* for both policy makers and a wider non academic audience meant that the book was used over the next decades as a key sociological teaching text on women in the social structure and was translated into German, Spanish, Swedish, Dutch and Japanese (Lyon 2007:837). It was praised for not only for bringing together data from four countries which allowed readers to assess trends in the women employed since 1900 until 1950, but also for its important contribution to developing conception of modern womanhood. The work made the gender issues central to the development of democratic politics by providing policy makers with a range of practical proposals for combing work and childcare supported across all aspects of public and community life. Presenting a comparative synthesis of empirical evidence, the book called for ‘re-definition of women’s role in society’ (Myrdal and Klein 1956: 25). The sociological core of the book was an analysis of three factors responsible for a new women’s role in society, an analysis of changes to the structure of the family and an analysis of changes to women’s rights to choose the nature for their relationship with children and work. ‘Myrdal’s basic concern was to outline a democratic social policy consistent with a progressive and essentially feminist conception of emerging women’s rights’ (Holmwood 2000: 39). The book’s compromise solutions to the dilemma of women’s two roles ‘remain as relevant as ever’ (Lyon 2002:10).

Alva Myrdal, one of the most influential reformers and moulders of public opinion associated with the ideology and praxes of social democracy in Sweden, contributed to the development of democratic social policy in which the gender issues are central. In the context of the building of the Swedish welfare state, her role as the expert and creator of public opinion was not unusual as Swedish reformers of that time tend to combine the role of expert intellectuals and agitator roles—‘to become what can be called rationalizing intellectuals’ (Eyerman 1994:151). As in the process of creating modern democratic welfare state social sciences ‘were given a key role’ (Eyerman 1994:154), Alva Myrdal, who believed in democracy and
relied on a solid foundation of scientific facts, became the most famous public figure in Sweden (Ekerwald 2005:3).

Myrdal’s allegiance to a democratic form of government was well known as she was never afraid of speaking up whenever democratic values or processes where under threat. Her ‘very personal way of concretising general ideas’ contributed to her success in influencing public opinion and established her image as a ‘creator of public opinion’ (Theorin 2001:3). Alva Myrdal was ‘a true intellectual, continuously exchanging views with scientists and leading politicians, who provided her with inspiration for policy work’ (Theorin 2001:2). Through her writings and in her distinguished career she was an enormous source of inspiration, exercised enormous power over public opinion and managed to place on the international political agenda many issues which had previously been excluded. Her persistent advocacy forced such issues as gender, development issues, peace research and the issue of poverty and hunger aboard on the top of the political agenda, in Sweden and outside. Although there is now criticism of Myrdal’s stand on Swedish sterilization politics and her population policy in general, the positive value of her radical proposals, which directly influenced the government’s decisions to assume responsibility for the well-being of all children, regardless of the financial situation of their parents, and prompted reforms in the fields of family, housing, and population policy cannot be underestimated. Similarly, while it is possible to criticise Myrdal for her limited view on gender related division of work, for her uncritical acceptance of the American ideals in schooling and for her top down model of making alterations, we need also to recognize the value of Myrdal’s many other texts which are ‘forgotten pearls’ of the past (Hijalmeskog 2002: 9, 2).

In all her activities, Myrdal’s basic aim was to design and facilitate democratic social policies coherent with feminist conception of women’s rights. Through her activities and writings she managed to put feminism on public agenda and to raise the aspirations of her contemporaries about what modern and emancipated women should and could achieve both at work and in the home. She was engaged with social science research and its popular dissemination. In her studies Alva Myrdal ‘moved freely between the social sciences, nonetheless her contribution to sociology and if we appropriate her here as sociologist it is because of the value of her social analyses, not because of any formal position (Ekerwald 2000:344).

Conclusion

The careers of the three sociologists and public intellectuals who won the Nobel Peace Prize provide us with evidence helping to illuminate contemporary discussion about the public role of sociologists, the public authority of intellectuals and public sociology. There are several important lessons for contemporary sociologists who

10 Alva Myrdal’ work was criticized recently for supporting Swedish sterilization politics. Yet, as Ekerwald (2000:3) notes, portraying Alva as ‘a eugenic utopian’ constructs a ‘false image’ of her. Moreover, Alva Myrdal’ work needs to be seen in historical context. Myrdal, in book Nation and Family (1945) stressed that the Swedish efforts to shape a family policy, unlike the Nazi pronatalist and racist family propaganda was democratic. See also Holmwood’s (2000:45–46) answer to this criticism.
aspire to practice public sociology and take the role of public intellectuals. Specifically, these three cases affirm, on the one hand, that sociology has a direct contribution to make to democratic debates and, on the other hand, the centrality of professional sociology in the sociological division of labour. Moreover, their intellectuals’ standings also suggest the importance of the courage of conviction as the essential building block of the authority to speak out on broad issues of public concern.

Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch and Alva Myrdal’s idea of sociology’s contribution to improving the quality of public discussion, like Burawoy’s (2005) idea of public sociology, stresses an organic relation between sociology and its various publics. These three independent intellectuals assumed that sociology is a means by which democracy is supported and improved. They took on the role of public intellectual as ‘democracy helpers’ (Kenny 2004:89) and were able to introduce sociology to the public arena because of their vivid imaginations, breath of sociological and intellectual interests, originality, ability to avoid the drawbacks of undue professionalism and their moral passion. Three women, being well equipped to bring to public view the complexities of social problems, contributed to the establishment and cultivation of democratic discourse and culture by enhancing people’s understanding, thinking and arguing about social issues.

The careers of the three sociologists and public intellectuals also provide us with an answer to the vital question of what does in fact provide intellectuals with the authority to earn the attention of a general audience. Addams, Balch and Myrdal’s achievements as public intellectuals and their input into public life document that the essential feature of public intellectuals’ authority is their professional knowledge and their standing in the field. Although Addams, Balch and Myrdal wrote when the process of the institutionalization of sociology in their respective nations had only begun, their presence on the public stage had a lot to do with their authority as social scientists. They managed not only to establish the link between scientists’ circles and a non specialist public but also to voice powerful arguments—based on knowledge—for reforms. Their projects of changes to national or international orders were rooted in their arguments for reason, planning and cooperation. For example, Addams’s belief that human beings possess a new method, ‘that of cooperative and experimental science’ (Addams quoted in Randall 1964: xx), prompted her to become actively involved in women international efforts for world peace, Balch’s proposals of reform were attempts at the rationalization of the anarchy of the international system, while Myrdal voiced and supported proposals of reforms aiming to rationalize and improve the state’s functions and services. Addams,Balch and Myrdal’s sociological knowledge provided them with the professional legitimacy, which allowed them to put important issues on the public agenda. In other words, the importance of intellectuals’ professional achievements is connected with the fact that their creative accomplishments provided them with the reputation to speak out on broader issues (Misztal 2007).

Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch and Alva Myrdal’s goals to improve women’s well-being and to reach a public audience resemble Burawoy’s (2005) aspirations for public sociology to improve lives of people and to serve to the purpose of improving democratic discussion. All three women participated in social movements and in non-governmental organizations, the forums which are also the main arenas of the
engagement for public sociologists (Burawoy 2005). Moreover, their relations with these organizations and movements were not of those of experts but rather, as Burawoy suggests for public sociologists, dialogical ones. Burawoy (2005) argues that public sociology, while adopting the neutrality assumption, still is a means of improving the quality of public discussion through the subsidization of opinion diversity (Turner 2007:793). In the same way, Addams, Balch and Myrdal’s successful relations with their audiences justified sociology for its capacity to enrich democratic debates.

Addams, Balch and Myrdal’s model of sociology represented the standpoint of a specific group and it reflected this group’s interests and views on the main social and political issues of the day. If we compare, for example, Addams and Balch reactions to the WWI with those of Weber or Durkheim’s, we noticed that both founding fathers of sociology ‘succumbed to the relevant nationalistic passion for their own country’ (Nielsen 2004: 1620), while these women had the courage to find their own voice. In contrast to Weber and Durkheim, whose moral political agenda ‘has nothing to do with any privileged sociological insight into that nature of social phenomenon’ (Nielsen 2004: 1620), Addams and Balch’s stand (and also Myrdal’s reaction to the WWII) represented beliefs and values of their women’s constituencies. Addams, Balch and Myrdal’s engagement in the public sphere, while helped by their creative imagination and stimulated by their specialised knowledge, demanded not only choosing the risk and uncertainty of the public sphere over security and safety of the professional fields but also passing value judgments, and thus being answerable for ideas behind these judgments. Addams, Balch and Myrdal all got very a high score on the accounts of the professional achievements and the courage of conventions, and this score endowed them with the authority to speak out on broader issues and determined their public intellectual positions.

While Burawoy (2005) points out that the individual sociologist may engage simultaneously in more than one type of sociology, the careers of Addams, Balch and Myrdal additionally illustrate possibilities of the merge of several roles, namely the roles of scholar, public intellectual and reformer, as well as the relation between the private and public spheres. Their many public projects seem to have succeeded because they skilfully combined their scholarly credential and knowledge with their social activism. Their influence on the public can be seen as a result of their capacity to bring together all their achievements in various fields in service of their nations and the international society as well as in service of specific interests. As all three women were public intellectuals before the monopolization of intellectuals by the university has taken place, they established a symbiotic relationship between their private worlds and their public audiences that they addressed, and this means that the academia, even for Balch who worked at the university, was not their only home.

To sum up, our discussion of careers and achievements of Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch and Alva Myrdal shows that what gives intellectuals the authority to speak to a general audience is their professional standing as well as in their ability to courageously uphold and act upon their core civic values. As we look forward to a new cosmopolitan model of the intellectual, these three women’s work for cosmopolitanism and pacifism and their involvement in workings of international organizations suggest ways and means through today’s public intellectuals can achieve international visibility, status and recognition.
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