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This paper explores how changing conceptions of religion, race, and gender at the beginning of the twentieth century promoted transnational anti-systemic movements and increased cooperation between progressive intellectuals and political activists. Using the cases of Bertrand Russell, George Bernard Shaw, W.E.B. Du Bois, Marcus Garvey, Jane Addams, and Sylvia Pankhurst, this paper chronicles and analyzes protest to the First World War and objection to the organization of the world-system.
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Introduction

Anti-Systemic Movements of the World War I Era

Voices of protest to inequalities in the world-system help define the protest, as does the practical execution and organization of the protest. Immanuel Wallerstein, principal advocate of world-system analysis, defines the world-system as “not the system of the world, but a system that is a world and that can be, most often has been, located in an area less than the entire globe.” The world-system referred to in this study can generally be defined as the areas affected by World War I, which include Europe, the United States, and the areas either colonized or otherwise economically and culturally linked with the belligerent nations, such as Africa and the Caribbean. Since the Revolutions of 1848, the dominant ideology of the world-system had grown out of “a clear liberal program for the core countries” and sparked opposition in the form of anti-systemic movements from portions Wallerstein identifies under two categories: social and national. Social movements become more efficient in their production alongside technological and cultural advances. Increased and accelerated transport of people, goods, and ideas enables the rapid growth of communities and strengthens ties between distant cultures.

Progressive politics at the turn of the twentieth century not only championed Frederick Winslow Taylor and the Efficiency Movement, but applied the same principles they proposed for a less wasteful society to produce a more efficient model of activism. The transformation of anti-systemic activity from localized social and national struggles
to a transnational network of activist groups allowed progressive causes to attract international attention and produce protest actions for larger audiences and with greater affiliations. Progressive activists recognized the benefits of bringing together local movements which emerged as individual phenomenon and establishing international organizations as the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), the Fabian Society, and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) and cultivated these advances in activist organization and implementation by taking advantage of advances in social production. A boom in the intellectual class and a reception of certain intellectuals as celebrities reflected the veneration of experts central to Taylorism. Intellectuals who enjoyed celebrity often used it to advance their political and social causes. Celebrity activist intellectuals provided not only leadership and the articulation of progressive ideas, but also served as recognizable and reproducible symbols of reform and activism. The use of celebrity activist intellectuals as brands demonstrated a more efficient use of human resources, adapting the division of labor to changes in reception resulting from a greater familiarity with liberalism and industrialization and methods of reception as urban populations and newspaper circulations grew to function more productively.

Using six prominent activist intellectuals from the transatlantic world, I explore the changing social identity of the intellectual as expressed in their political activism during the First World War. Examining the redefinition of intellectuals as a social category in conjunction with the reconsideration of other social categories, I show how changes in conceptions of race, gender, and spirituality affected and enabled the expansion of the intellectual’s social role to include providing criticism of the world-
system, engaging in political and social activism, and representing opposition to dominant ideologies. Examining the wealth of documents left by the intellectuals selected for this study, I try to resolve how the intellectuals themselves perceived the development of transnational activist networks, their role in developing these networks, their own intellectual development, the validity of classifying intellectuals as a social group, and how they viewed themselves within that social grouping.

Reflecting the diversity of intellectual activists during the Progressive Era, Bertrand Russell, George Bernard Shaw, Marcus Garvey, W.E.B. Du Bois, Jane Addams, and Sylvia Pankhurst are the subjects of my case studies. They were born in four different countries, came from a wide range of economic and educational backgrounds, and proposed distinct alternatives to the world-system. Thus they represented several perspectives within the intellectual class and championed the liberation of several subordinated social groups. Each of my chapters focuses on a pair of intellectuals whose ideas crystallized changing definitions of race, gender, and spiritual convictions in the early decades of the twentieth century. Within each pairing, I use members of the intelligentsia who experienced the political climate of the First World War at different stages of their intellectual development and I argue that their responses to the conflict reflect the dynamics of the social phenomena I use them to address.

The movements and networks of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries planted the seeds of modern transnational and cross-cultural political protest. The globally minded and globally organized anti-systemic activists that protest the injustices of the world-system in its present form may use different technologies than earlier activists but they use many of the same tools as the progressive movements discussed in
this study. Schools, regular and irregular publications, socially conscious economic behavior, constant letter writing, and fringe political parties continue to serve in challenges to the global order. Through continued reassertion of the intellectual’s role and responsibility to engage in political discourse and dissent, the identity of the activist intellectual has been reified in the gospel of social stratification, impacting the intellectual class as collectively defined. Throughout the twentieth century, anti-systemic movements continued to market the concept of the activist intellectual to reach larger audiences. During World War I, figures like Bertrand Russell, a member of the Royal Academy, possibly the most long-standing private intellectual society, and W.E.B. Du Bois, the first African-American to earn a Ph.D., following studies at Harvard University and the University of Berlin, established their authority and infamy as activist intellectuals by performing intellectual labor, producing social and political critiques, and defending progressive causes to audiences assumed to be members of the intellectual class. The creation of celebrities out of activist intellectuals, as difficult as creating any type of celebrities, demands strategy and talent. Fostering thoughtful dissent by artists, writers, and theatre people, playwrights such as Bernard Shaw allowed many people in the arts and entertainment industry to rise beyond their labor and become identified as activist intellectuals. The popularity of mass-marketed music has since its arrival created political commentators, many who championed progressive causes, from John Lennon to Joan Baez to Public Enemy. Arts and entertainment, especially popular music, has proven an effective marketing strategy for bringing activism into both popular culture and the global consciousness. Some questions arise: do these activist intellectuals see themselves as activist intellectuals? How do they view their role in the process of global
transformation? How do they respond to the celebrity that came with their activism and intellectual triumphs and how do they use that celebrity? In an interview about his activism in Africa, contemporary pop activist intellectual Bono described his celebrity as “currency” to used for activism.iii

Who Are the Intellectuals?

The evolving definition of intellectuals as a social group allows scholars to interpret the classification somewhat at will. While no one denies that intellectual labor exists, attempts at measuring or ascribing a value to intellectual labor prove impossible despite many shared characteristics among members of the intellectual class, such as access to education, engagement in public affairs, and recognition by others as intellectuals. Posing a problem for strict materialists and conventional sociologists, ambiguities and stark differences regarding economic background, cultural and national loyalty, and access to power within the intellectual class demand that scholars apply a specific criterion for defining the intellectual class different from the criteria used to categorize social stratum or movements that can be easily identified using class, culture, and power as demarcations. In assessing how the intellectual class has developed, Aleksander Gella suggests that neither the fruits of intellectual labor, “the raw material with which [the intellectual class] is dealing (ideas, values, cultural goods),” nor one’s comparative level of education should serve as the parameters by which the intellectual class is measured. Rather, the class must be defined “according to its position and function within the socio-political structure of society.”iv
Members of the intellectual class who arise from within or become intellectually involved with protest movements articulate and publicize the causes of those movements, allowing their resistance to become viable forces in the collective consciousness. Since the emergence of the intellectual as a social entity, politics have greatly influenced intellectual activity and public reception of that activity. The celebrity and notoriety of activist intellectuals creates a political and social element beyond and within the details of their intellectual labor. In etymological history, the term “intellectual” makes its first appearance in the nineteenth century when it was employed to describe critics of the persecution of Alfred Dreyfus in France in 1894. This conception of the intellectual parallels the emergence of similar social element in Russia, Germany, and Poland, referred to as the “intelligentsia.” For my purposes, these terms are somewhat interchangeable. Aleksander Gella notes that this is “quite typical” of American scholars. This conceptual approach is more formalist than historical, removing from the concept of the intellectual the social element traces of a particular society, viewing the intellectual as a fluid classification applicable in different times and spaces. This approach allows the intellectual to be treated as a meaningful political variable in different circumstances and allows for the comparison of different intellectuals and groups of intellectuals within that classification. Defining and defending that categorization can be difficult since the position of intellectual is not obtained biologically, materially or legally; rather a person gains some authority as a critic and is elevated to intellectual status. The identity is entirely social, determined by the relevance of intellectual labor to the society.
Though a tradition of intellectuals engaging in public affairs existed prior to the nineteenth century, the political and economic changes induced by widespread revolutions and ongoing industrialization that affected the intellectual as a social element. Political revolutions created government jobs that served bureaucratic and social needs. Industrialization placed an economic importance on science and engineering while increased literacy created a market for scholarship in the humanities. These changes busted “the shackles of ecclesiastical and courtly patronage” that had determined the influence of intellectuals in a world-system dominated by religious institutions and monarchial governments. On that account, we can assume that intellectual liberty, at least in Europe, emerged in a state of educated infancy less than three hundred years ago. Surfacing middle classes in industrial societies increased the need for higher education, which led to more institutions and more opportunities for intellectual work. As the industrial and market revolutions of Europe and the United States produced a recognizable professional and working class, so did they enable the classification of the intellectual as a social force. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the fragmentation of Enlightenment thinking and the failings of political and economic revolution became the subject of a growing community of cosmopolitan thinkers’ criticisms. The works of Friedrich Nietzsche, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Sigmund Freud, Charles Darwin, and the first generation of Marxists challenged the Victorian world in a radical way that produced an intelligentsia in distress. Controversies and innovations in philosophy in philosophy, science, ethnics, and other disciplines, coupled with the rise of extreme exertions of power within the world-system through imperialist power grabs and militaristic nationalism, created plenty of fodder for intellectuals to argue over and act
upon as the twentieth century began. Improvements in communication and transportation brought members of the intelligentsia from different parts of the world in contact with each other, allowing intellectual discourse to become ever more transnational as the world-system became increasingly extensive and integrated.

_The Uneven Development of the Intelligentsia_

Intellectual associations at the dawn of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were by no means homogenous and intellectuals confronted matters of social justice in different ways, to varying degrees, and with their own individual agendas and priorities. Many intellectuals supported the armed conflicts, military interventions, and colonial occupations of the era. Progressive politics, anti-war protest, and the activities of activists within the intelligentsia during the First World War warrants much discussion and has inspired a tremendous amount of scholarship. In *Redemption by War: The Intellectuals and 1914*, Roland Stromberg warns against a “historical amnesia” characterized by “the tendency to exaggerate opposition to the [First World] war.” ix Stromberg emphasizes the enthusiastic intellectual response to the war at the beginning and draws attention to intellectuals who subsequently changed their position from support to protest. x

Stromberg provides a strong intellectual history, but Robert Nye criticizes “his bias in favor of the causal power of ideas” for making it “difficult for him to separate the institutional and nonideational influences that worked on intellectuals through their social and professional affiliations from those influences of a purely cultural variety.” xi In a
cautious effort to avoid this recurrent pitfall, my study places intellectuals within the context of changes in collective psychology regarding race, gender, and spirituality, and acknowledges the differences between changes in perceptions of these social phenomena among the intellectual class and the wider society. The intellectuals in my study forced social change, but also felt the impact of changes going on around them. Interchange between social forces and intellectual discourse, especially as it manifests itself in the form of activism, strengthens the impact of the intelligentsia, the encouragement of broad-minded ideas and attempts to apply them to immediate, material living.

As Stromberg implies, many historians have studied the activities of intellectuals involved in anti-militarist and pacifist protest. Jonathan Atkin argues that “a clearly identifiable ‘humanitarian’ anti-war feeling” created a unique anti-war protest inspired by reason and aesthetic, rather than religious conviction. His argument compels my chapter of Russell and Shaw, both of whom relied on their self-defined spiritualities and discretionary reasoning to inspire their activism. Jo Vellacott’s *Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War* credits this period of Russell’s life with providing the foundation for of his mature philosophical and political ideas. Her work shows the metamorphosis of Russell from mathematician to activist philosopher, demonstrating well how world politics and intellectuals affect one another.

Focusing predominantly Sidney and Beatrice Webb, J.M. Winter examines how overlaps between the Fabian Society and the Labour party in Britain during the First World War exposed the incompatibility of theoretical socialism and practical politics in *Socialism and the Challenge of War: Ideas and Politics in Britain, 1912-1918*. A.J. Anthony Morris traces how disparate radical groups interacted with the Liberal
government in Britain and how those interactions shaped their varied positions on militarism and imperialism in the years leading up to the outbreak of the First World War in Radicalism Against War: 1906-1914. However these studies are narrowly framed around British rather than European or Atlantic-world developments and activism.

Douglas Newton and F.L. Carsten both treat the British left and their positions on war in a transnational context, detailing the interactions between the British left and their continental counterparts. Concentrating primarily on labor groups, neither Newton nor Carsten deliver as much on the transference of ideas between national groups as they do on the groups’ differences and disagreements. In a wider scope, Daniel T. Rodgers considers contact between progressive activists in the United States and in Europe, arguing that progressivism in the United States should be seen in a transnational context of social reform. Because of the global nature of war and empire, activism must considered in a transnational context beyond the Atlantic-world, a context that encompasses the colonial peripheries as well as the metropolitan core of the early twentieth century world-system.

**Gendering and Racializing the Intellectuals**

Many historians have investigated the role of feminists in anti-military protest and social reform. Sandra Holton discusses the social diversity among women’s suffragists in Feminism and Democracy: Women’s Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain 1900-1918. Kathleen Kennedy “examines how wartime expectations of loyalty in general and the anti-radical crusades in particular shaped women’s citizenship” in the United
States. She presents women’s participation in anti-war protest in the light of the power struggle over women’s social roles. Likewise Erica Kuhlman considers “how concepts of masculinity and femininity and their relations to notions of militarism, democracy, citizenship, and race” contributed to the United States entering World War I and how the feminist movement provided a “challenge to [U.S. military] intervention and to the gendered and race-biased assumptions of progressivism.” Using Antonio Gramsci and Mikhail Bakhtin as her theoretical foundation, Kuhlman argues that dominant social groups deployed language to sustain hegemony and establish a climate in which repressive notions of race and gender could flourish. While my research benefits greatly from both Kennedy and Kuhlman’s scholarship, I engage oppositional rhetoric from Pankhurst and Addams to show how women’s participation in intellectual discourse empowered them, allowed for the communication of political and social demands in a transnational setting, and contributed to changing conceptions of gender, citizenship, activism, and intellectual life.

The activism of W.E.B. Du Bois and Marcus Garvey and their global influence in challenging the terms of race has also generated considerable scholarship. They have been discussed together and compared in countless books and articles as well as often discussed together. The ambitions of both men to challenge the world-system demonstrate how racial oppression and moves towards self-determination began to be viewed in a global context. The emergence of pan-Africanism, calls for self-determination, international organizations like the UNIA, and the promotion of an African diaspora community challenged white and Western assumptions of power and marked the twilight of colonial imperialism. Such challenges to the racial inequalities of
the world system responded to and inspired changes in conceptions of diasporic identity. In *Black Empire: The Masculine Global Imaginary of Caribbean Intellectuals in the United States, 1914-1962*, Michelle Ann Stephens describes how ideas of nationalism and internationalism informed the activism of black intellectuals and encouraged a new understanding of race. I go further by integrating Du Bois and Garvey into the transatlantic exchange and querying how race also changed for the white, Euro-American intellectuals. Transnational activism supported hopes for the global identity imagined by pan-African intellectuals, but also challenged proposals for the separation of the races and civilization.

