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Olive Schreiner globalising social inquiry: A feminist analytics of globalisation

Liz Stanley, Helen Dampier and Andrea Salter

Abstract

Globalisation theory sees the processes of change it is concerned with as distinctively new, with a feminist analytics part of the newness of the current period too, focusing on some specific gender dynamics involved. However, the work of the feminist writer and social theorist Olive Schreiner (1855–1920) challenges, indeed overturns, such assumptions. Similar structural economic and political circumstances to those now called globalisation were the focus of Schreiner’s theorising, with her work demonstrating that ‘it’s been done before’ in the case of a feminist analytics of global social change. Also, Schreiner’s feminist interrogation of global change refused any confinement to gender (although it encompassed it), because for her gender was always already interconnected with class, ‘race’ and an array of wider structural forces and changes. Schreiner’s unfolding analysis of imperialism and the expansionist project in the period 1888 to 1913, and of war, peace and social movements in the period 1914 to 1920, are discussed, in particular by presenting new material from Schreiner’s extant letters and exploring the significant ways these add to the analysis in her published work. Over 5000 Schreiner letters are extant, are being researched by the Olive Schreiner Letters Project (www.oliveschreinerletters.ed.ac.uk), and provide an unparalleled resource for exploring the emergent analysis of a key feminist theorist.

Influentially, Saskia Sassen (1998) has proposed that this current phase of global economy and society is characterised by discontinuities with earlier periods in relation to the gender dynamics of the contemporary de-territorial organisation of economic activity and political power. In so doing, she has also pinpointed what a feminist analytics of globalisation might be, with her particular concern what she terms the ‘unbundling’ of territoriality in relation to the global city and the ‘unbundling’ of sovereignty away from the nation-state, and the impact of such on gender relations, suggesting that,

The purpose is to understand whether there is gendering in these strategic dynamics and transformations, and if so, what a feminist analytics would be . . . Global cities [are] sites for the incorporation of large numbers of women and immigrants in activities which service the strategic sectors
the transformation of sovereignty and the openings this has created for women (and other hitherto largely invisible actors) to become visible participants in international relations . . . (Sassen, 1998: 85, 86).

In later work, Sassen (2006) certainly acknowledges the importance of ‘historical conjectures’ and ‘distilling’ broad sets of factors from historiography, and notes that there are in-between times and places where the binaries do not hold. However, it is not so much developments in Sassen’s and other theorists’ of globalisation thinking we are interested in here, and more that a continuity across earlier and later work is that an analytics, a feminist analytics specifically, is seen to be part of the newness of the current period by globalisation theorists. However, the example of the feminist writer and social theorist Olive Schreiner (1855–1920), whose thinking we go on to discuss, challenges and indeed overturns this assumption. Similar structural economic and political circumstances to those now called globalisation were the focus of Schreiner’s theorising, with the corpus of her work demonstrating that ‘it’s been done before’ in the case of a feminist analytics of global social change. Additionally, Schreiner’s feminist interrogation of global change refused any confinement to gender (although it encompassed it), because for her gender was always already interconnected with class, ‘race’ and an array of wider structural forces and changes.

Olive Schreiner was a South African socialist and feminist writer, the prototype ‘New Woman’ and a high profile political commentator and social theorist. The social theory she produced between the late 1880s and 1913 was concerned with capitalism in its imperialist phase and focused around the ways in which local/global were being reconfigured in the changing relationship between colony and imperial metropolis; the savagery of capitalism’s imperialist incarnation in extending its reach; the remaking of the city as an international site of financial, communication, labour and other flows; and the imperial presence as a supra-power across different widely-separated colonial territories. Schreiner analysed such matters so as to deploy what would now be termed an intersectional approach. In her terminology, in the context of ‘local’ capitalism in its imperialist phase the woman question, the labour question and the native question were indissolubly interconnected and had to be investigated and analysed as such. The focus of Schreiner’s later social theory, developed between 1914 and 1920, changed with circumstances and the times. It was closely concerned with war, aggression, militarism and pacifism, including diplomacy and warfare as a kind of chess-game by the supra-powers that ignored suffering at local levels; the re-making of the relationship between men (literally) and the state, around legal compulsion, through conscription, to fight ‘for King and country’; the need for strong international social movements to counter the retrograde nature of local and supra-states; the rise of total war and the failure of international organisations to prevent it; and modernity and its wars bringing a radical break with the past. However, as with the earlier period, Schreiner’s analysis here too was a ‘joined up’ one which
perceived the interconnections and theorised their emergence and future ramifications.

Schreiner’s theoretical ideas over both periods were developed in a cross-genre way and appear as readily in her novels and allegories as in her political essays and theoretical treatises. Consequently hers was not a conventional academic voice even when writing most theoretically (Stanley, 2002; Stanley and Dampier, 2008). Also, although we have separated them in order to point up developments, her ideas across both periods overlap and there are strong continuities in her thinking. Schreiner published considerably more than commentators focusing on her specifically literary writings recognise. The development of her ideas is present in an especially illuminating way in her letter-writing, which provides, not so much insight into her social theory written elsewhere, as a grounded and emergent social theorising in its own right but which to date has not been explored in such terms.

The Olive Schreiner Letters Project is researching, analysing and will publish the complete Schreiner letters, exploring in depth her theoretical ideas in them. There are over 5000 of these in around eighteen archives and some eighty or so significant collections across three continents. Our analysis of Schreiner’s letters will explore the major concerns of her theorising, the ‘letterness’ of Schreiner’s correspondences and what an examination of changing writing practices in this large body of letters can contribute to a theoretical understanding of epistolarity as an index of social change over the period from the 1850s to the 1920s. In this paper, we focus on what Schreiner’s letters can contribute to understanding her analysis of the global and the changes it was heralding during her life-time, and the light thereby thrown on the character of the feminist social theory Schreiner produced, which was an encompassing theory of social life as a whole, a ‘joined up’ feminist analytics.