*Historicizing Agents of Social Change*

The impact these intellectuals had on legal and cultural readings of such socially stratifying concepts as religion, race, and gender affected the social order and the way the social order could be challenged. Transnational activism and the promulgation of intellectual ideas transformed society and social change, bringing anti-systemic movements into maturity. I examine the activism and impact of each individual within a framework of transnational organization and reception. In each chapter, I discuss the operations of each individual before and during the war. I then follow these passages with a comparison of the two individuals, explaining their collective impact in their respective social element (religion, race, gender). Intellectual life during the First World War was furious and these individuals in no way represent the spectrum of ideologies, attitudes, and intellectual labors present in the thriving intelligentsia.
Contact and Discrepancies Between the Spiritual and Material World

Alienation brought on by imperialist expansion which brought citizens into distant but real power struggles with the people of far off lands, coupled with the increasingly efficient alienation of industrialization, forced intellectuals at the turn of the century to broaden the spans of their philosophies, to make them applicable to the globalizing effects of their capitalist reality, and to at least attempt putting their intellectual discoveries into practice in the public sphere. Advances in technology and changes in methods of consumption created a material life with only vague connection or contact with the origins of the objects that served their living needs and increasingly created their identities. The changing world posed strong challenges to the metaphysical work of the intelligentsia. Recent activity in intellectual discourse seethed with both a dismissal and desire for spiritual reconciliation. A generation earlier, Dostoevsky’s *Crime and Punishment* in 1866 and Nietzsche’s *On the Genealogy of Morality* in 1887 offered radical challenges to contrived spirituality. In pursuit of geographic proof of the Flood, a religious naturalist returned from a trip around the world with a new insight to humanity that reduced traditional explanations of the divine to mythology. August Comte promoted his scientific ideology of positivism as a religion while other new religious movements like Spiritualism, Christian Science, and the Social Gospel also attempted to resolve the
spiritual dilemmas of modernity. Alternately new trends in Christianity like Fundamentalism and Pentecostalism gained flocks by professing an interpretation of the Bible clean of contemporary influence. Growing awareness of world religions, a product of imperialism and cross-cultural migration, compelled followers of Western religions to suspect their own religions’ claims of universality. Crisis characterized the common religious emprise as the nineteenth century ended, and early twentieth century intellectuals like Bertrand Russell and George Bernard Shaw recognized the necessity to consider doubt as part of the religious experience and incorporated it into their metaphysical interpretations.

New perspectives on religion emerged from attempts to balance moral conviction and spiritual needs with increasingly inexorable and justified sensations of doubt. Viewed as a valid component of spirituality, doubt allowed room for the marvels and trials of the modern world. Not necessarily embracing, but understanding doubt as unavoidable and therefore essential pried the tight grip of institutional religions on the psyche while refusing the despair of godlessness. The experience of spiritual doubt demanded action, but not resolution. One could no longer deem the outcomes of social processes and political affairs as God’s will nor alternately reject the public sphere as exclusive from spiritual matters because of its secular manufacture. Rather, doubt demanded active participation in the public sphere because of its godlike influence and its human origins. To function meaningfully as an aspect of devotion, accepting challenges to inflexible conviction must accompany political and social responsibility as the pilgrim realizes and wrestles with the human factor in matters of existence and causality. In this way, a stance of spiritual pyrrhonism contests dominant control of the world-system by positing the
believer within the exchange of power. Invocations of providence by politicians, the alleged authority of established religious institutions, and reified power dynamics came under scrutiny and lost some of their capacity to subjugate by advancing discovery of vulnerabilities in the world-system and justifying resistance to the dubious distribution of power.

In *Red Flag and Union Jack: England, Patriotism, and the British Left*, Paul Ward attempts to categorize antiwar activists into four groups.\textsuperscript{xxiv} Three of them opposed the war on political grounds. The fourth opposed the war on moral grounds; Ward describes them as “pacifists and socialists influenced by Christianity.”\textsuperscript{xxv} This description simplifies the religious experiences of an international population practicing other religions, non-traditional interpretations of the Christian gospel, or no religion at all. It also prioritizes Christianity as the deciding moral factor in activists whose interpretation of the gospel allowed for war and who may have been driven to protest the war because of moral reasoning independent of their religious affiliation and specific to the nature of modern warfare or other escalations of hostilities within the world-system. Too often historians ascribe the moral impulse to religion while considering the religious experience within the narrow limits of a specific orthodoxy or rigid definition. Since religious beliefs do not develop or sustain themselves in isolation from world events, moral obligation should be examined as a dynamic element of global consciousness, not one religious institution, doctrine, or influence. I do not disagree with Ward’s classification, but present this argument to clarify that Christianity’s “influence” on antiwar activists ranged and varied among groups and individuals. While faith-based groups composed much of the No Conscription Fellowship, Bertrand Russell, who served
as chairman, regarded Christianity as “a disease born of fear and a source of untold misery to the human race.”

Unlike Ward, Jonathan Atkin appreciates the emergence of substantial non-religious moral opposition to the Great War. In *A War of Individuals: Bloomsbury Attitudes to the Great War*, Atkin “champions a clearly identifiable ‘humanitarian’ anti-war feeling during the Great War itself— in all its humanistic, aesthetic and moral contexts” in Great Britain. Atkin stresses the individualistic nature of such opposition and the reality that individuals could join political or religious organizations without abandoning their intellectual autonomy. Atkin’s assessment of the war as a challenge to intellectual ideals of the late nineteenth century supports my assertion that the war nurtured the recognition of skepticism as a necessary element of moral and spiritual development among intellectuals by pushing “ideas concerning the liberty and duty of an individual ... in the minds of those who already supported the ideal of the ‘self.’” By broadening the gap between intellectuals fostering an emerging propensity towards individualism and the states and institutions that dissuaded independent thinking, the war generated rousing discussions of civil liberties and individual responsibilities. Opposition to interference by agents of hegemony establishes individualism as resistance defined by critical evaluation, the practical assessment of doubt, of terms of being.

The war deepened doubts regarding political structures and social conventions among the intelligentsia and, though nationalism tempted many intellectuals, the war also had an internationalizing effect, sparking doubt about reified and increasingly irrelevant distinctions among people. In the same way awareness of other religions prompted reevaluation of one’s beliefs, awareness of the “enemy” and the “savage” evoked a more
empathetic understanding of nationality. Demands and definitions of citizenship had evolved beyond the expectations of the church during the Crusades, the Inquisition, and the Reformation, periods when doubt most certainly was not considered a religious virtue. In the conceptual evolution of citizen, political institutions grew more powerful by attracting the obedience religion institutions try to monopolize, causing organized religions to surrender the faith of their followers and the capacity for social control afforded by their faith.

Addressing the ways Russell and Shaw received the material and intellectual developments mutually drove their metaphysical conclusions and their political activism, I explore how they used and redefined the role of the intelligentsia in society. I ask with what loyalty and success did they articulate their intellectual labor in the public sphere and how did that articulation manifest itself as protest. Evaluating Russell and Shaw’s impact while recognizing both the ideological and practical ways changes in world-system enabled their global activism, I speculate on the stratification of the intellectual class as a continuing process determined both by how the group organizes and conceives itself within a larger social order and by how that large social order perceives the class and organizes around it.

Bertrand Russell

(May 18, 1872-February 2, 1970)

In late 1913, in a letter to The Cambridge Magazine, Bertrand Russell recognized doubt as an essential component of the modern religious experience in his criticism of the Church of England’s demand that bishops, upon ordination, testify to “unfeignedly
believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament." The philosopher felt comfortable saying that “every educated person knows that, except in a very few instances,” a person would be lying if they claimed to “unfeignedly believe” everything in the Bible and that the church would benefit from the service of clergy who admit experiencing doubt. Russell confronted religion with both sincere interest and critical curiosity. His renowned hostility towards Christianity must be understood in context as a sensationalism Russell enjoyed and encouraged. Like many of the trouble-making men of letters in the generation before him, particularly Nietzsche and Ibsen, he used Christianity as a regular opponent, co-opting the language and mythology of Christianity to attack ideological and practical weaknesses common to most institutionalized social phenomena. Outside of his writing, however, Russell maintained close contact with impassioned Christians and worked with many Christian groups organizing against the First World War.

Russell’s metaphysical arguments, social polemics, and activism both echoed and attacked his upbringing in the Presbyterian, Unitarian, and Puritan faiths. His first marriage to Alys Pearsall Smith, an American Quaker, his experiences with her family, and his consequent intimacy with the Society of Friends familiarized him with Quakerism, which provoked courteous interest as well as pejorative commentary. After his marriage to Smith dissolved, Russell came in contact with the Quakers again through his peace activism. The Friends’ Service Committee (FSC) recruited Bertrand Russell to the ranks of the No Conscription Fellowship (NCF) in 1915. Localized Quaker groups sponsored many of Russell’s wartime lectures. In 1916, the Friends’ Peace Committee (FPC) held a Conference on International Sanctions in Devonshire in
which Russell participated.\textsuperscript{xxxvi} Differing opinions about whether to concentrate efforts on the release of jailed conscientious objectors or ending the war caused damaging contention between Russell and the Quakers of the FSC within the NCF.\textsuperscript{xxxvii} Debate with the Quakers over political strategy and priority forced Russell to qualify his own pacifism.

In addition to argument and affiliation, Russell engaged Christianity as a recognizable and provocative literary device. In \textit{The Labour Leader}, Russell wrote a Christmas 1914 message for peace, evoking the spirit of Christ quite convincingly for someone who saw the Christian religion as “the principal enemy of moral progress in the world.”\textsuperscript{xxxviii} In this message, Russell used his own celebrity and the universal recognition of the spirit of Christ as a symbol of peace to push his activist agenda. Obviously the Christmas spirit hadn’t swept over Russell, but rather he used the religion as means to an end. Aware that both his general and academic audiences came from a largely Christian background, Russell made use of Christian symbols to craft and practice his own spiritual agenda, establishing himself in opposition to organized religion while borrowing its metaphors to convey his own ideas and expressing frequent sympathies for both the faithful and disillusioned of the flock.

In an unfinished manuscript only published posthumously titled “The Pilgrimage of Life,” Russell borrowed from many popular personalities from throughout the Christianity’s historical franchise. Drawing on the styles of Apostolic Catholic Thomas Carlyle, Anglican Jeremy Taylor, and Transcendentalist and Unitarian minister Ralph Waldo Emerson, as well as, the poet and polemicist John Milton whose notorious disdain for the Christian church rivals his own, Russell used Christian modes of communication
towards different intentions. \(\text{xxxix}\) Going back and forth in the manuscript from mourning and cursing the loss of God through intellectual reasoning to celebrating a moral conviction and realizable peace that flourish in the absence of the Christian God, Russell detailed a Nietzschean hero who would emerge from the burden of Christianity to do good works for the love of goodness. \(\text{xI}\) Preventing the liberation of this figure capable of living in peace, Russell censured the Christian conceptions of remorse, forgiveness, atonement, and a benevolent god as corruptions of the “law of nature” or the “stern and pitiless God” that is truth. \(\text{xli}\) For Russell, the possibility of an afterlife adorned with eternal happiness and grateful god set people back from attaining a higher state because the disappointment of losing a loving God leaves the truth, trying to fill a void formerly filled by such a far-fetched illusion, so distant from the material nature of things, that actualizing good deeds within the laws of reality is impossible to imagine. \(\text{xlii}\)

Raised in a home with strong Protestant and Republican traditions, Russell speculated religious and political issues and explored alternatives throughout his youth, but would not publish his notorious attacks on organized religion until after the war. An emphasis on skepticism appears immediately in “The Free Man’s Worship,” the most noteworthy of the few pieces he wrote on religion before the war. \(\text{xliii}\) Russell began the pessimistic essay insisting that a meaningful philosophy must confront the likelihood that Man’s “origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms” and that “all the noonday brightness of human genius [is] destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system.” \(\text{xlv}\) Russell concluded that humanity’s knowledge of good and evil must be questioned “in a world which has no such knowledge.” \(\text{xlv}\) The religious elements of Russell’s opposition to militarism appear
in the question his conclusion proposes: should a person worship Force, which the
physical world recognizes as genuine power, and concede that the only feasible God must
be evil to create a world that rewards what contrived morality identifies as evil or should
a person worship with the conscious acknowledgment that the only good God is “the
creation of our own conscience”? Russell identified militarism as the worship of Force,
a “failure to maintain our own ideals against a hostile universe.” The horrors of the
war hardly tempered Russell’s bleak assessment of the nature of the universe, “that the
non-human world is unworthy of our worship,” but rather strengthened Russell’s
conviction that spiritual emancipation is impossible without the conscious acceptance of
nature’s cruel ambiguity.

Within Russell’s gloomy appraisal of nature and his condemnation of more naïve
interpretations lay a great faith in civilization, in humankind’s ability to overcome the
brutal obstacles of life. Viewing the war as a brutal obstacle to civilization created by “a
set of official gentlemen, living luxurious lives, mostly stupid, and all without
imagination or heart,” rather than the cruel god of Force, Russell denounced Britain’s
participation in the war as a crime against a larger civilization, neither responsible for nor
aware of the agreements made by the government which pledged the nation to war. For Russell, a strong civilization exercised critical doubt in spiritual matters because a
kinder world could only exist if humankind worked to create it. The same doubt driving
the acceptance of responsibility for the world order could be applied to all institutions and
it pained Russell to see “the London crowds” abandon both senses of doubt and
responsibility as they “precipitated in a few days down the steep slope to primitive
barbarism, letting loose, in a moment, the instincts of hatred and blood-lust against which
the whole fabric of society [had] been raised. Placing war within a camp characterized by Force and democratic civilization within a camp characterized by conscience, Russell defined anti-war protest as elemental to the struggle against the “evil” in the world that inventive and critical thinking resisted and belligerence as bolstering the efforts of nature to destroy. Depicting war as an ally to the most likely god Force, Russell suggested that protest against war expressed resistance to the higher power, challenging the commonly held understanding of pacifism’s relation to religious conviction where the faithful, whether Buddhist, Christian, or Jain, attempt to emulate the divine through their pacifism. While evoking both Nietzsche and Thomas Hobbes in his portrayal of the state of nature, Russell views a democratic civilization rather than a Nietzschean individual or a Hobbesian centralized state as the meaningful opposition to the violence of chaos.

Russell’s early denunciations of the war called on nations to recognize the universal imperfection of governments as they “not only embody, but also foster and perpetuate, good or bad habits of mind,” demanding active skepticism. As unquestionable as Force’s rule over nature appeared to Russell, the ambiguous validity of anything created outside of nature, like governments, begged an objective yet critical response from him and he confronted them using the language of morality and religion. Russell asserted that “no nation is wholly devilish or wholly angelic” or “simply wicked” and insisted that such assessments during war ensured future conflicts.

This detached analysis of international politics inspired Russell’s lifelong advocacy of a world government and his support for the League of Nations and later the United Nations. The inadequacies of national governments in confronting global tensions
and the polarization created by definite cultural distinctions demonstrate the need for impartial assessment of the world-system. Transnational activism inherently argues that the world-system not only needs to be examined impartially, but must constantly increase the integration of cultures, responsibilities, and markets to function in peace. The existence of shared interests of states and civilians cannot be refuted; these shared interests must be handled democratically and publicly. The Berlin Conference of 1884, the secret alliances that set the war off, unchecked imperialist expansion, and vast trade inequities exposed the fragile relationships of dependency among nations and the unimagined levels of dominance made possible by the industrial world order. To Russell and others, the discovery of secret alliances clarified states’ intentions to manipulate their citizenry and manufacture public opinion.\footnote{lii}

Russell argued the ultimate end of war could only take place once “the different parts of the world have become so intimately related that no part can be indifferent to what happens in any other part.”\footnote{liii} The dropping of tariffs and other trade barriers appealed to Russell because free trade promotes more activity and contact between national economies, greatly reducing incentive for military confrontation. Russell’s enthusiasm for free trade must be considered in context. At the time of the First World War, states, militaries, and religious institutions were understood to wield the most power on the world stage. Multi-national companies like United Fruit Company had just emerged. Colonial economies reflected exploitative state policies more than commercial domination. A world government to oversee state and military power could seem sufficient to prevent violence. Seeing internationalism as rational means towards a preserved peace, Russell supported the centralization of global power under a world
government “strong enough to decide by law all disputes between nations,” which does not resemble religious opposition to war, but rather thoughtful meditation on world affairs. In *Principles of Social Reconstruction*, Russell argued for a single military government “in order to prevent war and at the same preserve liberty.” Before the United States entered the war, Russell had high hopes that Woodrow Wilson and the U.S. would be capable of helping end the conflict through diplomacy and international cooperation.

The United States held particular interest to Russell. While the U.S. fascinated Russell, he retained a criterion as discriminating as Tocqueville in his survey of the land of milk and honey. The role religion played in American civic life drew Russell’s interest as early as his first trip to the United States in 1896. Writing to the sociologist Graham Wallas, who served in the Fabian Executive with Shaw, Russell shared his early insights about how politics and religion operated across the Atlantic. While lecturing on non-Euclidean geometry at Bryn Mawr, Russell noted the hypocrisies of local religion in nearby Philadelphia and rural Pennsylvania, describing the Quakers and Puritans he encountered as “the greatest liars and hypocrites [he had] ever seen and are as a rule totally destitute of vigour.” His amateur ethnography of “the lazy hypocritical Puritans” attributed complacency towards political corruption and an obsession with their individual commerce to most Americans that, he noted, did not interfere with their religious faith.

The religious elements in American plutocracy and themes of consumption and accumulation in American spirituality appeared readily to Russell. The interplay between politics, economics, and religiosity distinguished the power dynamics and general spiritual practices of the United States from those of Europe where tradition and
aristocratic privilege hindered the absurd conclusions of market capitalism that saturated American life during the Gilded Age. In some ways, the emerging Gospel of Wealth reinforced Russell’s belief that the only plausible god rewarded Force, whether natural or the institutionalized violence of wealth, but claims by the wealthy of their divine right to manage the money and public affairs of the many provoked Russell’s critique. In the same letter to Graham Wallas, Russell selected John Wanamaker, the Philadelphia department store mogul, as representative of a typical American plutocrat. Wanamaker used bribes to obtain the position of Postmaster General and to secure the protective tariff, a contentious issue for Russell. In addition to such corruption, which obviously warranted suspicion, Russell indicated Wanamaker’s substantial wealth and conspicuous religiosity as disturbing yet defining characteristics of the businessman. In Wanamaker, who would eventually become associated globally with American Liberal Protestantism, Russell observed the fruition of liberal religious interpretations “more compatible with a commercial economy than Calvinism.” Russell saw the skepticism adopted by Europeans when confronted with the shortcomings of social institutions manifesting itself as fatalism and pessimism in Americans who recognized the hypocrisies and corruption of society, but contented themselves with private complaint rather than public criticism.

To the readership of The Nation and the Athenæum in 1926, Russell offered his opinion on American Protestantism: “the whole intellectual atmosphere is reminiscent of the seventeenth century.” Wanamaker biographer William Leach’s evaluation of Liberal Protestantism as a spiritual response to traditional religion’s growing irrelevance distinguishes the phenomenon from deeper intellectual movements in Europe.
Describing Liberal Protestantism in America as “accommodationist,” Leach notes a lack of intellectual engagement evident in the promotion of only “individual salvation, personal well-being, and harmony, not discontent, conflict, shame, or insight.” This distinctly American interpretation of Protestantism adapted traditional spiritual beliefs to suit new economic ideologies and justify plutocratic rule.

Russell admitted the war itself had a profound affect on his ideas and “gave a new direction to [his] interests.” His political activism had until this point concentrated on women’s suffrage and free trade. He tried to enter politics in 1910 as a candidate for the Liberal Party, but his refusal to attend to church to gain political favor persuaded the selection committee to back someone else. During the South African War, Bertrand Russell supported the Boer War, which he regretted and attributed on the influence of Fabian Socialist Sidney Webb.

By July 1914, with the British declarations of war looming, Russell had committed himself to advocating neutrality, spearheading a petition signed by sixty-three academics and intellectuals to “express their conviction of the supreme importance of preserving England’s neutrality .. considering that .. no vital interest .. is endangered such as would justify .. participation in a war.” The full petition appeared in The Manchester Guardian and The Daily News and Leader on August 3, the same morning Sir Edward Grey ‘the Peacemaker’ delivered his speech to the House of Commons and won their support to declare war on Germany the following day. So essential to the development of Russell’s political thought, the war forever pervaded Russell’s appraisal of international politics. In evaluating world affairs towards the end of his life, Russell asserted that he could not “think of that the world would now be in anything like the bad
state in which it is if English neutrality in the first war had allowed a quick victory to
Germany.”

Russell reaffirmed his contention that “the great world, so far as we know it from
the philosophy nature, is neither good nor bad, and is not concerned to make us happy or
unhappy” a few years after the war in a small book called What I Believe. Lessons
learned from the war can be inferred from Russell’s description of “the good life” which
is “guided by knowledge” and his definition of this guiding “knowledge.” Russell
called for the application of scientific knowledge to encourage “behaviour likely to
realize social purposes we desire” to produce a world where “more desires will be
satisfied than in one where there is less love or less knowledge.”

Condemnations of colonialism and the stressed assertion that “the world is a unity, and the man who
pretends to live independently is a conscious or unconscious parasite” demonstrate the
persisting coadunation of Russell’s political and religious ideas.

Assessing the implications of the war in creating a better world, Russell described
the war like a scientific experiment which tested the hopeful hypothesis “that misery and
cruelty and degradation were due to tyrants or priests or capitalists or Germans and if
these sources of evil were overthrown there be a general change of heart and we should
all live happily ever after” to be false. From the results of the experiment, Russell
determined the alleviation of fear as the most probable deterrent of war, requiring
“increasing security” and “cultivating courage.” In his argument on how to establish
security, he arrived at justice, which he defined as “the recognition of the equal claims of
all human beings,” as the only means of providing sustainable security. At this point,
Russell’s political philosophy had matured, expanding upon the internationalist principles
of his earlier work, and he spoke confidently about the nature of the universe as it related to peace.

When Russell’s anti-war activity brought him in direct contact with the system he was challenging through his arrest and brief imprisonment, he approached it soberly. Convicted for statements he made in “The German Peace Offer” in The Tribunal, the paper of the No-Conscription Fellowship, Russell made accusations against the United States army including participating strikebreaking.lxxx Since his election to chairman of the NCF, Russell foresaw the prospect of prison.lxxxi His metaphysical conclusions forced him to resist the dominant system and he accepted the consequences because he wanted to live according to those conclusions.lxxxii The persecution of an intellectual activist for acting according to their principles confirms the thought crime as a component of Western understanding of justice. Russell’s conviction brought the products of his intellectual labor against hostile interpretations of law that legitimated the conflict between state and individual regarding limits on freedom of thought. Like Galileo, Russell’s beliefs and his articulation of those beliefs forced the consideration of dominant institutions and received hostility, an anticipated consequence and tangible validation of intellectual activism.

Russell transformed his moral opposition to war into a scientific opposition by situating the war within the same framework he applied to metaphysical arguments. Because Russell’s spiritual and political convictions relied on speculative reasoning that drew support from secular realities, process and experimentation took priority over an orthodoxy of theory and practice. Like the will of nature, the efforts of humanity and their consequences can only be approximated somewhat using scientific evidence and
critical presumption. For Russell, reason’s inability to predict the future required spiritual and political discourse to accept uncertainty and with it, a flexibility regarding the means to which any end may be attempted and an accommodating consideration towards reform. Russell’s willingness to risk his academic standing and personal freedom, evidenced by retracted teaching positions and imprisonment, confirmed the earnestness of Russell’s faith in skepticism.

George Bernard Shaw
(July 26, 1856-November 2, 1950)

The events surrounding World War I came upon Bertrand Russell at the dawn of his intellectual life, he had published Principia Mathematica and taught at a handful of schools. He developed much of his confidence in his conclusions regarding religion, politics, and social justice during the war. Meanwhile George Bernard Shaw faced the Great War already firm in his Fabian socialist beliefs, accomplished in his craft, having published thirty-five plays, and established as a member of the international intelligentsia. One of the most prominent members of the Fabian Society, Shaw had obtained generous regard as a social critic and intellectual troublemaker. More pronounced than Russell’s role in the Bloomsbury Group and the prestigious Royal Academy of Arts, Shaw’s participation in the Fabian Society greatly influenced the ideology and reputation of the group. The socialist agenda of the Fabian Society distinguishes it from the intellectual organizations Russell attached himself too. The Bloomsbury Group primarily concerned itself with literary and cultural radicalism while
Fabians attempted to translate socialist theory into a feasible political socialism. Shaw contended to know “‘practically all the leading Christian Socialists.’” While Russell had only tasted some political agitation in his support of women’s suffrage, Shaw greeted resistance to the war with experience in political confrontation. He offered his position on war and imperialism confidently in his denunciation of the South African War of 1899-1902. During the South African War, Russell supported the war and England, which he regretted and attributed on the influence of Fabian Socialist Sidney Webb. While Russell reconsidered his faith in liberalism, Shaw participated in debates regarding reformism, gradualism, and utilitarianism as methods of socialism with authority and conviction.

Somewhat ironically, Shaw announced he had has his fill of political activism just a years before the war broke out. In 1911, Shaw resigned from the Fabian Executive, feeling he had reached his limits as a political activist and could reach more people through his plays. The outbreak of the war drew Shaw back into political discourse and after “sunning [himself] on the roof of the Hydro Hotel for nearly two months,” published his “Common Sense About the War,” a condemnation of the war supported by impulsive observations, as a supplement to The New Statesman on the 14th November 1914. Like Russell’s suggestion for a world government in Principles of Social Reconstruction, Shaw advocated a solitary world military power as the best defense against war in this early appraisal of the conflict. In supporting a world government, both men demonstrated a faith in some greater truth, the definition of justice that such a world government would practice. This greater truth could only be realized through the
efforts of people and supported by scientific evidence, subverting the holy with the secular.

Among the observations and opinions contained in “Common Sense About the War,” Shaw considered the prevalent religious skepticism in Britain and praises the atheists “intellectually honest enough to object to profess beliefs they do not hold, especially in the solemn act of dedicating themselves to death in the service of their country.” While Shaw maintained a continued interest in spiritual matters and religious practices throughout his life, Warren Sylvester Smith argues Shaw’s religious beliefs had reached full development by 1906.

Shaw’s religious conclusions drew inspiration from Charles Darwin, Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, and French philosopher Henri Bergson. Growing up in a Protestant household in predominantly Catholic Dublin exposed Shaw to differing interpretations of Christianity and their social consequence. Living in cosmopolitan London since 1876, Shaw observed the religions of immigrant groups and the emergence of new spiritual movement. In “The New Theology,” a speech given at Kensington Town Hall in 1907 and soon reprinted in Britain and the United States, Shaw contended that a great deal of his new religion’s “truth” could be found in the texts of all world religions, modern poetry, and articles of the Church of England. Shaw’s religion also encouraged spiritual individualism.

Shaw’s religion and its theory of Creative Evolution suggested the fate of the universe was determined by a flawed force attempting progress. Labeled the Life Force, this spiritual presence, which persisted in humans, worked towards two somewhat conflicting goals. These goals reflected Nietzsche’s tremendous influence on Shaw. In
the tradition of Nietzsche’s Übermensch, Shaw presents the Life Force as the drive to
develop creatively and serve the universe, compelling the collective consciousness and
individuals towards a state of intellectual innocence, similar to the child stage Nietzsche
describes as the final process for the Übermensch. Alternately, Shaw often used women
to depict the Life Force as a presence more concerned with maintenance and security than
overcoming. By simultaneously enabling and preventing overcoming, the Life Force
reiterated Nietzsche’s suggestions that the state of nature exists independently of any
systems of morality, that the confines of the eternal recurrence of the same exist only for
themselves, and that adulation of tradition impedes spiritual liberation. Shaw’s use of
women as symbols of society’s sluggish creep towards equality mirrored many of
Nietzsche’s same assessments of women. Though Shavian and Nietzschean portrayals of
women may appear misogynistic, portraying women as second-class citizens did not
condone gender inequalities, but rather recognized them. Shaw contended the system that
encouraged a feminine resistant to intellectual freedom could be overcome through
socialism. Shaw played a unique role in the English-language reception of Nietzsche
by first translating the idea of the Übermensch as Superman in his play *Man and
Superman* in 1902.

Shaw would refer to Nietzsche and Arthur Schopenhauer “to remind [his] readers
that what they call [his] individual eccentricities and paradoxes are part of the common
European stock.” Shaw’s affinity for the German iconoclasts exceeded the affections
of a pupil, expressing a sense of intellectual camaraderie as realized through a nearly
devotional commitment to suspicion. Shaw perceived both pessimistic philosophers as
members of an intellectual class and legacy to which he believed himself to belong
despite differences in nationality, economic background, manner of intellectual labor, and local culture. Nietzsche’s influence on progressive intellectuals extended far beyond Russell and Shaw; American anti-war activist Randolph Bourne adopted Nietzschean language and theories to condemn war, criticize organized religion, and promote personal spirituality in his wartime essays “American Use for German Ideals,” “Twilight of the Idols,” and “The Puritan’s Will to Power.”