1888 to 1913: Analysing imperialism and the expansionist project

Across various publications dating from her return from Europe to South Africa in late 1888 up to 1913, and by means of her typical cross-genre use of different writing forms, Schreiner developed an analysis of what was happening to South African society with its distinctive mix of peoples, the discoveries of diamonds and gold and, in the wake of this, the eruption of ‘the modern’ into its still largely pastoral economy (eg Schreiner, 1923a). She did so as ‘a returned South African’, someone with a distinctive viewpoint, producing a grounded analysis which used this particular viewpoint to contemplate the imperial metropole from a supposed periphery that was its ‘local’ core. In doing so, Schreiner produced what would now be termed a ‘glocal’ analysis, for her analytical concerns combined global and local and developed responsively around her increasing understanding of the changes occurring to the prevailing largely pastoral way of life for whites as well as black peoples in southern Africa as ‘the modern’ impacted upon it.
Such changes included: rapid industrialisation around the discoveries of diamonds and gold and the ingress of large numbers of miners, financiers and others; the eruption of a ‘local’ international finance centre in Johannesburg; imperial expansionism and the horrors of what this could mean ‘on the ground’ in massacres in Matabeleland and Mashonaland; the expropriation of land and resources and the related creation of black peoples as merely ‘hands’ within capitalist forms of production through the establishment of ‘compounds’ and migrant labour; the role of finance capital, monopolists, rings and cartels and making money for its own sake; the deliberate provocation of ‘local’ wars by the manoeuvrings of finance capital; and the need for political associations and social movements to support progressive change (Schreiner, 1896; 1897; 1899). These all feature in Schreiner’s letters, which provide a sometimes startlingly prescient analysis of the changes then occurring and pinpointing of those then still to happen. Exploring her letters adds substantially to the analysis in her published work since ideas expressed in the letters often predate their surfacing in formal publication. There are also ideas and analytical concerns in the letters that never saw publication, largely because of debilitating health matters that decreased Schreiner’s energies and prevented various publication plans from reaching fruition.

Following Schreiner’s late 1888 return to South Africa, her letters became concerned with her developing thinking about the machinations of Cecil Rhodes within the framework of capitalist and imperialist expansion in southern Africa, the ruthlessness of this expansion, Johannesburg as a distinctively new kind of world city, and the changing interface of the local and the global. Schreiner saw Rhodes as instrumental in creating a system of imperial finance capital with powerful ‘clout’ on the ground in political life, impacting significantly on the economy of southern Africa and shaping imperialist expansion there. Rhodes played a very distinctive part in the imperial project and for Schreiner he represented a system which combined imperial expansion, finance capitalism, political power, cartels and monopolies, bribery and ‘squaring’.

...if the whole country with all its mineral wealth, mines, tramways, and farms, passes into a few hands of capitalists, freedom in the next generation will be a dream of the past in South Africa... If only Dutchmen Englishmen and Natives would all see where the common danger lies and combine against the common enemy, which is not a person; but a system. If Rhodes were to die tomorrow, we should be free of the most energetic of the capitalists, but capitalism would be with us still! (OS to Betty Molteno, 1 March 1898, UCT; all Project transcriptions in this article are ‘to the letter’ and contain any underlinings, insertions, deletions and mistakes in the originals).

Schreiner’s emergent analysis was not about Rhodes as an individual, no matter how powerful or ruthless, but rather ‘the ‘system’, with her letters
emphasising that something about South Africa had fed and grown this, in-built structures which permitted or encouraged it. In particular, Schreiner identified the absence of an active civil society and of a liberal as well as radical tradition as responsible. In addition, the ‘Rhodes system’ worked through force as well as other means and, as Schreiner’s letters reiterate, it would strike back through intermediaries at any who opposed its interests. On this, she emphasised that,

We fight Rhodes because he means so much of oppression, injustice, and moral degradation to South Africa; - but if he passed away tomorrow there still remains the terrible fact that something in our society has formed the matrix which has fed, nourished, and built up such a man! (OS to John X. Merriman, 3 April 1897, NLSA).

And while the Jameson Raid broke the Rhodes system’s main power-base, the skilful and ruthless scheming at its core meant it might always resurge, using any means it could, with the provocation of an imperialist war being what Schreiner saw as its ‘last card’ for regaining power and increasing profit.

Schreiner’s letters are prescient on a related count too. Even before the South African War started, her letters emphasise that defeat would not crush the Boer Republics because of how they would fight, but the conduct of the war would destroy British influence in South Africa longer-term. Her letters deal with what would happen in South Africa after the end of the war, correctly prophesying that, while the aftermath would bring Union of the four settler states, this would be retrograde politically on all counts but especially race ones:

I see the Transvaal and Free State are determined that when federation comes we shall take the Franchise away from the Colonial natives who have it now. I think with terror of this Federation which will mean the most terrible native war and the most merciless South Africa has even know. (OS to Alice Greene, 8 November 1907, UCT).

Moreover, Schreiner’s letters from early on take a clear-eyed view of the structural embeddedness of racism in relation to the Boer Republics, for instance commenting that, ‘I love the Boer – let us deal justly, generously by him as by the native: but let us not give one inch to his cardinal vice’. (OS to John X. Merriman, 25 May 1896, NLSA).

By the later 1890s Schreiner’s letters recognise Johannesburg as a quintessentially modern and global city. One of the distinctive features she focused on was that Johannesburg had resulted from a sudden condensed eruption of the modern, because gold on the Rand and the money and other markets that rapidly grew up around it:
Here’s this great fiendish, hell of a city sprung up in ten years in our sweet pure rare African velt. A city which for glitter and gold, and wickedness – carriages, and palaces, and brothels, and gambling halls, beats creation . . . (OS to Edward Carpenter, 13 November 1898, Sheffield).

. . . I am slowly being confirmed in my opinion that Johannesburg is Hell. Every man living for himself, every man fighting for gold, gold, gold, and trampling down everything that stands in his way. (OS to Alice Greene, 25 January 1899, UCT).

Schreiner’s letters portray Johannesburg, not just as a global city with a highly mixed cosmopolitan population, but a rag-bag one of outsiders from all over the world with no local allegiances and organised around profit, gambling, exchanges and flows, and in pursuit of money-making for its own sake:

Johannesburg has collected the off-scorings of the earth; all the sharp clever scoundrels on one hand, and and the poor helpless good-for-nothings on the other. (OS to Betty Molteno, 28 September 1899, UCT).