Imitating Nietzsche who reproached his mentor Richard Wagner in *Twilight of the Idols*, the title a play on Wagner’s *Twilight of the Gods*, Bourne chided his mentor John Dewey for his naïve acceptance of democracy as an actualized political concept and the Wilsonian rhetoric that justified war in the name of spreading democracy.

Bourne and other American radicals like civil libertarian and lawyer C.E.S. Wood and socialist playwright Floyd Dell championed Shaw’s censure of traditional religious institutions in *The Masses*, the Greenwich Village organ of intellectual dissent during the war. Like Nietzsche, Shaw impacted a broad spectrum of intellectual laborers because his work exhibited both intellectual immediacy and interpretative ambiguity. American socialists like economist Richard Ely and feminist novelist Charlotte Perkins Gilman and many within the Fabian Society integrated Shaw’s understanding of evolution as a stumbling participant in human progress into their interpretations of socialism. Unlike the historicism of Hegel that Marx eagerly promoted, Creative Evolution did not attest axiomatic status or rapturous inevitability, rather Shaw’s ideological framework placed socialism within the context of a world where adaptability in the face of an emerging world order and the will of nature determined collective and individual survival.
Resonating with activists across the transatlantic world, Shaw’s conception of spirituality informed the moral campaigns of a new generation of activists. British progressive Fenner Brockway, who co-founded the No Conscription Fellowship with Clifford Allen, recalled a moment of political and religious revelation he experienced in the formative years of his activism that illuminates the impact of Shaw’s new religion. Following a speech by Shaw about the class structure stifling the Superman’s development, Brockway, then in his early twenties, asked the playwright what he and other young people could do in the face of such oppressive social conditions. Brockway credited Shaw’s advice- “Find out what the Life Force is making for and make for it too.” - with defining his own “consciousness of universality identity” objectively. Brockway paid tribute to three deciding forces in his life: “The beauty of Nature gave me my spiritual inspiration, Bernard Shaw gave it direction, [anti-war socialist] Keir Hardie gave it implementation.”

For Brockway and other disciples of Shaw’s flexible faith, the expression of the Life Force as a metaphysical compulsion towards intellectual freedom and harmony in the universe justified activism without restricting their activism with the inherent fallibility of absolute moral and mystical dogmas. The divinity of conscience in Kant’s moral imperative, the submission rigidly demanded by traditional religions, and the reified authority of long-standing religious and political institutions lacked the versatility necessary to pursue spiritual or political growth meaningfully in the intellectual and political climate of the early twentieth century. With its tolerance and appreciation of world religions, discriminating compliance to political and intellectual developments, cautious implication of scientific divinity, and refusal to accept any contrived notion as a
self-evident truth, Shaw’s religion challenged the same institutions as Nietzsche’s hammer-philosophizing, but also responded to the intellectual crises heralded by nihilists with constructive ambitions and a sympathetic temperament indicative of the Progressive movement.

Performing Ideologies to Craft the Iconography and Identity of the Modern Iconoclast

Shaw’s compulsion to speak out against the war spurred, like Russell’s, from a commitment to a metaphysical understanding that necessitated their engagement in political affairs. Shaw suffered some unpopularity for his views, but simultaneously gained notoriety that further accentuated his legend; perhaps because of his age, his actions or his esteem, Shaw did not attract the same attention of the state as Russell. Fabian socialism and other political associations informed the morality and interpretations of systems of morality in Shaw’s plays. His labors as an essayist, editorialist, and speechmaker clarified some of the ambiguities found in Shaw’s fictional efforts. During the war, he created timely pieces intended to address an international audience as an ethical authority interpreting world politics. Shaw saw himself not only as an activist, but also as a member of an intelligentsia where activism meant authenticity. He spoke and behaved as a moral leader, distinctly open-minded and individualist but somewhat evangelical and accepting of, if not expecting, devotion from his listeners and readers.

The difference in age between Russell and Shaw and their different approaches to war resistance, ideologically and materially, contributed to their creation of contrasting
icons of the celebrity intellectual activist. Established and intellectually confident, Shaw portrayed the intellectual as a reliable irritant of the system who had successfully gained recognition within the system as a useful social critic and representative of a laudable understanding of ethics. The rendering of the intellectual provided by Shaw contributed to an understanding of the social type as argumentative, charismatic, and socially conscious. Russell’s activism during the war generated similar indictments, however his rebellion took on a different character. In contrast to the opinionated sage embodied by Shaw, Russell represented a younger and more volatile incarnation of the trouble-making intellectual activist. His dismissal from Trinity College, his courtroom appearances and brief imprisonment, his challenges to Victorian morality including his scandalous love life, and a tendency to agitate with signature sensationalism and aplomb created an image of the intellectual activist marked by passionate defiance, youthful idealism, and a certain sexiness that spoke to a form of arousal novel in the Modern Age, one detached from Victorian prudery and newly cognizant of the brain’s function as a sexual organ.

Facing the crises and building upon the advances of nineteenth century social critics Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud, Russell and Shaw validates the efforts of their predecessors by continuing to analyze the world system and metaphysics with a cynicism defined by an awareness of inherent fallacies. Approaching intellectual endeavors with an understanding of the hollowness of social conventions as evidenced by class analysis, exposed through genealogical deconstruction of social institutions, and rethought through psychoanalysis, Russell and Shaw fashioned an archetype of the intellectual within terms set by radical critics, insinuating an inherent radicalism. Though the intelligentsia has always sported conservative, liberal, and radical members, figures like Russell and Shaw
perpetuate a mythology of rebel philosophers within the social strata. The implications of this mythology inspired Roland Stromberg to clarify misconceptions of overwhelming protest among intellectuals to the First World War in *Redemption by War*. While the truth behind the generalization of the intellectual class as politically and socially radical contradicts the misconception, the intellectual activist continues to serve as a symbol of resistance. Insurgent groups, dissenting individuals, and social movements from the National Socialists in Germany to the M-26 Movement in Cuba have continued to employ the works and reputations of iconoclastic luminaries of the late nineteenth century to give their own ideas weight. Accepting the analytical terms provided by antagonists of the nineteenth century intelligentsia, Russell and Shaw introduced the “Revolt Against Reason” to world politics, challenging the intellectual labor of their predecessors with practical application and challenging the public sphere with the metaphysical and moral dilemmas revealed in the intellectual labor of radical thinkers. Not alone in espousing Feurbach, Marx, or Bergson, Russell and Shaw participated along with the Russian revolutionaries, New York Bohemians, and the Dadaists in promoting skepticism and activism as fundamental traits of the intellectual.

Using their own lives and activism to attest the merit of their intellectual labor, Russell and Shaw struggled to represent their ideas under exacting circumstances. Generating discussion of, if not always support for, their assessments of the world system and proposals for social and political reform, both men increased the visibility of the intellectual as critic, stimulated transnational dialogue and organization among progressives, and advocated skepticism and individualism in political and spiritual decisions. Consciously conducting their public lives in accordance with the philosophical
positions asserted in their speeches and publications, both men adhere to their sense of intellectual responsibility with an admirable reverence. Their sincerity not only strengthened their arguments, but also encouraged a standard of integrity and engagement among the intelligentsia.

The spiritual and political cynicism of Russell and Shaw give some insight into how changes in the collective consciousness enabled a new understanding of the intellectual class during the Progressive Age. To truly appreciate the radicalization of this social group at the beginning of the twentieth century, the introduction of new ideas must be considered with the introduction of new members. The gradual acceptance of women and people subordinated on racial terms as intellectuals as members of the intellectual class fostered democratic ideals, national and international syndicalism, transnational communication networks, and the creation of new identities within the intellectual category.
The Clumsy Internationalization of the Race Question

Following the “discovery of the New World” in the late fifteenth century, European powers took it upon themselves to determine the role Africa would play in the emerging transatlantic system. Eager to exploit the wealth of mineral and agricultural resources in the Americas and the Caribbean, Spanish and Portuguese colonists began to rely on African slaves for cheap and dependable labor. The trend caught on with the other European powers that came to colonize the Americas, but by the end of the eighteenth century, the system of colonial slavery began to show signs of increasing incompatibility with changes in the world economic, political, and social system. As slavery in the Americas was overturned between the 1830s and 1880s, Africa began to be reassessed in the minds of world powers. At the Berlin Conference of 1884, German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck gathered representatives from thirteen other nations to discuss colonization and trade in the continent. While European powers and merchants scrambled for Africa (and East Asia), peoples on the other side of the “color line” began to formulate their own ideas about the outcome of rising internationalism. The early twentieth century saw new opportunities for non-whites to challenge a world-system bent on maintaining a distribution of power that favored the white and wealthy. As Booker T. Washington’s accommodation strategy quickly grew outdated, blacks in the Caribbean and the United States sought a new agenda to advance black peoples, not only in their local community,
nation, or region, but globally. Marcus Garvey from Jamaica and W.E.B. Du Bois from the United States serve as excellent example of this new black activist model.

Changing understandings of race cannot be stated so simply as a transition from property to global activist. The colonization of Africa changed a continent that had until the Age of Imperialism had only been a source of “property” for the dominant forces in the world-system into a continent drawn up, quartered, and occupied. While an exchange of manufactured goods, particularly guns, for slaves had allowed Europeans and Americans to penetrate the continent somewhat, colonization brought the “civilizing mission” into full swing by extracting raw materials instead laborers from the continent, building railroads, and attempting to create European-style markets out of non-European communities, in essence, forcing this peripheral area into extremely unequal relations with the core. Though few world-system analysts leap to admit it, colonization was essential to the emergence of nationalist anti-systemic movements. As formal imperialism consumed the continent of Africa, informal imperialism transformed the economies of the Caribbean and Central American countries, particularly when it came to the export of bananas and other fruits. The migration of workers of color between islands in the Caribbean and countries throughout the Americas promoted a supranational race consciousness, of which Garvey definitely took notice and advantage. The United Fruit Company brought the major exports of these countries under U.S. control and brought these countries into an institutional economic relationship with each other. Within the United States, the end of Reconstruction in 1877 led to an intensification of white supremacy and black subordination. The passing of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882 deepened the system of racial hierarchy.
In *Race Over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism 1865-1900*, Eric T.L. Love argues against the popularly held notion that racial ideology determined U.S. foreign policy. His argument states that while racism existed and was in many ways institutionalized in the United States, it was not a monolithic force that dictated every action of the U.S. government abroad. Indeed, politicians who promoted white supremacy took both imperialist and anti-imperialist positions. The motivation for U.S. expansion beyond the continent, like most motivations, was principally economic. Love defines racism or, to use the terms of the period, racial prejudice and prejudice of color, three ways: “culturally sanctioned strategies that defend social, economic, and political advantage on the basis of race,” “exclusionary relations of power based on race,” or the effort to create a social order based on race. My argument is that racism, which informed the imperial and domestic policies of the United States and European powers, met with an educated and transnational resistance that responded directly to the proposed roles of race in emerging social orders. While my argument may appear dialectical in nature, I believe all activists, especially Garvey and Du Bois, operated with unique ideas and perspectives, engaging in frequent dialogue characterized by debate. This approach compliments Love’s assertion that policymakers operated “as individuals and complex human beings.”

Love’s focus on personal accountability poses some necessary challenges for a discussion of race, but also illuminates the distinction between racially prejudiced and socially privileged by race. The competition for power cannot be understood as a race war, but as an ideological battle regarding the structure of a changing global community. My larger argument, which includes this discussion of Garvey and Du Bois, asserts that
the transparency of anti-systemic and reform movements defined those movements as they cooperated with one another to both further their own agendas and remain faithful to their ideals. British Socialist E.D. Morel and American satirist Mark Twain’s protested against colonialism in Africa through their writings and their activism in the Congo Reform Association make an easy example of white men rejecting a racial and sexual hierarchy that would privilege them. The efforts of middle-class white women largely drove the abolitionist movement in the antebellum United States and a tradition of white women championing the rights of other races continued, including Jane Addams’s participation in founding the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Likewise, I will show here than the activism of Garvey and Du Bois was not only concerned with race, but also attempted to resolve economic and gender inequalities, improve labor conditions, and draw attention to the true motivations and consequences of war and militarism.

Taking advantage of emerging transnational networks and growing sympathies regarding racial inequities, Garvey and Du Bois strengthened organization among race activists, increased the esteem and audience for intellectuals of color, and compelled a rethinking of race and racism. As the Great Powers swept people of all nations into total war, Garvey and Du Bois’s activism and intellectual labors gave voice to subordinated people and shaped intellectual discourse around new understandings of race. Recognizing how global thinking and international activism could be used to challenge traditional and contrived notions of race, both men acted as if the world was under their jurisdiction, traveling in ways distinct from the migrations of their ancestors and understanding
national borders to be growing increasingly more irrelevant like a crutch that had begun
to do more harm than good.

William Edward Burghardt Du Bois

(February 23, 1868-August 27, 1963)

In “The Conservation of the Races,” a pamphlet-length essay published in 1897, a year after Plessy v. Ferguson’s ‘separate-but-equal’ ruling, W.E.B. Du Bois credited the idea of race for “its efficiency as the vastest and most ingenious invention for human progress.” In Du Bois’s broad understanding of world affairs, he recognized race as a historical idea, one that had encouraged cooperation and hostility. As a founding member of the Niagara Movement, which eventually became the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Du Bois appreciated that race came with a legal definition much more complicated than its scientific definition. He understood that the race idea could change and he found the contemporary model to be stubbornly outdated. Du Bois described racial groups as bound by two kinds of forces: physical, such as similarities in appearance and ancestry, and “spiritual, psychical differences,” such as “a common history, common laws and religion, similar habits of thought, and a conscious striving for certain ideals life.” Du Bois regarded the second set of cultural commonalities as more meaningful, “undoubtedly based on the physical, but infinitely transcending them.”

Essential to Du Bois’s vision of a more cooperative world, overcoming physical differences would allow different races to find similarities within their psychical and cultural identities and to work towards a common goal, sharing that
“conscious striving for certain ideals of life.” “The Conservation of the Races” treated race with sophistication and an objectivity that distinguished Du Bois as an intellectual as well as an activist.

Du Bois anticipated aspects of the methodology of world-systems analysis, aware that language, customs, and law throughout the world-system perpetuated racial oppression and hostilities between different groups. For the world-system to function, Du Bois believed different groups needed to adapt their psychical differences towards a shared end despite evidence that racial formation historically led to “the differentiation of spiritual and mental differences between the great races of mankind and the integration of physical differences.”

In his assessment of the race idea’s use value to the world-system, Du Bois made an appeal to the intellectual community that race should be entirely rethought with transnational and transracial cooperation as its ultimate objective: “if .. there is substantial agreement in laws, language, and religion; if there is a satisfactory adjustment of economic life, then there is no reason why, in the same country and on the same street, two or three great national ideals might not thrive and develop, that men of different races might not strive together for their race ideals as well, perhaps even better, than in isolation.”