Another feature of Johannesburg’s hyper-modernity which her letters pick out concerns its uniqueness when located in its geographical context, as an entirely new juxtaposition of the modern and the pastoral:

You see Johannesburg has sprung up so quickly that that [sic] the country about is quiet untouched. You will see a grand new modern house and just out side the back door the ant heaps and rocks and flowers of the ‘velt’ . . . (OS to Betty Molteno, 27 October 1898, UCT).

Connected with the rapid creation of hyper-new Johannesburg as an international city of migrations, transfers and flows, Schreiner’s epistolary concerns increasingly identify the local form of capitalism in Southern Africa as rampant and unchecked. The invention of Johannesburg and the hyper-new was taking place in a context in which there was no strong local state, no vibrant local civil society, and no organised labour movement to oppose hierarchies of power because class had been ‘manufactured’ to map onto race with the absolute abjection of black people within the ‘glocal’ economy that was resulting:

Edward, you don’t know how bad things are in this land . . . wealth as the only possible end and aim in life, is more recognized here than, I think, in any country in the world . . . It’s funny to be in a land which is all philistines! . . . There are other individuals, but no other class. There are money making whites, and down-trodden blacks, and nothing between. And things will have to be so much worse here before they can be better . . . (OS to Edward Carpenter, 23 November 1892, Sheffield).
Schreiner’s developing analysis also focused on changes to the borders between the local and the global in her letters in the wake of the December 1895/January 1896 Jameson Raid on the Transvaal, initiated by Rhodes and British Foreign Secretary Chamberlain, and followed by British High Commissioner Milner’s provocation of war with the Transvaal and Free State in October 1899. Her letters throw interesting light on how this changed her developing thinking about the relationship between the local, as represented by the Boer Republics, and the global power of Britain working both through Rhodes’ Chartered Company and Milner’s pursuit of war to produce a unified British colonial state.

When I hear people talk of the absolute necessity of an exterminating war with the Basutos and dark races generally because they are so rapidly becoming socialized and skilled workmen, and if not crushed now will never be crushed, I am always reminded of a visit a friend of mine paid to Milner before the Boer war, when he stuck his hands on the arms of his chair, and said, ‘It is now or never! They will become too strong for us if we wait!’ (OS to John X. Merriman, Sunday 1912, NLSA).

As an international public intellectual, Schreiner was aware she could appeal to metropolitan and global audiences beyond the imperial supra-power and so act as an informed voice of protest in the international mass media. A US reporter, for instance, wrote to businessman and politician Percy Molteno that ‘In discussing the Transvaal question I have been astonished to find what influence Olive Schreiner seems to have, especially among cultivated Americans . . .’ (Montagu White to Percy Molteno, 26 February 1900, UCT Misc). Schreiner also wrote about such matters to Jan Smuts, a political adversary on ‘race’ matters who she also liked, stating:

I am writing an article on the situation which I hope will may open the eyes of the English public to the true condition of affairs a little. I will be able to say in it all I would have said to Milner if I had met him personally . . . If it is too long for the ^news^ papers here, I shall have to print it in pamphlet form, but I hope it will appear in the paper on Monday.’ (OS to Jan Smuts, 19 May 1899, Pretoria)

As Montagu’s comment implies, Schreiner’s ‘hope’ expressed to Smuts is sober rather than vainglorious, given the high volume of international sales all her publications including this one achieved.

Schreiner’s letters also show she was increasingly aware that local groups and associations representing the vested interests of imperialists and speculators were producing a propaganda version of circumstances which on the ground were very different from, for example, what propaganda from the South African League (initially a front established by Rhodes and associates) was promulgating:
... the mass of Johannesburgers are increasingly against war. There are many English men here who five years ago would have fought the Transvaal Government who would now like to shoot the Leaguers for making trouble. Even in the last six months the tone here has changed very much. We cannot win the capitalists to our side; we can win the mass of the thinking English people in England and Johannesburg. (OS to Jan Smuts, ?June 1899, Pretoria).

The backcloth was the systematic purchase of newspapers across South Africa by Rhodes and associates so as to control their editorial content and political slant. For Schreiner, the counter-move had to be support for and the growth of intermediary associations which would be both genuinely local but also part of an international movement. In 1899 and 1900, this concerned the peace congress movement, which she hoped could become a bulwark against warmongering by making local civil society more organised and effective:

... I would like to know your opinion of a plan I have for forming an ‘Uitlander’s Peace Association’ in Johannesburg in opposition to the League. The mass of Johannesburg do not want to fight: and it is only necessary to organize this public feeling in some way to make it effective. (OS to Jan Smuts, 7 June 1899, Pretoria)

Schreiner strongly supported the 1899 peace movement because it was anti-imperialist as well as anti-war. Later her letters recognised that its activities and networks underpinned the post-war growth of women’s franchise campaigns, but they are also fully aware that for many of the women involved their feminism was linked with a highly racialised form of white nationalism, something which eventually split the women’s suffrage organisations.

In her published work, Schreiner’s analysis of changes and developments encompassed: her intersectional analysis of ‘race’ among South African peoples; the parasitism of whites in feeding off the labour of black people, who were reduced in economic terms to ‘hands’ in the new capitalist forms of production around the then-mushrooming diamonds and gold industries; the entrenched systemic nature of the ‘Rhodes system’ with its effects outreaching as well as outliving Rhodes himself; and that by 1899 the imperial blunder of provoking war had put in motion the establishment of a future local state unified around racial and other retrograde values. Her letters add to this her keen sense of: the emergent and ‘could be otherwise’ character of such developments; the imperialist savagery behind many of them, in events which took place ‘off centre’ both to the imperial metropole and to the ‘local’ political centres in southern Africa and so were largely invisible to metropolitan publics; local attempts to form civil and political associations that might counter such things; links between white radicals and a growing black intellectual and political elite; and in particular Schreiner’s prescient awareness, almost as soon as such developments appeared on the horizon, of the possible long-term ramifications.
A gender analysis is present in Schreiner’s work, both published and the unpublished theorising in her letters, as a continuous thread. It is not so much that one dimension of her theorising is ‘about gender’ and another part is ‘about the rest of social life’, but that these are indissolubly bound into each other in her feminist analytics. Two connected examples concerning the ‘black peril’ and the imposition of pass laws amply show the ‘joined up’ character of Schreiner’s feminist analytics. The so-called ‘black peril’ was a fabricated moral panic, whipped up by the proto-nationalist movement following the Union of South Africa in 1910, and it involved some key figures from women’s organisations including the suffrage movement. Its demonization of black men as all potential rapists of white women was rebutted by research carried out by the General Missionary Council, in which Schreiner participated. As she emphasised to its Secretary, its effect was to ‘vanish’ the fact that it was actually black women who were most at risk:

The subject of the so called Black-Peril is one that interests me deeply. My feeling of course is that peril which has long over shadowed this country, is one which exists for all dark skinned women at the hands of white men. (OS to James Henderson, 26 December 1911, Cory)

Pass laws too were part of the raft of retrograde activity from increasingly well-organised Boer/Afrikaner nationalist organisations occurring in the wake of Union of the settler states of South Africa in 1910, having been put into effect in the Transvaal and Free State as soon as responsible government was regained in 1906–7 and then extended after Union. In 1908 to 1910, Schreiner had actively opposed Union because she saw it as a mechanism for overturning more liberal racial policies in the Cape. Certainly retrograde legislation followed, culminating in the Land Act of 1913 which severely restricted black people’s rights to occupy land and later underpinned the provisions of what became apartheid. Schreiner’s letters indicate her awareness not only that pass laws particularly affected women as traders and urban workers, but were part of an increasingly gender-bifurcated set of policies and employment practices that would have long-term repercussions on women’s position in the interconnected labour markets that composed the South African economy:

A class or a sex or race refused in a so-called democratic state under 20th century conditions the right to take its share in in [sic] the government of the state will ultimately be driven [sic] the lamentable use of force, and answer repression with resistance which must shake society to its foundations . . . (OS to John X. Merriman, 20 July 1913, NLSA).

In emphasising the integrated, ‘joined up’ nature of Schreiner’s feminist analysis and her refusal to see the ‘woman question’ as something separate, it is also important to note that although she was closely involved in the women’s suffrage movement in South Africa early on, she later withdrew from the
Women’s Enfranchisement League and suffrage activities in 1911 when it became clear that many white women were campaigning for the vote on the same terms as white men, rather than for universal and thus non-racial suffrage: ‘... it was not a personal matter that made me leave the society... the women of the Cape Colony’ all women of the Cape Colony... ‘These were the terms on which I joined’ (nd, Women’s Enfranchisement League leaflet comments, NLSA).

For Schreiner, these retrograde policies signified the structural repositioning of black women within South Africa’s domestic and other labour markets, making them more vulnerable to sexual, economic and political exploitation and subjugation. Her letters analyse such things around ‘local’ occurrences and also as irrevocably interconnected with other retrograde changes occurring around nationalism, Union, the demonization of black men, severe limitations on black land holdings, and the shaping of compliant labour markets. As this indicates, it is not possible, or at least not without vitiating its power and compass, to separate off Schreiner’s epistolary analysis of gender dynamics from her analysis of ‘race’ and racism, of nationalism, of the political structures of Union, and development of a locally-specific Fordist capitalist mode of production centring on mining and extraction.

1914–1920: Analysing war, peace, international organisations and social movements

We now discuss Schreiner’s analysis of war, peace and international organisations and movements between 1914 and 1920. In various publications, particularly in articles about peace, war and conscientious objection, public letters on conscientious objection, her unfinished manuscript ‘The Dawn of Civilization’ and her wartime allegories (Schreiner, 1915–1918, 1923b), Schreiner’s thinking over this time developed away from her earlier radical social constructionism regarding militarism and violence, which argued that if men had equal responsibilities for social care then this would end male militarism and aggression. Her later writings engage with the fact that ‘modern’ war combined what seemed a sudden eruption of people’s desire for violence and blood-letting, with state-level machinations, and with national identities being re-made around reconfiguring the relationship of men (literally, ie males) to the state and militarism through compulsory military service and legal sanctions against those who resisted. For her, the nature of warfare had fundamentally changed and become mechanised, anonymised and a crucial part of peace-time economic life, and was consequently fundamentally changing the character of social life too. She also came to think that the origins of militarism lay within human ontology, proposing that women and men are equally predisposed to aggression and militarism although how this is enacted takes different gendered social forms (Schreiner, 1916a; 1916b; 1916c).

Schreiner’s letters give a particular edge to how her ideas are understood, because they show the development of this changing analysis of the causes and
consequences of war and the wider ramifications thereof. They deal with the rise of universal and total war, her prophesy that the international peacekeeping organisations being proposed in 1914 would fail and result in a more terrible and even more total war, her analysis of the emergence of an ‘after’ in which economies would remain dependent on warmongering, and her view that radical social movements would be the only means of effectively opposing such retrograde developments. The specifics once again show just how ‘joined up’ her social theory was.

Schreiner’s epistolary account of the role of diplomacy and of governmentality more generally positions these as central to the new developments in warfare occurring. On this, writing to her brother Will, a former Prime Minister of the Cape and from 1915 to 1919 the South African High Commissioner to Britain, she commented that:

I am not a lover of war; but give me the soldier every time. Diplomacy as carried on in the past and present is Hell three over. It is a game of chess played between rulers, in which the peoples and their good and happiness are pawns (OS to Will Schreiner, Thursday ?3 December 1916, UCT).

Other Schreiner letters also pinpoint diplomacy and its game-like character as directly culpable for bringing about the Great War, seeing the war as deliberately provoked by the German High Command for its own reasons, but thereafter also suiting the diplomatic, political and military elites of other nations too. They also emphasise the long-term cyclical nature of militarism and its alliances, with today’s enemies likely to become tomorrow’s allies and vice versa:

It is strange how the scene remains the same . . . only the details change from generation to generation. Yesterday it was German English and Belgians against France; today Germans against English French and Belgians; perhaps in ten or fifteen years it will be . . . Western peoples against Russia . . . A curious nightmare life when you study it historically! (OS to Will Schreiner, 29 July 1916, UCT).