His insistence on “a satisfactory adjustment of economic life” hinted at socialist and communist beliefs he would espouse later in his life. Class struggle and clashes between racial groups have overlapped since the origin of inequality. Du Bois’s nonchalant “perhaps even better” coyly implied that society would benefit both materially and morally from a reform of the racial order. The ideals of workers, social reform, and women’s movements could not reach fruition with grotesque racial inequalities hindering the general uplift of mankind.
Engaged in continuous debate over race with other intellectuals, particularly other black intellectuals, and assiduously challenging the conventions of social organization of diminishing use value, Du Bois used “The Conservation of Races” and its idealistic vision of a world less dependent on race to define to deliver an iconoclastic message that challenged and echoed some of his contemporaries. Closing the essay with a suggestion for an academic creed for the American Negro Academy, sometimes called the Voice of the Talented-Tenth and where Du Bois would serve as president two years later, he made clear his frustration with hesitancy among blacks and black intellectuals to promote meaningful ambitions and celebrate the strengths of the black race. He believed their strengths were distinct, having “a contribution to make to civilization and humanity, which no other race can make,” and they could only be realized through industrious efforts to educate and to learn coupled with greater access to the economic and intellectual activity of the world-system.\textsuperscript{cxvii}

Stressing intellectual labor as both possible and necessary for blacks, Du Bois criticized the ideas proposed by Booker T. Washington at the 1895 Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta. While Washington believed access to rank-and-file work would provide some economic independence and social mobility, Du Bois understood that the working class experienced very little economic independence and shoving minority populations into a subordinated class while encouraging complacency could hardly be considered progressive. His world-view remained dynamic throughout his life, but his intellectual development at the beginning of the twentieth century shaped some of his most emblematic arguments and the direction of his activism. Washington was as much an influence as a rival for Du Bois.
While Du Bois came to disagree with Washington’s Atlanta Compromise, scholars often forget that Du Bois originally lauded Washington for the address. Even after rejecting Washington’s strategy of accommodation, Du Bois admired the man, writing in 1903 in *The Souls of Black Folks* of Washington’s “very evident sincerity of purpose,” “tact and power,” and deserving of both “the applause of those who believe in his theories” and “the respect of those who do not.” Veiled attacks on Washington, like those in “The Conservation of the Races,” and direct criticisms, most famously in that same passage from *The Souls of Black Folk*, encouraged the sensationalizing of their disagreements. Putting their debate on display and identifying one another publicly as intellectuals made the differences between their philosophies a matter of public discourse; by legitimizing each other’s arguments with their attentive criticisms, the publicized contention between Du Bois and Washington confirmed Du Bois’s assertion that there existed a role in the intellectual community that could only be fulfilled by blacks and that the complexity of the race idea necessitated more scholarly work and open dialogue.

Another black intellectual who fostered Du Bois’s intellectual development was Alexander Crummell, first president of the American Negro Academy and sharply critical of Washington. Wilson Moses depicts Du Bois’s attitude towards his relationship with Crummell as one of “hero worship” where Du Bois idealized Crummell in pursuit of a surrogate father figure; Du Bois had been raised by his mother and maternal grandparents, abandoned by his Haitian-born father Alfred Du Bois early on. Being raised by women surely contributed to his sympathies with women’s movements. Wilson
identifies “The Conservation of the Races” as “a specific endorsement of Crummell’s ideas.”

Crummell, an Episcopal priest who spent twenty years in Liberia as a missionary, along with a handful of other black intellectuals laid the foundation from which the Pan-Africanism expressed by both Du Bois and Marcus Garvey would arise. Crummell’s proposed agenda for Africans and African descendants entailed using Christianity, education, and colonization to create a civilization superior to Europeans. Despite these high hopes, Crummell generally regarded most blacks in the United States and Africa as rough, without character, and in need of “civilizing.” Crummell’s reproachful assessment of morality and ambition among blacks reappeared in many of Du Bois’s addresses and figured prominently into Du Bois’s proposal in “The Conservation of the Races,” where he identified “the correction of immorality, crime and laziness among Negroes themselves” as the most crucial action to improving race relations.

Du Bois echoed Crummell’s disappointment in the sluggish crawl towards empowerment in the chapter devoted to the man in The Souls of Black Folk. Adopting the style of bible stories and the tone of a somber sermon in the eulogistic chapter, Du Bois depicted Crummell’s life as an unfinished mission to uplift of blacks throughout the world-system, “the world-wandering of a soul in search of itself, the striving of one who vainly sought his place in the world, ever haunted by the shadow of a death that is more than death, - the passing of a soul that has missed its duty.” Providing more of an allegorical tale than biography, Du Bois told of Crummell’s resistance to three temptations he believed every black man faced and few were capable to resist. Crummell’s final temptation was to accept a natural inferiority among blacks, “to doubt the destiny and capability of the
race his soul loved because it was his; to find listless squalor instead of eager endeavor; to hear his own lips whispering, ‘They do not care; they cannot know; they are dumb driven cattle.’ Crummell’s elitism and frustration struck a chord with Du Bois, inspiring his notion of “the Talented-Tenth.” Du Bois embraced education, the opportunity to travel, and the opportunity to distinguish himself.

Du Bois attended the University of Berlin, visited Jamaica, and traveled throughout Europe before the outbreak of First World War. While studying in Germany in the 1890s, Du Bois absorbed as many concerts and lectures as he could, and enjoyed a more relaxed racial atmosphere than he had experienced in the United States. He adamantly believed African-Americans benefited from contact with whites outside of the United States. As a sociologist, Du Bois treated his experience as an opportunity to observe and analyze racial perceptions in Germany, but, as an intellectual striving to excel in the name of race, Du Bois traveled through the country in pursuit of European culture. The contradictions inherent in his admiration of European culture and his disdain for both the informal and institutionalized racism he observed troubled Du Bois. His exposure to Hegel, Marx, and the German Social Democratic Party during this time would inspire his socialist leanings later in life, forever color his weltanschauung, and challenged his signature intellectual elitism. Similar to his brush with the common workers of Germany, Du Bois found in his trips to the West Indies and to the American South social and educational differences that made him aware of the complexities of uplifting blacks. The socialism Du Bois would cautiously embrace, being evolutionary in nature, reflected both German bureaucratic socialism and Washington’s strategy of accommodation.
While Du Bois reached many in his audience through lectures, most discovered his intellectual labor in print. An amazingly prolific writer, Du Bois published more than twenty-five books and wrote for many journals including *The New York Times, The Independent, The New Review*, and *The Atlantic*. Du Bois served as the editor of *The Crisis*, the main organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), from its inaugural issue in 1910, a year after Du Bois helped found the organization, until he resigned twenty-four years later. The *Crisis* was immediately successful; its first issue sold out its initial thousand copies, leading Du Bois to more than double the size and run for the second issue. While primarily concerned with the plight of African-Americans, *The Crisis* dealt with many global and progressive issues, particularly World War I and women’s suffrage, and, like the NAACP itself, concerned itself with the advancement of “colored peoples,” being defined as “black, brown, red and yellow peoples, including Negroes, mulattoes, Chinese, Japanese, Egyptians, Arabs, Indians, etc.” Disconcerting to the NAACP board of directors, Du Bois used *The Crisis* to deliver fiery indictments of politicians, institutions, and intellectuals. Du Bois caused endless headaches for NAACP executives including progressive journalist Oswald Villard, who served as treasurer and chairman of the NAACP and for a brief time, served as a contributing editor to *The Crisis* until his frustration with Du Bois led him to disassociate himself from the journal altogether. When the European nations declared war on each other, *The Crisis* had 33,000 subscribers and shortly after the war, circulation exceeded 100,000.

In the years prior to United States involvement, Du Bois contributed an analysis of the conflict that placed it within a global context that included the colonies and
subordinated racial groups of the Great Powers. In 1914, urging African-Americans to take notice of the events in Europe, Du Bois described the war as “one of the great disasters due to race and color prejudice,” foreshadowing “greater disasters in the future.”

Du Bois understood the role of the Scramble for Africa and imperial aspirations in the conflict. In “The African Roots of the War,” Du Bois insightfully analyzed the power struggles taking place in the world-system. Du Bois scrutinized the motivations behind an open-door policy in China, observed the obsession with trade in foreign markets, and challenged the popular idea that the Balkans were “the storm center and the cause of the war,” suggesting that while “the Balkans are convenient for occasions .. the ownership of materials and men in the darker world [was] the real prize that [set] the nations of Europe at each other’s throats.”

The rhetoric of democracy used by the Allied Powers during World War I did not endear Du Bois to Western Democracy. He saw how vulnerable minorities became in a democracy with a “racist majority.” However, Du Bois hoped that something positive could come out of war; he cautiously supposed that since “black Africans and brown Indians and yellow Japanese [were] fighting for France and France,” the Allied Powers would “come out of this frightful welter of blood with new ideas of the essential equality of all men.” Like many progressives, Du Bois bought into the demonizing propaganda of Germany as the most evil of aspiring empires. His complaints were more informed than some of his contemporaries who justified their hatred of Germany for being more militaristic than the other militaristic states. From his experiences studying in Berlin and his admiration of German culture, Du Bois had “deep cause to love the German people.” He favored an Allied victory because he favored their record with their colonies; he
advised his fellow Americans to give their “sympathies in the awful conflict .. with France and England” because while they had not “conquered race prejudice .. they [had] at least begun to realize its cost and evil, while Germany exalt[ed] it.” He had heard his political science professor at the University of Berlin Heinrich von Treitschke profess the inferiority of mulattos, had read German scientists justifications for racist conquest, and detested Germany’s colonial misdeeds. Despite his fear of a German victory and the looming sedition acts of Oliver Wendell Holmes not to yell fire in a crowded theater, Du Bois held little back in his criticism of the United States and the management of African-American soldiers. Shortly after the armistice, Du Bois published a treatment on the African-American experience in the war called “The Black Man in the Revolution of 1914-1918,” which celebrated the contribution of African-American soldiers, brought attention to race-oriented propaganda used by all nations involved in the conflict, and exposed the slings and arrows suffered by black soldiers. Du Bois went so far as to say, “the black soldier saved civilization in 1914-18.” Even after publicly disputing Washington’s approach, Du Bois reverted to accommodation in supporting the United States’ military involvement, publishing “A Philosophy in Time of War” which stated, “our souls are ours, but our bodies belong to our country.” Observing that black soldiers were hardly rewarded for their service, Du Bois would later regret his support for the war. Refused representation at the Paris Peace Conference, Du Bois organized the second Pan-African Congress in Paris a month later, not unlike the recent tactic of the Pro-Democracy movement to hold its World Social Forum at the same time as the World Economic Forum.
A venerated civil rights activist and the first African-American to receive a PhD, W.E.B. Du Bois maintained his activism and intellectual labor within a global context. His contributions in the fields of anthropology, sociology, history, and politics, often politicized and sensationalized, brought challenges to dominant traditional thinking and introduced new perspectives into Atlantic-world anti-systemic thought.

*Marcus Garvey*

*(August 17, 1887-June 10, 1940)*

Despite Marcus Garvey’s vaguely defined title of “Provisional President of Africa” and his well-known association with the Back-to-Africa movement, the Jamaican-born activist never visited the continent. His efforts to do so were thwarted by the British and U.S. governments. Though Garvey never made it to Africa, he traversed much of the globe, his political fame and intellectual labors traveled even further than his person. While Garvey and Du Bois shared a number of contacts, exchanged occasional correspondence, and held many ideological positions in common, they did not get along.\textsuperscript{cdlviii} In his 1923 portrait of Garvey, Du Bois delivered a number of backhanded compliments about his fellow black activist-intellectual.\textsuperscript{cxl} In characteristic elitist fashion, Du Bois placed Garvey at a subordinate level, deriding him for having “no thorough education and a very hazy idea of the technic of civilization.”\textsuperscript{cxl} Speaking of Garvey almost like a child or criminal, Du Bois further degraded Garvey, accusing him of being “inordinately vain and egotistic, jealous of his power, impatient of details,” and “a poor judge of human nature” for whom “dream, fact, fancy, wish, were all so blurred in
his thinking that neither he himself nor his hearers could clearly or easily extricate them.  

Garvey gained much of his education through contacts he made with other black intellectuals. While Du Bois voiced his doubts about Garvey’s abilities, his fellow Caribbean activist and intellectual Dr. J. Richard Love and the Egyptian-Sudanese scholar, actor, and journalist Dusé Mohamed Ali both chose to help develop Garvey intellectually after recognizing his potential in his early activism. Mentoring Garvey during two of the most formative periods of his life, Love and Ali prepared Garvey to participate in the global intellectual community, schooled him in the organization of social movements, and introduced to him to emerging activist networks throughout Europe and the Americas. Their support and guidance enabled Garvey to set goals beyond local agitation and organization and to accomplish such tasks as organizing the tremendously popular Universal Negro Improvement Association, which organized and aspired on transnational terms.

Already well-traveled and well-educated, Love first came to Jamaica in 1889 when Garvey was just an infant. Like Du Bois’s mentor Alexander Crummell, Love was an ordained Episcopal priest and early advocate of Pan-African thought. While a native of the Bahamas, Love agitated for political causes throughout the Caribbean, encouraging blacks to campaign for political offices, protesting colonial policies and the land tenure system, and giving voice to the concerns of poor in his militant journal the *Jamaican Advocate*. Delivering lectures on Toussaint Louverture, hero of the Haitian Revolution, and Phillis Wheatley, the poet sold into slavery as a young girl in the eighteenth century and generally regarded as the first African-American writer of distinction, Love saw
Jamaica as a fertile ground for a revolutionary rethinking of the cultural and institutional politics of race. He devoted the last twenty-five years of his life towards encouraging reform on the island and the broadening of its intellectual interests. Love had great faith in the intellectual capacity of the Jamaican people and he emphasized education in all of his activism. Authoring most of the articles and editorials in the *Jamaican Advocate*, published weekly and distributed all around Jamaica for ten years, Love inexhaustibly provided the people of Jamaica and the nationalist movement with consistent intellectual stimulation, written with the intention of being accessible and provocative to a colonized audience, some survivors of Jamaica’s legacy of slavery which ended only sixty years before the Advocate’s debut. In remembering the publication and its architect many years after its last issue and Love’s death, Garvey referred to the reception and accessibility of Love’s intellectual labors by insisting “‘one cannot read his ‘Jamaica Advocate’ with getting race consciousness.’”

Placing little value on providing proper education to its subjects, the British Empire concentrated its “civilizing mission” on more profitable endeavors, instituting British law, installing public administration, harbors and other forms of infrastructure and revolutionizing the movement of goods and people by building railroads, the gift that defined the second half of the Age of Imperialism. By supplying radical news of substance and relevance weekly, the *Advocate*, which Love classified as “‘the literature of political and social freedom,’” encouraged Jamaicans to engage in both political agitation and intellectual discourse, neither of which received any support from the crown or the colonial administration. Less abstractly, the *Advocate* endorsed labor organization and education by serving at the official organ of the Jamaica Union of
Love passed his commitment to improving and expanding access to education on to Garvey.

Garvey wrote and spoke about education in the language of Pan-Africanism he had learned from Love. Describing education as “the medium by which people are prepared for the creation of their own particular civilization, and the advancement and glory of their own race,” Garvey echoed ideas proposed by Love, Du Bois, Henry Sylvester-Williams, and other early Pan-Africanists who argued for education and achievement independent of the dominant system and the dominant race. Pan-Africanism argued for a separate intellectual legacy that did not simply imitate the triumphs of Western civilization, but produced new and unique knowledge that would provide all humanity with much needed benefits. For Garvey and other Pan-African theorists, the potential to grow intellectually lay inside every person of African descent.

Unlike Du Bois and those who championed the notion of a Talented-Tenth, Garvey believed intellectual development was largely a choice and could be accomplished not only with traditional scholarship, to which access was limited, but also through everyday experience. Garvey imagined an intellectual spirit that allowed anyone to “become as great and full of knowledge as the other fellow without even entering the class room.” This conception of education provided a certain amount of legitimacy to the experiences and insights of colonized, impoverished, enslaved, and subjugated Africans. Garvey and Love attracted popular support by including their audiences in the progress and promise of the entire race. An editorial, published a week after his death, credited Love, “‘more than any other man,’” with “‘breath[ing] life in the political existence of the people’” and convincing the Jamaican masses with their “‘political
sensibilities .. as apathetic as sodden leather’ ” that they “ ‘had a claim on political life.’

Love’s agenda, carried forward by Garvey, required that the intellectual and political activity of a race united across classes and borders reflect the history of the entire race and serve to uplift the entire race, if not all humankind.

Constantly striving to improve public and intellectual life in Jamaica, Love helped organize the Jamaica Cooperative Association and the People’s Convention. In 1906, after some unsuccessful campaigns, Love was elected to the Jamaica Legislative Council in Saint Andrews. Love’s participation in radical politics, reverence for intellectual work and education, and use of aggressive journalism left a lasting impression on Garvey. Upon Love’s death in 1914, the UNIA held a memorial meeting where this man, so influential on Garvey, was described as “a man of strong and pronounced views, of independent opinions and fearless in his expressions of them,” “an uncompromising Advocate of Equal Rights for all,” and an “Unflinching Champion of the cause of his race” with global aspirations for challenging the role race would play in the world social order.

In 1910, Love encouraged Garvey to travel around Latin America. Fundamental, perhaps sentimentally, to Love’s larger Pan-African vision, the dream of uniting blacks throughout the Americas in struggle and reform had not been realized in his lifetime. By urging Garvey to familiarize himself with Central and South America, Love bestowed the unrealized and ambitious agenda upon his intellectual heir. Without question, a passionate interest in social reform and organization compelled Garvey’s first voyage beyond the coast of his native Jamaica. Garvey first arrived in Costa Rica where he worked as a timekeeper on a banana plantation. Over the next two years, Garvey
traveled to Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and Honduras. Garvey observed the effects of Spanish and French colonization, U.S. military intervention, and the business practices of the United Fruit Company on natives and black migrant workers in the area. Seeing the suffering of blacks beyond his native island inspired Garvey to found an international organization, which would become the Universal Negro Improvement Association.

Shortly after returning to Jamaica from his jaunts through Latin America, Garvey departed for Jamaica’s metropole in 1912. While staying in England and touring Scotland, Spain, and France, he encountered racial communities different from those in the western hemisphere both in racial distinctions (physical appearance, common ancestry, language, self-identification) and in collective definition. While he encountered racism, Garvey, like Du Bois, recognized differences in the way race expressed itself in Europe and the Americas. By no means did Europe provide a model for a raceless society, as nationalist rhetoric charming most of the continent into total war two years after Garvey’s arrival demonstrates. The example Europe did provide, however, confirmed the understanding of race, held by Garvey and Du Bois, as a product and element of its society, mutable and subjective. Europe would be the closest Garvey would ever get to Africa. Deeply intrigued by and ideologically invested in the continent, he relished his contact with Africans during his stay in Britain. Garvey’s impressions from these conversations and relationships largely informed his understanding of Africa and its politics.

Among the Africans he befriended in London, Garvey found a logical successor to his previous mentor Dr. Richard Love in the Egyptian-Sudanese scholar, actor, and
journalist Dusé Mohamed Ali. Shortly after meeting, Ali recruited Garvey to write and work for the *African Times and Orient Review*.\(^{clxxiii}\) Founded by Ali in the summer of 1912, the *African Times and Orient Review* provided well-researched and provocative discussions of race, politics, history, and culture to audiences with limited access to such discourse, much like the *Jamaican Advocate*, but employing more sophisticated language and reaching a significantly larger readership. While formally chartered to promote the intellectual labors and nationalist movements of African and Asian peoples, the *African Times and Orient Review* found readers and contributors throughout the international intellectual community including E.D. Morel and George Bernard Shaw.\(^{clxxiv}\)

Much as Love had introduced Garvey to the intelligentsia and activist leadership of the Caribbean, Ali made a wealth of contacts from the international community available to Garvey. Ali, a corresponding member of Alexander Crummell’s American Negro Academy, helped foster Garvey’s relationships with black leaders in the United States and directed Garvey towards the works of early Pan-Africanists like Crummell and Edward Blyden.\(^{clxxv}\) The reverence Love held for education, literature, and culture reappeared in the importance Ali placed on increasing intellectual awareness among Africans. Impressed with Garvey’s enthusiasm and potential, Ali took keen interest in Garvey’s intellectual development, imparting as many pearls of wisdoms and unpopular opinions as he could manage. Ali encouraged Garvey’s intellectual pursuits at Birkbeck College, guided him towards the resources available elsewhere in London, and helped him gain access to reading room at the British Museum.\(^{clxxvi}\) Ali celebrated the study of African history, writing his own monograph on Egyptian history, and publishing Garvey’s history of Jamaica.\(^{clxxvii}\) Working for the *African Times and Orient Review*,

---
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\(^{clxxvii}\) Working for the *African Times and Orient Review*,
Garvey familiarized himself with Ali’s style of activist journalism, which included openly criticizing government policy and exposing colonial abuses, but also recognizing black achievements in commerce, culture, and other areas.\textsuperscript{clxxviii} His experiences as a printer in Kingston and with the \textit{African Times and Orient Review} prepared him to publish his own journal, \textit{The Negro World}, in 1918.\textsuperscript{clxxix} When Garvey began publishing \textit{The Negro World}, he invited Ali to serve as a contributing editor.\textsuperscript{clxxx} For several years, Ali contributed a weekly article on foreign affairs to \textit{The Negro World}.\textsuperscript{clxxxii}

After two very formative years in London, Garvey returned to Kingston in July 1914, anxious to put his education into practice.\textsuperscript{clxxxii} During the next two months, Garvey made his determination to participate in public life clear. Within a few days of his return, Garvey became involved in a mildly heated public debate over the way the rest of the world viewed Jamaica, leading to a discussion of the racial climates of the United States and Jamaica.\textsuperscript{clxxxiii} The dialogue took place through letters published in the \textit{Gleaner}, Jamaica’s most popular national newspaper. Responding to a criticism by one of Jamaica’s labor leaders, Garvey politely explained himself and lightly defended the article under attack, entitled “"The Evolution of Latter-Day Slaves: Jamaica, A Country of Black and White," published in Britain earlier in the year before being reprinted in the back pages of the \textit{Gleaner}.\textsuperscript{clxxxiv} However, when the \textit{Gleaner} published a letter by Charles Shirley, a Jamaican-born minister who had recently returned from living in the United States, criticizing Garvey’s depiction of life in Jamaica, Garvey seized upon the opportunity to promote himself and his beliefs.\textsuperscript{clxxxv} Adopting a shameless self-righteousness, Garvey attests to “‘love the negro,’” to “‘have fought many battles for him,’” to “‘have suffered for him,’” and to know the “‘true history’ of the negro.”\textsuperscript{clxxxvi} He
references his faith in the “nobility and courage about the negro” and his “life’s purpose to continue to suffer for him, in the hopes that in the end some good will be achieved in the interest of the struggling race.”

This immediate leap into public debate and the founding of the United Negro Improvement and Conservation Association and African Communities League (UNIA) on August 1, 1914 reveal how Garvey’s intellect and ambition had matured. Six years earlier, Garvey had never left the island, received only minimal formal education, and only knew activism within the context of the print shop; by the founding of the UNIA, Garvey had visited three continents where he helped local workers organize, worked on several newspapers, enjoyed intimate friendships with prominent intellectuals, developed working relationships with several activist organizations, and gained the confidence that would eventually gain him his notoriety.

Upon his return to Jamaica, Garvey possessed a self-assurance that allowed him to speak his beliefs with conviction and to embrace a personal as well as intellectual identity. Though his time in the United States, which began in 1916, would introduce to him to several other interpretations of black nationalism and inform much of his political thought, Garvey had already begun to identify himself as Pan-Africanist, pursued leadership positions, and compile a long and varied lists of international contacts. Leaving London and the tutelage of Ali, Garvey arrived in Jamaica without the egos of his mentors to infringe upon his budding megalomania or dissuade his fantastic ambitions. Creating the UNIA so soon after arriving home indicates the presence of a newly acquired confidence and refined ambition.

If Garvey had learned anything from Love and Ali, it was the importance of propaganda as Garvey began distributing the first pamphlet under the auspices of the
UNIA within days of the group’s commencement. Entitled “A Talk With Afro-West Indians: The Negro Race and Problems,” it condemned the black race as a whole for losing “hold of the glorious civilization that he once dispensed” and then failing to cooperate amongst one another in hopes of reclaiming their position among what Pan-Africanists consider opposing civilizations. Remaining loyal to the strategies of his predecessors, Garvey followed his mildly confrontational introduction by swiftly shifting attention to the subject of education, fostering the race’s collective intellectual livelihood and specifically the study of history. Garvey blamed disunity among peoples of African descent on a lack of race pride, inhibiting the ability of Africans to conceive their race capable of reaching their potential. Garvey believed regular intellectual stimulation and a solid understanding of common ancestral heritage would replenish lost dignity, generate a communal sense of pride, and motivate an interest in challenging the politics of identity.

Garvey concluded his pamphlet with a list of UNIA objectives. While most items on the agenda employed vague language that allowed for interpretation, Garvey made the emphasis on cooperation, brotherhood, communality, and global mindedness readily apparent, pledging “To Establish a Universal Confraternity among the Race” and “To Promote the Spirit of Race Pride and Love.” More specific pledges included the building all types of higher education facilities and installing offices, much like embassies, in countries throughout the world to serve the interests of the country’s African population. As expressed in the pledge, Garvey and the UNIA’s attitude towards the people of Africa mirrored the laments of the white man’s burden, promising
“To Assist in Civilizing the Backwards Tribes” and “To Promote a Conscientious Christian Worship among the Native Tribes of Africa.”

More than youthful impatience compelled Garvey’s decision to unveil the UNIA on August 1, 1914. The date carried a particular importance with Jamaicans and other Caribbean subjects of the Crown as it marked the eightieth anniversary of abolition in the British Empire. For better or worse, Germany declared war against Russia on the same day, eclipsing Garvey’s bold initiative to change the world. The circumstances created by the conflict forced the group to make an ideological choice: protest a war that exemplified the worst excesses of empire or support Great Britain and its allies. Only in its infancy, the UNIA hardly had the resources or abilities to support any nationalist independence movements. Operating within a small and distant colony both economic peripheral and legally restricted, the UNIA would have required extraordinary means to persuade the British government to seek peace with victory. In September 1914, the UNIA adopted a resolution affirming their loyalty to the Crown and aligning themselves with Great Britain and its allies. While certainly the safest and perhaps the wisest political decision in such a situation, pledging their support for the British war effort also entailed an endorsement of the colonial system. Throughout the world-system, individuals and organizations took similar positions to the UNIA for pragmatic and idealistic reasons. During the early stages of war, many members of the intellectual community responded with an enthusiastic patriotism they often remembered with reproach; many labor unions and feminist groups ceased their agitation during the war with the hope of receiving some sort of concessions after the war. Political activism often obliges the making of moral compromises and uneasy alliances; war only complicates the
awkward struggle for social justice as it threatens the fragile gains of marginalized groups. The UNIA’s resolution, first published in the Jamaican press, reappeared a month later in *The Times* (London), increasing the statement’s visibility tremendously. By reprinting the resolution, *The Times* provided its international readership with a limited impression of the UNIA as a loyalist group “mindful of the great protecting influence of the English nation ad people, and their justice to all men, and especially their negro subjects scattered all over the world” and proclaims “God save the King! Long live the British Empire!” While nationalist independence movement had not been the priority of the UNIA, such a public endorsement of colonialism would seem to discredit any claim to self-determination.

Overshadowed by the events in Europe, Garvey’s organization encountered extraordinary obstacles in capturing the public’s attention. In its inaugural two years, membership of the UNIA barely exceeded one hundred. While membership rose sluggishly during the initial years, the UNIA drew increasingly larger audiences to its weekly meetings and lectures, steadily kindling interest and sympathy for the organization. Most of the UNIA’s early efforts resulted in little more than frustration. The colonial government refused his appeal for public land to build a school for boys. Launched in Kingston, the UNIA held all of its meetings in the capital until October 1915 when the group assembled in Garvey’s hometown of St. Ann’s Bay. One of many unsuccessful engagements during the organization’s infancy, the meeting failed to attract new members and sparked such derision from those in attendance as to make Garvey cry. Garvey struggled to provide the UNIA with a regularly published journal, heralding its arrival in the first and every subsequent pamphlet the group published and
repeatedly promising copies to his international contacts. Garvey’s dream finally materialized in August 1918 when the first issue of *The Negro World* appeared. Tirelessly campaigning to win support and procure funds for the UNIA, Garvey refused to accept these early defeats as indicative of the organization’s future.

Concerning himself and his organization with the plight of Africans everywhere, Garvey cultivated particular interest in race relations in the United States. Having familiarized himself with the popular debate among African-American intellectuals, whether to employ Du Bois or Booker T. Washington’s approach, Garvey hoped to overcome the differences between the two Americans’ platforms and encourage Jamaicans and other diaspora populations “pave [their] way both industrially and intellectually.” Trying to engineer a trade school in the tradition of the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, Garvey solicited Washington for any advice and assistance Washington could offer. Expressing interest in Garvey’s project and the larger objectives of the UNIA, Washington encouraged Garvey to visit, pledging to do whatever he could to make Garvey’s visit “as pleasant and as profitable” as possible.

Washington associated their correspondence and anticipated collaboration as exemplary of “the age of ‘getting together’” defined by “evidences of constructive accomplishment which are the result of friendly cooperation and mutual helpfulness.” Washington’s death in November 1915 ended this intriguing relationship.