The result of ‘studying it historically’ herself was Schreiner’s increasing conviction that war would be universal and total from then on. Even before war was declared in 1914, she identified what was happening as new and distinctive, a universal war impacting in indirect as well as direct ways across the world:

By the time this reaches you will know whether our worst fears have been realized and the universal war has come. War is to me so exactly like Hell. You don’t need to picture anything else. It always means loss to everyone; to those who win and to those who lose . . . (OS to Alice Greene 4 August 1914, UCT).
Schreiner also saw war’s totalising aspects as affecting all aspects of life because it encouraged domination in interpersonal as well as international political life, writing that:

I feel it is the beginning of a half a century of the most awful wars the world has seen . . . While the desire to dominate, and rule and possess empire is in the hearts of men there will always be war . . . (OS to Edward Carpenter, ?13 October 1914, Sheffield).

Regarding international peace-keeping organisations, almost as soon as war started and quite unlike most of those she was close to in feminist and pacifist groups, Schreiner rejected seeing the League of Nations then being promoted as a solution to cyclical warfare:

. . . If ever that League to enforce peace comes into existence, it will form the most awful instrument of oppression, and lead to the most cataclysmic wars which earth has ever known. (OS to Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence, December 1914, UCT).

Her view was that this would exacerbate the problems, by being a mechanism paralleling and reinforcing existing divisions of power at an international level. Before international peace organisations could work effectively, Schreiner proposed, the supra-powers had to be divested of control and the demise brought about of the autocracies of Austro-Hungary, Russia, Germany and Britain.

As the war unfolded, Schreiner’s attention focused on what a universal war was doing to the fabric of everyday life by encouraging an omnipresent militarism:

I suppose it’s because I’ve lived through a great war, and seen that the evils that result from it and follow it are infinitely greater than the war itself. The militarism, the spirit of hate and inhumanity which affects all people who have lived through a war, are much worse than the fighting and dying. (OS to Edward Carpenter, ?January 1915, NELM).

As has been often said, the South African War was ‘the last of the colonial and the first of the modern wars’ (Cuthbertson and Jeeves, 1999: 3), setting the scene for total war in two key ways: it introduced new killing technologies that anticipated later twentieth-century warfare (smokeless bullets, trenches, heavy artillery), enabling mass killing on a vast new scale; and it involved civilians in a new way by dislocating large numbers from their homes and disrupting their livelihoods, and in this way impacting on their lives in a manner and magnitude that prefigured the nature of twentieth-century warfare. Clearly Schreiner drew on this in her post-1913 theorising. Also by 1915, when the above letter to Carpenter was written, Schreiner had directly experienced some of the
everyday totalising aspects of militarism. Her originally German name resulted in her being asked to leave hotels and boarding houses and sometimes ‘cut’ by people she was introduced to, for instance. Also, her involvement in anti-war activities and support for conscientious objectors resisting the 1916-introduced compulsory military call-up led to frequent difficult incidents:

Yesterday I went to a meeting of the Womans International Federation . . . a lady beautifully dressed . . . appeared at an open door . . . As I passed she said, ‘That way to the ‘traitor meeting’ . . . the Peace meeting, and all peace meetings are meetings of traitors!’ . . . (OS to Alice Greene, November 1917, UCT).

As this mention of federations and meetings indicates, Schreiner continued emphasising international social movements as the means to bring about progressive social change, although hers was no starry-eyed approach and she fully recognised that some parts of these could act in retrograde ways (Schreiner, 1911).

From the mid 1890s Schreiner’s letters track her activities in promoting the growth and effectiveness of ‘local’ political associations in South Africa; from the 1900s on, she is equally engaged with the need for international women’s and labour movements, emphasising their potential to bring about social change specifically in relation to the autocracies. Her letters from 1914 on emphasise at the level of social movements, not governmentality, her strong support for an internationalism built from the ground up as the only counter to warmongering autocracies, and during the period of the war she was an important presence in women’s peace organisations:

I am sending you a copy of woman peace programme I have gone on the committee of the English branch. Do you know any women who would care to join it? (OS to Hermann Kallenbach, 16 March 1915, NLSA).

I was going to Holland on Saturday to attend the Womans International conference at the Hague but the government has refused to let us go (OS to Alice Greene, 20 April 1915, UCT).

Jane Addams and Dr Jacobs and some other women who were at the Hague are here . . . I am going to her meeting at Kingsway Hall tonight to be on the platform. This is a large public meeting . . . I am working at my thing on war(OS to Betty Molteno, 30 April 1915, UCT).

Schreiner was involved in the foundation and activities of women’s international organisations and in supporting pacifist organisations such as the No Conscription Fellowship. And as her ‘working at my thing on war’ comment indicates, by early 1915 she was re-conceiving her earlier ideas about gender, aggression and social behaviour. She had also turned an analytic gaze upon what she termed ‘the “after the war” . . .’, a period she correctly thought
would be characterised by strong reactionary movement of the autocratic supra-powers, rather than by peace as ordinarily understood:

I wonder what you think of this reconstruction of the government. I am afraid it will lead to tremendously increased evils at the end of the war - and it’s the ‘after the war’ I dread most for all the nations . . . (OS to Will Schreiner, 1915, UCT).

Schreiner’s analysis was firmly that what had been constructed by the wartime supra-powers was a military apparatus that was closely intertwined with economy and polity which would not easily be dismantled, such that ‘I think there is a great reactionary movement coming on everywhere for a time.’ (OS to Betty Molteno, Saturday June-August 1918, UCT). This was because, her letters emphasise, the Great War had put in motion a dynamic that would be played out over a fifty year period, during which the supra-powers would continue jockeying for control. Eventually, she proposed, there would be another universal war, but one more total and of far greater devastation:

I may be quite wrong, but . . . For the next 50 years, I believe there will be bloodshed and a merciless drive on the part of the powerful to crush the weak . . . I opposed this war because of the evil I foresaw it would produce for generations to come . . . (OS to Betty Molteno, Tuesday 1915, UCT).

Schreiner’s letters also analyse modernity as finally brought about by the Great War, changing polity, economy, military apparatus and civil society. It was its ‘bursting’ impact, building on the ‘cracking’ brought about by capitalism, urbanisation and so on, which for her constituted the decisive break with the past, so that the incoming tide of resultant changes had to be responded to and ultimately could not be prevented:

Don’t you begin to see this is the 20th Century!! That the 19th is gone forever. It will have to go even in South Africa! The old world is cracking; or rather, it cracked long ago, and now its bursting. (OS to Jan Smuts, 19 November 1918, Pretoria).

This is the 20th century; the past is past never to return, even in South Africa. The day of princes, and Bosses, is gone forever: one must meet the incoming tide and rise on it, or be swept away forever. (OS to Jan Smuts, 28 October 1920, Pretoria).

As Schreiner’s letters amply show, while some important specifics of her theorising changed over this period, at the same time there is the strong continuity that its gender concerns remain inseparable from other elements of her social theory. Her letters, of the moment and immediately responsive, show the genesis of her changing thinking in unfolding circumstances including
where such developments would take polity, economy and civil society in the
future. Longer-term, the ‘fifty years later’ which Schreiner’s letters often
invoke, militarism and war economy, coupled with structural problems caused
by international peace-keeping organisation, would bring about even more
total warfare. But longer-term still, the ‘far future’ of a better world the letters
also invoke, she proposes can be made real through international social move-
ments, through increasing numbers of people making choices and organising
and acting together to bring about such outcomes. Overall, her letters convey
a complicated mixture of grave pessimism and hopeful optimism about the
direction in which the world was moving.

A gender analysis is crucial to the emergent analysis in Schreiner’s letters,
intertwined with seemingly non-gendered concerns such as the character of
war economies, the likely failure of international organisations and the post-
war development of new forms of autocracy among the great powers. She
remained analytically interested in the situatedness of women within such
things, with her letters commenting that women and men are equally ‘primi-
tive’ in their aggressiveness, and that women were as war-mongering or more
so than men because, as non-combatants, they were comparatively protected
from its realities. Her letters also recognise that the pacifist women’s organi-
sations were by no means alone, with Schreiner herself actively involved in a
number of mixed groups, but that women were more able to work interna-
tionally than mixed groups for obvious reasons connected with the war and
conscription. However, as with her letters from the 1880s to 1913, what she
theorises post-1913 about women always takes cognizance of the wider
context of social life, economy, polity, war, the forces of change.

Schreiner’s feminist analytics from 1914 to 1920 continued to position
gender as part of the intersectional analysis at its core. Relatedly, in spite of
ill-health and lack of mobility, as soon as she returned to South Africa in
October 1920, she commented on the new pass laws, African women’s orga-
nised opposition to these and mass jailings, and gave financial to support to
the organisations representing them. As ever, Olive Schreiner’s joined up
theorising saw the connections here, between the impact of the pass laws on
local women, retrograde legislation in South Africa more generally,
the ‘white-ing’ of its trades unions, and the acceleration of its distinctive
local form of capitalism which resulted from its involvement in the Great
War:

‘Oh Betty why did I come out? I have made many mistakes in my life - but
this is the greatest of all there is so much one ought to do now, and I can’t
do it. I would like to go out about among the natives and really try to enter
into touch with them . . . This union of the Unionist with Smuts and the
South African Party bodes no good for South Africa . . . I have not met one
human being who feels at all on the native question as I do. I could not join
the Nationalist because of their narrow racialism.’ (OS to Betty Molteno, 5
November 1920, UCT)
Globalization theory encompasses two broad and basically conflicting positions: globalization is a radical departure from the past composed by a massively accelerated set of economic, political and social changes and flows and it dates from around the end of World War II; and globalization is the current name for changes and developments with long historical antecedents and these are an extrapolation of capitalism and imperialism in today’s circumstances. We align ourselves with this second strand of theorising but with an important proviso. The tacit view within even this second approach is that theorising the processes of global change, and theorising them in a particular way as a ‘global social inquiry’, is new. We cannot agree. Olive Schreiner’s social theory provides an incontrovertible example of a global social inquiry produced a hundred years previously. We now want to provide a more detailed exposition, starting with what are seen as the quintessential features of present-day globalization.

Table 1 employs Jan Aart Scholte’s (2005) helpful four-fold framework of hypercapitalism, polycentrism, hybridization and reflexivity to shape what are often discussed as rather disconnected lists of characteristics. Using these, one column shows what are generally seen as the defining attributes of globalization by present-day globalization theory, while the other shows the focuses of Schreiner’s feminist analytics. Showing these concerns, of social theorists now, and of Schreiner’s feminist analytics then, points up just how much her analytical interests overlap with the features now attributed to contemporary globalization. The point being made here is a simple but consequential one: ‘it’s been done before’ in terms of a joined up theorising of the processes of global social change. The attributes focused on by Schreiner are those which now preoccupy today’s theorists: financial flows, global cities, the diminished national state, and the changing dynamics of gender within these, among them.

Importantly, Schreiner saw the changes she analysed across both periods of her theoretical work as being the products of capitalism, imperialism, autocracy, warfare and the competing supra-states. Rather than using the blander de-politicized terminology of globalization, hers was an ethically as much as politically committed form of analysis, directed towards challenging and changing, as well as analysing, the ongoing social dynamic she was concerned with analysing. The point for her was to change the world, based on a joined up analysis and theorisation of developments within it.

Conclusion

So what kind of an analytic voice was Schreiner’s, both in her work overall and in her letters specifically? Also, how should the ‘global research imagination’ underpinning Schreiner’s epistolary theorising be understood in ontological, epistemological, methodological and aesthetic terms? Globalization is widely
recognised as having existing and potential future impacts on research activities and the research imagination, including: the emergence of a ‘global social inquiry’ characterised by challenges to disciplinary formations; the provincialization of formerly dominant European and US constructions of research, social science and knowledge; the rise of non-territorial networks of researchers; research agendas with non-disciplinary topics and themes; and ‘national’ forms of social science increasingly being challenged by ‘cosmopolitan’ social theory.