Initially conceived as a lecturing tour across the entire Americas, Garvey’s voyage to the United States in 1916 scarcely resembled his original itinerary. Less a tour of the Americas than an eleven-year affair with the United States, Garvey’s extended visit afforded him the opportunity to discover new influences and new audiences. In
American cities, particularly Harlem, New York, Garvey discovered a world more conducive to his own intellectual development than he had encountered in Jamaica. Acquainting himself with intellectuals of different races, ages, and ideologies, Garvey experienced a second education and renewed interest in political activism and intellectual work. Although the UNIA extended a letter to Du Bois welcoming him when he visited Jamaica, the two had only debated on paper until Garvey arrived in the offices of *The Crisis*. Du Bois’s program, which sought political rights and peaceful integration, met opposition from Garvey’s ever-increasing Black Nationalist sentiment.

New economic opportunities and changes in the U.S. labor force, resulting from U.S. involvement in World War One, also encouraged Garvey to stray from his intended activity. New York provided Garvey an opportunity to make a global impact that could not be found in Kingston. American culture, particularly American capitalism, invigorated Garvey and colored his successes. In less than a year, the New York office of the UNIA replaced the office in Kingston as headquarters. In 1918, Garvey was able to publish the first issue of *The Negro World*, finally establishing an official organ for the UNIA. *The Negro World* achieved a circulation of fifty thousand in its first two years of publication, published articles in Spanish and French, and gained international recognition. *The Negro World* became so popular it was banned in Barbados, Trinidad, British Guiana, and all of the Italian, French, and Portuguese colonies.

Like Du Bois, Garvey perceived the end of the war to represent an end to accommodation and an opportunity to resolve inequalities in the world-system. As the victorious states argued over the conditions of a post-war world, tensions rose among black intellectuals as they argued over the most effective strategy to play a role in
determining those post-war conditions. Challenging Du Bois’s participation in the Paris Peace Conference, Garvey led the UNIA in proclaiming “their repudiation of Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois” and denying his claim to represent the interests of their race. Finding Du Bois too conservative, Garvey slandered Du Bois, identifying him as a “reactionary under pay of white men.” Garvey instead favored a radical agenda of absolute separatism. Addressing the Paris Peace Conference through an editorial in the *Negro World*, Garvey recognized the role Africa played in igniting the war, stating, “it can be easily seen that the war of 1914 was the outcome of African aggrandizement.” His proposal, which he expressed with little ambiguity, for a lasting peace required total decolonization and separation, insisting “the white man confines himself politically to Europe, the yellow man to Asia and the black man to Africa.” Garvey had high hopes that Japan and China, under Japan’s influence, might compel the issue of race at the Peace Conference. The outcome of the Paris Peace Conference left many in the world-system dissatisfied.

*Obstacles to Defining Race Continue*

Even as radical race ideas like eugenics, Social Darwinism, and “the white man’s burden” had grown outdated and laughably inadequate. The struggle to define race continued to prove difficult throughout the twentieth century. As race and culture are inextricably linked, cultural differences between communities and individuals identified, either by themselves or by others, as one race presented problems for separatist and Black
Nationalist agendas. How could people with so many differences be united around such a flexible category as race?

The evangelical element of Garvey’s global agenda demonstrates the diversity among early twentieth century intellectuals. Du Bois came to reject Christianity spiritually, but, like Bertrand Russell, remained interested in the church as a social institution and political force. Unlike Russell, who opposed the church on ideological grounds, describing Christianity as “the principal enemy of moral progress in the world,” Du Bois believed the church could benefit the African-American community as a moral and social institution. All of the intellectuals in this study, whether advocates or opponents of Christianity, understood the power and employed the language of the Gospels and by doing so, made their own contributions to the collective understanding of the religion as a symbol and a social convention. Using Christian metaphors to provide his ambitions with a sense of spiritual purpose, Garvey inadvertently inspired a new religion. Surviving into the present day, Rastafarianism, which recognizes Garvey as a prophet, has kept Garvey and his philosophies in the popular consciousness.

Though the Wizard of Tuskegee impressed both men, Garvey and Du Bois both agreed that Washington underestimated the potential of their race and rejected his strategy of accommodation. Du Bois believed a Talented-Tenth would exceed the expectations placed on the intellectual capacity of the African race and Garvey believed members of the African diaspora communities could compete economically in enterprises they had been excluded from. Garvey’s background organizing on the grassroots level, strengthening unions and activist groups throughout the Atlantic-World, contrasted with
Du Bois’ dissent, which was closely tied to his scholarship and academic accomplishments.

Following the Peace Conference, the rift between Du Bois and Garvey widened. Du Bois had trouble taking Garvey seriously and described his activism as “bombastic, wasteful, illogical, and ineffective and almost illegal.” Garvey continued to publicize his criticisms of Du Bois, making unfounded accusations and attacking his loyalty to his race. In addition to Du Bois, Garvey alienated many other black intellectuals by adopting and espousing more radical ideas. The radicalism that isolated Garvey from the intellectual community inspired a brief surge in support for Garvey among non-elites, evidencing by a rise in UNIA membership. While a series of arrests and deportation discredited Garvey in the intellectual community, he remains a cherished folk hero, particularly in his native Jamaica, sustained in the public consciousness through music, murals, and the practice of Rastafarianism.

By assuming the position of intellectual-activists, Du Bois and Garvey both challenged the intellectual as a social role in distinct ways that reflected both their personal experiences and changes in the collective struggle with the notion of race. While Du Bois and Garvey remain in the public consciousness, much scholarship remains undone regarding many of the intellectuals they exchanged ideas with and many of the activists who participated in and with their organizations. The full impact of the black intellectuals active during the First World War cannot yet be fully determined, but the lasting appeal of Black Nationalism is evidenced by its reappearance in social movements later in the twentieth century like the Nation of Islam and Black Panther Party.
Eluding the "cult of domesticity," which maintained household management as the sole function of middle-class women, inherited from the Victorian era, many young women forsook social convention at the turn of the century in pursuit of greater independence than afforded to their mothers. Indicative of changing social attitudes, the phenomenon heralded the ideal of the "New Woman." The "New Woman" entered the public sphere by going to college, earning her own income, living alone or with other women, and participating in politics and social causes. Craving greater control over their own destiny, women organized themselves, entered the public sphere, and agitated for their rights as citizens to include the right to own property and obtain a divorce.

Determined to restructure the social order and affect public policy, women activists sought the right to vote. Meeting with resistance from threatened men and hesitant women, first-wave feminists and their claim to the franchise rejected political definitions of gender endured and accepted by democratic societies for years without question. Campaigns for women’s suffrage, in which Jane Addams and Estelle Sylvia Pankhurst both participated, blossomed on both sides of the Atlantic.

Like other contemporary idols wilting in their own twilight, conventional notions of gender could not escape the critical tribunals of modernity intact. As the terms of the public sphere and the responsibilities of the state evolved to meet the changing interests
of society, the capacity of women as agents of social change appeared disproportionate to the rights and responsibilities allotted to them. The purpose of the state had been shifting its center from military defense to social welfare since the French Revolution. Because of the inadequacy of that “dangerous attempt of radical intervention in the basic structure of social order” to produce a peaceful and prosperous society, challenges to social organization emerged in political form to monitor the power of the state, fearing Terror, and to combat persisting inequalities and inefficiencies, fearing Revolution.

Wallerstein distinguishes political persuasions ideologically by their willingness to promote and accept change to the prevailing social order. All these familiar distinctions, conservative, liberal, and radical, define themselves through their relationship with the predominant system, their vision to transform the system, and the speed with which they believe the transformation could take place. Wallerstein’s assertion that these groups create the local and global culture (geoculture) through their willingness to experiment can be applied to the visions of the state as conceived of by Addams and Pankhurst in theory and in practice. Both women fought tirelessly to promote a more democratic purpose for the state.

By the twentieth century, dialogue regarding state intervention in social welfare and social responsibility generally had begun to focus on issues that both concerned women’s welfare and reflected the traditional activities of women. As social issues became more politically relevant, the necessity of increasing women’s participation, particularly but not exclusively through the franchise, proved essential to expansion of the state. Growing urban centers needed mothers to keep the social household. Since women performed and organized a great amount of social welfare efforts, their access to
the public sphere encouraged greater discussion on social issues and informed that discussion with the unique knowledge generated by their experiences. Lacking the vote obliged women to express their political concerns off the ballot. Performed outside the formal political process, women’s activism of the early twentieth century discovered other avenues to exert political influence and advance social issues. Accomplished without suffrage, the contributions of women’s rights activists illustrated how the public sphere transcended “politics” narrowly defined.

Sensitive to the range of injustices prevalent in the world-system, Addams and Pankhurst challenged tyrannical excesses and social disparities, regardless of gender. Both women incorporated the struggles of organized labor and other social movements into their agendas. Lending their energy and reputation to friendly causes, they sought to democratize representation in the public sphere. While their political activism expanded beyond women’s rights, the gendered character of their activism should not be ignored. Conceptions of “republican motherhood” and “social feminism” perceived women’s role and efficacy in politics and progressive causes as distinct from men.

During the struggle for suffrage, women activists established organizations and networks of likeminded women eager to contribute to public affairs. While many suffrage groups suspended their efforts during the war, Addams, Pankhurst, and other activists empathized with the women of other nations and publicized the horrors of war imposed on the lives of women. As women had used gender difference to explain their value as social reformers, the women’s peace movement distinguished itself both in rhetoric, objectives, and practice from other resistance efforts. By identifying how socially accepted understandings of sexual difference, sometimes backed by bogus science,
depicted women as providers of a much needed compassion in the home, women activists argued that social reform and anti-war protest allowed the compassion-providing ability of women to overcome the limits of the private sphere so they might straighten out the world’s problems with a woman’s touch.

Jane Addams

(September 6, 1860 – May 21, 1935)

Embarking on her first trip to Europe as a tourist and a scholar in 1883, Jane Addams received an education she had not expected. Still relatively unfamiliar with the extent to which industrial capitalism had failed the urban poor, Addams could not ignore the desperate living situations she observed. A popular pamphlet detailing the abject poverty and hazardous conditions suffered by residents of London’s East End introduced Addams to progressive journalism and its ability to further progressive causes. This pamphlet motivated Addams to venture into the East End to observe the situation first hand, an experience that left, imprinted on her memory, the image of “myriads of hands, empty, pathetic, nerveless, and workworn, showing white in the uncertain light of the street, and clutching forward for food which was already unfit to eat.” Both distressed and inspired by this enlightening incident and the other exposures to working-class misery she witnessed over those two years abroad, her conception of poverty figured into a global context.

Over the next two years, Addams lingered on the thought of improving the lives of the urban poor while following the debates on social reform among activists and
intellectuals in Europe. Addams crossed the Atlantic Ocean again in December 1886. On this trip, Addams established contacts with activists and intellectuals who introduced the traveling Americans to socialism, positivism, and Marx. After a year of traveling around the continent, Addams returned to the East London, where her heart had been captured by despair five years earlier. In East End, Addams discovered a pivotal source of inspiration in Toynbee Hall. Devised to reduce class disparities by democratizing access to intellectual and cultural treasures, Samuel and Henrietta Barnett created Toynbee Hall with the support of Oxford University in 1884 as a social experiment and consequently launched the settlement house movement. Intended to promote both social cooperation and moral well-being, the settlement house movement demonstrated how the harmonious interplay between activism and intellectual life could be expressed as a social institution. Addams profited from the hospitality and insights offered by the Barnett family and the other residents, most of whom were somehow affiliated with Oxford. The staff of Toynbee Hall eagerly shared their experiences with Addams, describing the classes, social clubs, concerts, and other offerings while sharing suggestions on how to endear the settlement house to the community. In “The Snare of Preparation,” Addams used the meeting at Toynbee Hall as the climax in her narration of her own intellectual development. Comforted, if awed, by the success of Toynbee Hall, Addams felt anxious, but capable, possessing the “confidence that although life itself might contain many difficulties, the period of passive receptivity had come to an end,” and she “had at last finished with the ever-lasting ‘preparation for life,’” providing her enough experience to confront “whatever perplexities and discouragement concerning the life of the poor” with at least a small measure of confidence.
Inspired by what she saw at Toynbee Hall, Addams adapted the settlement model to conditions in the United States and to suit her own gender-informed ideology of social responsibility. Nine months after her return from Europe, Addams opened Hull House with Ellen Gates Starr in Chicago in September 1889. In the few months preceding the opening their doors, Addams delivered speeches throughout Chicago, trying to recruit other female residents, making the case that “women were particularly suited to improving cross-class societal ties since they had traditionally taken responsibility for social matters.”

Constantly working to change the social agenda, Addams often promoted welfare efforts specifically as women’s work. She argued that the fulfillment of women’s “simplest duty,” which “is to keep her house clean and wholesome and to feed her children properly,” could not be accomplished without community and state assistance, Addams believed, in modern times, women hoping to “affectively continue their avocations, … must take part in the movements looking toward social amelioration.”

The conditions of modernity, which forced urban social problems, foreign wars, and world trade into the household, demanded women take an active role in public affairs to fulfill their domestic obligations.

Hull House provided many services to the immigrant community including health services, public baths, theater, swimming facilities, legal defense, and space for labor groups to organize. The classrooms of Hull House had a very special impact on the community and played a vital role in confronting the social ills that Addams saw as obstacles to a peaceful and healthy society. Influenced by the educational philosophies of Friedrich Froebel, the father of the kindergarten movement, and her friend John Dewey, Addams saw the fruition of democracy and childhood education closely linked.
Immigrants from many cultures came together at Hull House, respected one another and worked towards common goals. In serving the immigrant community, Addams addressed culturally based obstacles to democracy and the ethics of assimilation through education. Not only did Hull House offer citizenship preparation classes, it also tried to heal some of the wounds to family and community life suffered during the immigration experience. Addams catered education programs around the material experiences of the students, celebrated the students’ native culture in the classroom by teaching folk crafts and songs, and addressed the gap created by geographic and cultural transfer between immigrant parents and their children as families established themselves in new industrial, urban environments. Her efforts to preserve the family unit informed her education policy of cultural preservation. Her intention to protect the parents from “the judgment of the young,” which she purported to be “founded upon the most superficial standard of Americanism,” emphasized that while the community took upon many of the tasks in raising a child, the community could replace fundamental influences of the family.

When the scope of her activism exceeded the walls of Hull House, Addams proved adept at challenging municipal government, mediating spirited labor disputes, and administering transnational organizations. Serving on the Conciliation Board created by the Civic Federation of Chicago, Addams helped arbitrate the Pullman Strike in 1894 and the 1910 Garment Workers’ Strike. The political capacity Addams demonstrated in organizing and maintaining women’s protest to the First World War substantiated women’s claim to the public sphere. Creating the Women’s Peace Party (WPP) in January 1915, Addams quickly expanded the operation by connecting networks of women activists from neutral and hostile countries. He work culminated in the
International Congress of Women, where thousands of women assembled at the Hague to provide what was “needed above all else .. some human interpretation of this overevolved and much-talked-of situation in which so much of the world finds itself in dire confusion and bloodshed.”