Thinking about Schreiner’s work and approach in relation to contemporary specifications of the research imagination of global social inquiry, it is clear that her feminist analytics anticipated many things now associated with a global form of social inquiry, as sketched out in Table 2. Schreiner’s analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholte’s Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Globalization Theory</th>
<th>Schreiner’s Feminist Analytics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypercapitalism</td>
<td>Expanded markets</td>
<td>Expanding markets, esp. gold &amp; diamonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global markets</td>
<td>Imperial global markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shift to tertiary sector</td>
<td>Expansion primary sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International finance capital</td>
<td>Expansion international finance capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accumulation for own sake</td>
<td>Accumulation for own sake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global finance organisations</td>
<td>Global finance organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polycentrism</td>
<td>Shift/decline in the national state</td>
<td>Rise/decline/renewal of local states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decline local civil society</td>
<td>Weak local civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privatised governance</td>
<td>Privatised governance – eg Chartered Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rise of supra-state</td>
<td>Supra-state 1 = Britain, 2 = Union of SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybridization</td>
<td>National identities undermined</td>
<td>National identities weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-nations</td>
<td>Micro-nations – 4 states, Boers, black ethnicities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supra-identities</td>
<td>Supra imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-territorial identities</td>
<td>metropolitan identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contestation &amp; internal movements</td>
<td>Feminist, pacifist, labour, ethnic/race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contestation &amp; internal movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity</td>
<td>Reflexive late modernity v. alternative foundations</td>
<td>Reflexive modernity &amp; making new foundations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and the ‘voice’ it was expressed in, like that of the contemporary social scientists who shared ideas and approaches with her, challenged emergent disciplinary formations. Her work promoted knowledge from the margins, the imperial periphery, and concerned the local and grounded; it was involved in non-territorial networks that transcended national and international boundaries; it developed analytical and publishing agendas which determinedly crossed disciplinary, academic and popular, boundaries; and it rejected any

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Research Imagination</th>
<th>Global Social Inquiry</th>
<th>Schreiner’s Feminist Analytics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td>• Post-territorial space</td>
<td>• Changing &amp; scalar territorial space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A changed time/distance relation through the virtual</td>
<td>• A changed time/distance relation through the material then the virtual – steam, cable, post, telegram, telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Change as the social fabric</td>
<td>• Change as the social fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>• Uncertainties, including of knowledge</td>
<td>• Uncertainties, including of knowledge, &amp; especially for those in the colonial/imperial ‘margins’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A different research ‘voice’ &amp; claims</td>
<td>• Knowledge from below – movements &amp; networks remaking knowledge from the ‘periphery’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>• Post/multi-disciplinarity</td>
<td>• Multiplicities of ‘voice’ &amp; local claims versus the supra-power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobilities &amp; flows</td>
<td>• Knowledge from below – movements &amp; networks remaking knowledge from the ‘periphery’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The life-world/global nexus important but barely researched</td>
<td>• Multiplicities of ‘voice’ &amp; local claims versus the supra-power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>• Emergent identities &amp; practices</td>
<td>• Emergent identities &amp; practices – the 3 key ‘Questions’ of race, gender, labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The situational, events</td>
<td>• The situational, events – Doornkop, Jameson Raid, Mashonaland, South African War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The unstable</td>
<td>• The unstable – annexation, forced compliance, escalating mechanisation &amp; totalisation of warfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elitist hierarchy of social theory over other analytical and political agendas, seeking instead allegiances across these divisions too.

Schreiner’s feminist analysis is centrally concerned with contesting the activities, approach and values of the supra-powers (not just Britain, that is, but supra-power as such) and also with organising to challenge this from below and from the periphery. Its substantive research aspects are grounded in the situational and also in the unstable events produced by the workings of the expansionist activities of imperialism and finance capital. Her feminist analytics is articulated in a very distinctive ‘voice’ which crosses genre-boundaries and makes a direct appeal about global matters happening locally linked, as she emphasises, to the local of the metropole by the workings of imperialist capitalism. Her feminist analytics and the global social inquiry it produced are firmly intersectional and holistic. There is no confining Olive Schreiner to gender, for the analytical compass of her work is social life ‘joined up’, requiring a concomitantly joined up social theory.

Schreiner’s social theorising in her letters clearly takes up distinctive positions in relation to ontological, epistemological, methodological and aesthetic dimensions of a feminist global social inquiry. Ontologically, her letters are, ‘by nature’, a response to the emergent changing character of time, space, place, for such was the pace and the impact of change at the time of writing that conventional publishing media inevitably lagged behind the situations and events that her letters engage with and conceptualise. Epistemologically, they are a means of trying to make sense of uncertainties, but also they remake prevailing conventional ideas about what can be known and by whom. Schreiner engages in a ‘different voice’, one expressed from the colonial periphery, articulating general ideas from its particular ‘local’ circumstances and doing so in the renegade form of ‘mere letters’. She does this to theorise ‘global society’ and advance claims about it which are in part about who has what knowledge, in greater part about ethics, power and the state in relation to the trans-territorial imperialist supra-powers. Methodologically, her published work as well as her letters were produced outside the confines of the academic disciplines. However, more radically, Schreiner always wrote in cross-genre ways, with her theory appearing in her novels and allegories as well as her letters, and her more personal writing appearing in her formal published theorising and not in her letters, which instead engage with externalities, materialities and events. Aesthetically, the quintessence of her letters is their engagement with the emergent and situational events, the inevitable instability of constant cumulative change, and the mobilities and flows which resulted.

Schreiner’s letters have the strong ‘bird in flight’ characteristics that letters more generally have, giving them their emergent, ‘for the moment’ and ‘could be otherwise’ tone. They inscribe in a very immediate way the detail and edge of social and political changes as they were occurring and enfold these in the particular dynamics of her epistolary relationships with the people closest politically to her, and as she responsively engaged with the public, political, economic, military and other events of the ‘moment’. In an important sense,
then, her letters are Olive Schreiner's feminist analytics, rather than just a side-line to it.
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Notes

1 We are persuaded by the argument that Sassen's later 'grounding' is actually in 'the space of theory' rather than in actual spaces and places located in time (Sparke, 2005, 2009). However, here we are more interested in Sassen's take on feminist analytics and its time and place, which for us is not the possession of the US in the late twentieth century but to be found both earlier and elsewhere. We discuss Olive Schreiner's contribution to this, but we are not claiming Schreiner as a founder, more as an earlier exemplar which shows that the present-day assumption is faulty.

2 Schreiner scholarship was taken in a new and more productive direction by First and Scott's (1980) important biography; not for its problematic and now very dated psychoanalytic interpretation of Schreiner's character, but for its historical reinterpretation of Schreiner's significance as a key writer and social thinker. Our approach is in line with Schreiner's own views in focusing on 'the works' rather than the life; see here Berkman, 1989, McClintock, 1995, Burdett, 2001 and in particular Stanley, 2002. These are many derivative biographical accounts; however, the outstanding ones grounded in primary scholarship are First and Scott 1980 and Schoeman 1991, 1992.

3 The Olive Schreiner Letters Project is funded by the ESRC (RES-062-23-1286); we gratefully acknowledge the ESRC's support. The Project is researching the light thrown by Schreiner's 5000+ extant letters on Schreiner's writing, her social theory, and also the major events her letters were concerned with (see here footnote 6).

4 There were approximately 25,000 letters at Schreiner's death, most of which were destroyed by her estranged husband, Cronwright-Schreiner, with the 5000+ now extant letters being ones never given to him. There are three existing edited collections of Schreiner's letters, each in different ways problematic. The collection by Cronwright-Schreiner (1924) features highly truncated, bowdlerised and otherwise inaccurate versions of some of the letters he subsequently destroyed. Rive's (1987) collection includes letters from a wider range of correspondents, but are often more extended notation than accurate transcription, and are also marked by (frequently unacknowledged) omissions of often crucial parts of letters. Draznin's (1992) collection is exemplary for its time, but features only the atypical correspondence with Havelock Ellis, and also its transcriptions are smoothed over for readers by omitting omissions, deletions and 'correcting' errors.

5 The Project (www.oliveschreinerletters.ed.ac.uk) is analysing Schreiner's letters in a project-designed VRE (Virtual Research Environment). The VRE is a custom-designed set of aids supporting the project's particular analytic approach, providing tools which exceed the capabilities of CAQDAS (computer assisted qualitative data analysis software) software. The transcripts with a full supporting editorial apparatus will published by HRI Online at the University of Sheffield (www.hrionline.ac.uk/schreiner/schreiner.htm) in January 2012.
6 These included colonialism under transition in the Cape from the 1850s on; feminism and socialism in 1880s London; prostitution and its analysis, understandings of ‘race’ and capital; the machinations of imperialism ‘on the ground’; Rhodes as ‘a system’ and his Chartered Company’s role in imperial expansion; the Jameson Raid; the South African War and women’s relief organisations and the concentration camps of this war; changing international and South African perspectives on women’s franchise campaigns; labour issues and Union rather than the federation of South Africa than Schreiner favoured; pacifism and war economies in the wake of the Great War; and political and economic changes in South Africa after 1914.

7 These massacres resulted from the campaign by Rhodes’s British South Africa Company to expand its Southern African mining interests by conquering what is present-day Zimbabwe, with this including brutal reprisals in response to Ndebele and Shona resistance.

8 See Schreiner’s ‘South Africa’ (1891), ‘The Boer’ (1892) and ‘The Englishman’ (1893), in later form in her (1923a) Thoughts on South Africa, and also The Political Situation (1896), Trooper Peter Halket of Mashonaland (1897); An English South African’s View of the Situation (1899); ‘Woman’ (1900), Woman and Labour (1911).

9 This involved chronic asthma, and also a congenital family heart valve problem that led to the early deaths of many family members.

10 Interestingly, the greatest change to Schreiner’s thinking that occurred following her return to South Africa concerned ‘race’ and her shift to a radical analysis of racial hybridity ‘in our very persons’. Tantalisingly, there is almost nothing about this in her letters. Perhaps she was too immersed formulating her re-thinking in her essays for it to surface in her letter-writing. See Stanley 2010, Stanley and Dampier 2010.

11 A term Rhodes used; it involved giving people what they desired, then later asking for favours to be reciprocated.

12 The chevron ^as thus^ indicates an insertion, deletions are crossed through as thus, and underlines are as thus. Schreiner did not always fully date her letters; therefore question marks in front of dates are those that have been provided by an unknown hand (the addressee, someone else in the family, an archivist), while dates without question marks are Schreiner’s own.

13 This was a failed attempt to forcibly annex the Transvaal, with the secret cognizance of both Rhodes and Chamberlain, with their involvement later whitewashed.

14 The analysis eventuates in Schreiner 1909.

15 An English South African’s View of the Situation (Schreiner, 1899).

16 ‘Uitlander’ means an outsider or incomer.

17 Schreiner was very informed about the ‘dynamic of destruction’ happening but which has, for reasons Kramer 2007 explores, now largely been lost sight of. ‘Total war’ has been defined as having total war aims of complete capitulation, using total warfare methods of unrestricted violation of international principles, involving total mobilisation of all material and economic resources, and exerting totalising organisational controls over both public and private life. Schreiner’s emergent epistolary analysis recognises all of these aspects and prefigures what Kramer sees as a ‘new schema’ for thinking about total war.

18 This is a reference to Schreiner’s (1915–1918) uncompleted part-manuscript, ‘The Dawn of Civilization’.


20 The issues and themes Schreiner explored from the later 1880s to around 1913 also engaged some well-known social scientists, including her friends John Atkinson Hobson and Leonard Hobhouse. An interview with Schreiner is a centre-piece in Hobson’s The War in South Africa (1900), with his analysis closely following hers regarding finance capital especially. Hobson was
a close friend and influence on Leonard Hobhouse, who later held the UK’s first sociology chair. Hobhouse was influenced by Schreiner’s work, particularly Trooper Peter Halket . . . and its indictment of what ‘imperial expansion’ actually meant. His Guardian pieces were critical of British provocation and conduct of the war, while his Democracy and Reaction (1904) analyses imperialism as antithetical to liberalism with both a large and a small ‘l’ and was an important contribution to theorising what in today’s terms would be termed global governance. Regarding her developing analysis between 1914 and 1920, her concerns were shared with well-known social scientists who she knew personally or whose work she was influenced by, as they were hers. Schreiner’s broad ideas about ‘race’ and especially concerning educated Black intellectual elites and black social movements were influenced by W.E.B. Du Bois (1903), with his The Souls of Black Folks particularly touching a nerve for her. Schreiner’s radical pacifism was shared with Jane Addams (2006 [1906], Davis 1976), with Schreiner’s letters suggesting they had been in epistolary contact prior to meeting in London in 1915 around the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom being established, through their joint friendship with Aletta Jacobs.
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