An unprecedented feat in transnational organization, the Hague Conference burst with participants in spite of a tendency among women’s groups to reject a feminist internationalism in favor of a patriarchal patriotism that asked them to silence their political ambitions in the service of their country. The protest of the women’s movement reached levels of international cooperation that suggested world government. The meeting of the International Congress of Women began at the Hague and traveled through the war capitals, trying to bring the left together in solidarity against the war. The Congress hosted representatives from Great Britain, United States, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Poland, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway-Sweden. The Congress also received daily messages from representatives in Bulgaria, Iceland, Portugal, and Turkey.

Addams’s anti-war position alienated timid progressives and her popularity suffered, but nothing could have shifted her sophisticated resolve. Founding the WPP and presiding over the Hague Conference before 1917, Addams assumed a civic responsibility to protest the war before the United States even entered. Keen to the complexities of the world-system, she predicted the local effects of the conflict in Europe. As the war persisted, her sensitivity to human suffering only stiffened her conviction. Addams maintained a commitment to peace that surpassed simply objecting to militarism. Addams defined her conception of peace in material terms and
contextualized it historically. When Addams traveled to Russia in 1896, Leo Tolstoy planted the seeds in her mind about bread labor and revolution, making “peace and bread .. inseparably connected in [her] mind.” Attributed to Bondereff, a Russian peasant, the hypothesis of “bread labour” predicted a bloodless revolution and the end of hostilities should a soldier receive the promise of an equal share of land to work and make bread. As a freshly revolutionized Russia withdrew from the war in 1918, the idea of “bread labour” seemed so powerful that Addams named a book after it. Addams described the Russian peasants and soldiers as yielding “to the instinct to labor on the land which is more primitive and more imperative than the desire for war.” The linking of social welfare and warfare rang true with Addams perceived her social work as peace activism and her peace activism as social work.

Defining peace as a pervasive element in the social order to be nurtured or neglected, Addams believed that the social order and the collective consciousness supporting it would gradually transform the understanding of warfare. Borrowing the language of Herbert Spencer, Addams asserted that the societies are organized around dogmas of either industrialism or militarism in Newer Ideals of Peace in 1907. Arguing that an industrial society works in everyone’s interest while a militaristic society is driven by competition, Addams urged the energy and resources spent fighting other nations be redirected towards combating more pressing threats. Essential to this paradigmatic shift, cosmopolitanism and internationalism compelled a greater awareness of others and a positive sense of interdependency. Addams predicted a global exchange where, “[o]wing to the modern conditions of intercourse, each nation will respond, not to an isolated impulse, but will be caught in the current of a world-wide process.” Seeing
the potential for ethnically diverse urban areas to blossom into “the kingdom of human kindness,” Addams believed daily experiences with other cultures contributed to peaceful relations with other nations, thus making the communication promoted by the settlement movement between classes and cultures acts of peace activism.

Like the rest of the intellectuals discussed in this study, Jane Addams saw the need for a political body to preside over national governments. In her interpretation of a world organization put forth at the International Women’s Congress, she called for an international committee to arbitrate conflicts and an international organization that addressed global social issues. The Women’s Congress eventually became the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom and continues to pursue the goals of the women who met at the Hague. Jane Addams remained socially and politically active until her death in 1935.

Estelle Sylvia Pankhurst

(May 5, 1882 - September 27, 1960)

As the daughter of Richard and Emmeline Pankhurst, two feminist champions, Sylvia inherited a family tradition in radical politics. Early members of both the Fabian Society and the Independent Labour Party, the Pankhursts raised Sylvia and her siblings within an intellectual community thriving with activists and artists. Pankhurst’s intellectual development initially centered in the fine arts. She studied at the Manchester School of Art and the Royal College of Art. Her political beliefs motivated her art, and she hoped to decorate spaces occupied by the poor and working classes.
Following the completion of her studies, however, Pankhurst found that her intellectual pursuits now gravitated less towards art than towards social work and organizing.

Pankhurst advocated “the policy of social care and reconstruction, which is the policy of awakening womanhood throughout the world.” Like Addams, Pankhurst found inspiration in London’s East End. Her role in the Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU) led her to establish the East London Federation of the Suffragettes (ELFS). She used these groups to evangelically pursue the popular intellect and energy of the “the working women of East London,” determined to convince them “to fight for their own enfranchisement.” Unlike Addams, Pankhurst adopted more extreme methods of protest like her notorious hunger strikes and frequent prison stays. Her radicalism, which echoed the sentiments held by her father, strained the tensions between Sylvia and her mother Emmeline, who had founded the WSPU, and her sister Christabel, leading to Sylvia’s expulsion from the WSPU. Directing class to the center of political discussion, Pankhurst unashamedly embraced socialism and social work, questioning the “Parliamentary system under which people suffer” and suggesting “the substitution for it of a local, national, and international system, built up on an occupational basis, of which the members shall be but the delegates of those who are carrying on the world’s work; and shall be themselves workers, drawn, but for a space, from the bench, the mine, the desk, the kitchen, or the nursery and sent to voice the needs and desires of others.” Pankhurst distinguished herself from more conservative suffragists by demanding universal suffrage, organizing among the working class, and challenging gendered policies and practices in the labor movement.
When Sylvia Pankhurst and others renovated the abandoned and dilapidated public house Gunmakers Arms to establish the Mothers Arms in 1914, they intended the building to serve as “a Children’s Day Nursery and Mother and Infant Clinic and Milk House.” The building quickly expanded its services to providing lectures on hygiene, domestic science, literature, and labor issues as well as providing drugs, clothes, and foodstuffs free or at reduced prices. Like Hull House, the Mothers Arms recruited from the female population with “friends from the country send[ing] flowers and eggs.” Also, like Hull House, copies of great works of art adorned the walls of the Mothers Arms, following a philosophy that high culture had a place in all levels of society. The Mothers Arms grew out of the Women’s Hall on Old Ford Road in Tower Hamlets, which not only provided social services but also housed a garment and a toy factory, both of which ran as cooperatives. Pankhurst described activity at Women’s Hall during the war as “the poor gallantly helping the poor.”

Pankhurst wrote and co-authored over twenty books and pamphlets and helped found three newspapers. Shortly after her split with the WSPU and the founding of the ELFS, Pankhurst founded the two-page regular *Women’s Dreadnought*, which would eventually evolve into the *Worker’s Dreadnought*. Until the journal began to reach a substantial audience, ELFS supported the paper with sales from baked goods.

Pankhurst believed that voting rights should be extended to all women without property qualification, anticipating the mobilization of a mass women’s movement. Pankhurst served as the secretary for a meeting of diverse organizations at the London Opera House in September 1915 demanding equal pay and suffrage for women, protesting industrial and military compulsion, calling for an end to taxes on food and
other necessities, and the abolition of the House of Lords. Participating groups included women’s organizations like the ELFS, United Suffragists, and the Women Writers Suffrage League and labor groups like the Dockers Union, Amalgamated Toolmakers, Electrical Trade Union, the National Union of Railway Workers, and branches of the Independent Labour Party. The final agenda of the meeting reflected the call for state involvement that Pankhurst shared with Addams, calling for “old age pensions, public health work, housing, educational activities,” and the nationalization of Britain’s mineral and natural resources. Broadening the definition and audience for women’s causes, Pankhurst contributed to the advancement of the women’s movement as a meaningful political force. By including labor and anti-war issues in their political agenda, women socialists and anti-war activists demonstrated the impact of women’s suffrage and political participation in shaping the world order.

In addition to class and gender inequalities, Pankhurst was also acutely aware of race. With Germany producing nearly all the dolls in Europe and trade suspended during the war, Pankhurst led an initiative to build dolls in the toy factory at the Women’s Hall. With Pankhurst designing many of the dolls, the factory began producing dolls of many races shortly after production begun. Distinguished from many in the women’s movement, Pankhurst and Addams acted as mavericks regarding the color line, raising concerns about the inequalities in the world order.

*Peace Work is Women’s Work*
Gaining access to the public sphere by negotiating the sexism of the intellectual community and manipulating traditional conceptions of gender, Addams and Pankhurst compelled the world-system to recognize how contemporary developments necessitated female participation in public affairs. Highlighting increased cosmopolitanism, industrialization, and developments in collective understandings of ethics and morality as catalysts for a rethinking of the social order, Addams and Pankhurst echoed the internationalist radicalism characteristic of the other intellectuals discussed in this study. Their commitment to social work and peace work expressed their novel understanding of feminine obligation, introducing new interpretations of gender into public discourse. As women, Addams and Pankhurst felt a responsibility to social work and peace activism. As activists, they sensed a need to encourage the intellectual livelihood of the entire community regardless of race, sex, or class. As intellectuals, they fused their philosophies with their actions, unable to separate their personal goals from their intellectual ambitions.

Both women wrote prolifically though they have been most remembered for their activism. Pankhurst’s accounts of the Suffrage Movement and biography of her mother helped spread the history and ideas of feminism in Britain. The visual arts allowed Pankhurst a unique entry into the intellectual community. Her painting and artistic training contributed to the look of the feminist movement. Jane Addams’s writings on education, urban planning, and peace contained vibrant philosophy and sophisticated interpretations of the changing world-system. Though she lost some public support as a result of her anti-war activism, Addams was afforded a level of free speech and mobility denied to the other intellectuals in this study. As an American, Addams avoided the
censure of the British Government which threatened Shaw and Garvey and jailed Pankhurst and Russell. Jane Addams served as the president at the Hague, but Pankhurst was denied permission to travel by the British government. As a white woman from the middle class, Addams did not suffer from racism and the threat of lynching that Du Bois encountered. Of course, as a woman, Addams was denied a political voice until the nineteenth amendment after the war. Addams maintained a friendship with Du Bois and shared many of the same causes including the founding of the NAACP.

While both women embraced progressive causes, their political views also sustained deep sympathies with socialist and communist movements. Both women held an interest in Russian communists and Bolshevism. Addams visited Russia in 1896 and Pankhurst visited the Soviet Union in 1917 and 1920. Labor struggles and the public consequences of industrialization weighed heavy on the minds of both activists. Their writings exhibit understandings of the household encouraged by publicly held conceptions of gender. Both women imagined urban communities as expanded and interdependent households. They shared public education, child labor, and children’s health issues as priorities. The effects of war on women and children motivated their peace activism.

They both promoted social work as a responsibility women had to themselves, their communities, and their families. Social work involved them in the lives of men and women who lived and worked outside of their own economic strata. This allowed them both to observe the operations of the world-system in a unique way that male intellectuals did not explore as often. Their involvement in poor and immigrant urban areas brought ideas from the intellectual community to those excluded by economic or cultural
obstacles. Though Russell and Shaw both held public lectures, they lectured mostly at academic functions and society engagements at venues less friendly to the “masses.” Garvey built his support network by appealing to the poor and Du Bois engaged with many communists intellectually, but Pankhurst and Addams lived, worked, and organized with the urban poor in efforts distant from the traditional understanding of politics. Because social work and peace work were gendered women’s work, the experiences of women activists reflected the adaptation as much as transformation of gender.

Establishing social centers like Hull House and Mothers Arms, these women gave their ideas opportunities to occupy physical space and attempt proposals for meaningful reform. Unlike the organizations and demonstrations participated in by the other intellectuals of this study, the settlement movement and welfare programs looked for permanent solutions to ongoing problems. Bertrand Russell’s condemnation of Christianity hoped to radicalize the very foundation of the world-system to create a more utopian order, but his intellectual labors did little for a hungry or sick child. The concentration on public health and urban management distinguishes Addams and Pankhurst’s activism from Garvey and Du Bois who hoped economic independence, separatism, and individualism would provide uplift for peripheral subjects of the world-system.

As women throughout the Atlantic-World confronted changing gender expectations by rejecting or embracing political activism, Addams and Pankhurst stood in the forefront of radical feminism. Pankhurst organized women in political dissent, using militancy and controversy to provoke change in the social order and state policies. Addams also organized women, but she insisted upon pursuing her agenda through less
combative methods. She despised violence, but rarely surrendered to her critics. Addams was also most adept at organizing on a global scale as her successes in the peace movement demonstrate. While many other women fought social conventions, these two activists also fought injustice, inequality, and economic shortfall.
Conclusion

The intellectual-activists I’ve examined in this study impacted society and challenged the social order through their works and ideas. The categories employed to subjugate groups of people had begun to prove themselves incompatible with technological developments and the deepening of cross-cultural relationships. Anti-systemic movements arose to force new definitions of those categories into common and formal use. Motivated by the capacity of the masses to contribute to intellectual life, these activists campaigned for public education, spread radical ideas through the press, and toured the world, giving lectures and establishing transnational connections between activist organizations.

By studying the social and intellectual work of these six individuals during World War One, I have chronicled elements of the development of democracy in world history that manifested themselves in everyday life and in the policies of dominant social institutions. Religion, race, and gender create nuanced social distinctions that complicate the realization of true social and political democracy. The problems created by these distinctions inspired these intellectuals to consider the implications of both the dominant policies and their own activism. Today religion, race, and gender continue to cause crises in the struggle for social justice.

These intellectuals took social concepts and articulated them in a way that made them less abstract in an attempt to change their influence in determining the social order. By reconfiguring religion, race, and gender intellectually, these activists protested the world-system in the language of science, democracy, and trade. They vexed their fellow
intelligentsia by rejecting socially acceptable positions of complacency and trust in the world order. Drawing attention to those strata of society most susceptible to the problems of the world-system, such as the suffering imposed by war or inequalities in the social order, these intellectuals broadened the definition of humanity. Though the subjects of my study treated the “masses” which varying degrees of respect and interaction, they generally, if idealistically, perceived genuine democracy as the ultimate goal of their activism and of the world-system.
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While I have made every attempt to provide meaningful criticism, studying these individuals has been somewhat an act of hero worship for me. I cannot deny that the words and actions of these individuals inspire me. My own political activism, social work, and intellectual labor has been largely driven by my experience growing up in the Southeastern United States at the end of the twentieth century where social stratification responds to powerful religious institutions, enduring racial discord, and traditional conceptions of gender, all particular to the region. While outsiders often conceive of the South as home to reactionary pastors, blatant racism, and antiquated gender roles, a culture devoid of an intellectual livelihood and detached from global developments, I reject these misconceptions and take a certain pride in having been a part of community that continues to confront its past and its consequential social inequalities while celebrating the positive aspects of its history and creating a distinctive multi-cultural community. A product of intellectual diversity as much as racial and class distinctions, Southern cosmopolitanism is unique and I find it incredibly appropriate that Atlanta has hosted many global events like the 1996 Summer Olympics and this year’s World Social Forum.

While I call Atlanta one of my homes, I was not born here, nor do I plan to stay here. I have also cultivated friendships and contacts with intellectuals and activists throughout the world, a luxury afforded to my generation by technological advancements in communication, greater economic and political cooperation between nations, and the actions of individuals like Russell, Shaw, Du Bois, Garvey, Addams, and Pankhurst.
Having inherited their intellectual legacy, I hope to come to new revelations and conclusions about their contribution to our world.
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