
Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals: An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I

Dr. Kenza Tegaoua ¹

¹ University of Algiers 2, kenza.tegaoua@univ-alger2.dz

Received: 26/ 06/ 2023

Accepted: 24/ 10/ 2023

.....

Abstract:

This paper examines the perspectives of American intellectuals during World War One, specifically their attitudes towards U.S. involvement in the European conflict. The primary objective is to evaluate their reliability and trustworthiness. To accomplish this, the study adopts Jean Paul Sartre's theory of True and False Intellectuals, as outlined in his work *Plaidoyer pour les Intellectuels*. The theory is applied to analyze the positions and responses of certain American intellectuals in relation to the war. The research ultimately aims to enable readers to differentiate between True and False Intellectuals, particularly in times of war.

Keywords: Bourne, Democracy, False Intellectuals, Morals, Sartre, True Intellectuals, War.

Corresponding author, Dr. Kenza Tegaoua

Email: kenza.tegaoua@univ-alger2.dz

1. INTRODUCTION

Commenting on the blast of World War One in Europe, Charles Edward Russell once said: “War is sheer insanity” (Thompson 86). Based on his words one understands the preposterous characteristic of wars which bring destruction, havoc and harm to humanity. WWI is a major event in human history, it begun in Europe in 1914 and ended in 1917 with the U.S. intervention to solve the conflict between the Axis and the Allies. During the first years of hostilities, U.S.A adopted its policy of isolationism which kept it in an aloof position; however, the debate on its involvement created division among U.S politicians and more importantly among intellectuals. Some supported the intervention in the war; whereas others were fervent opponents of interference, particularly regarding warfare. In other words, the European conflict brought turmoil within American politics and academia, creating a considerable split between the intellectuals.

The French writer and philosopher Jean Paul Sartre gathers several conferences on intellectuals in his *Plaidoyer pour les Intellectuels*, an advocacy for intellectuals in English¹. In his book, he defines the concept of an intellectual and his role in society, drawing connections to wars and conflicts while also establishing a clear distinction between two categories of intellectuals, namely the 'False' and the 'True' ones. According to him, False Intellectuals do not oppose wars, due to their servitude to the government and the interests they gain. On the other hand, True Intellectuals refute wars and do not fear to

¹ (All translations are mine)

denounce them; they disregard any interest because wars are immoral and contradict Universal values. Given his insights, the choice of Sartre's work in this paper becomes evident.

In the debate over U.S. intervention, the division among intellectuals represents the differentiation between Sartre's False and True Intellectuals. Thus, this paper applies his theory to examine the stances of U.S. intellectuals during WWI, aiming to discern the two types. Hence, the following questions arise: who were the False and True Intellectuals in the U.S. during WWI? And does Sartre's concept of the True Intellectual hold true?

2. Sartre's Theory of False and True Intellectuals

2.1. The False Intellectual

Sartre offers the reader a comprehensive definition of the intellectual and states that “the intellectual is someone who gets involved in matters that do not specifically concern them... in the name of a holistic conception of humanity and society” (*Sartre 12*). This implies that intellectuals engage in issues beyond their own domains, advocating for the greater good of mankind and society. This conveys his concern in humanitarian values. Sartre carries on:

Originally, therefore, the group of intellectuals emerges as a variety of individuals who have gained some recognition through works that pertain to intelligence (exact sciences, applied sciences, medicine, literature, etc.) and who misuse this recognition to go beyond their field and criticize society and established powers in the name of a comprehensive and dogmatic (vague or

**Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals:
An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I**

precise, moralistic or Marxist) conception of
mankind (Sartre 13).

This implies that intellectuals gain either recognition or infamy from their works that demand intelligence. They exploit this reputation, surpassing their areas of expertise and interests, to critique society and governance, advocating for a comprehensive and dogmatic understanding of humanity. This reinforces the humanitarian characteristic of the intellectual and his devotion to the welfare of mankind. He not only goes outside his scope but he also dares to denounce the misdeeds of the established government. In short, for Sartre, the intellectual cares for the well-being of man and has to step outside his sphere. This way he will be able to acquire the necessary diversity of knowledge and sufficient wit to identify and condemn governmental misconduct that may pose a threat to human well-being.

Furthermore, Sartre mentions the difference between what he calls: “*Techniciens du Savoir Pratique*” (Technicians of Practical Knowledge) (Sartre 17) and “*Intellectuals.*” He claims that “in modern societies, the division of labor enables different groups to undertake various tasks that, when combined, constitute praxis. And, for our purposes, it generates specialists in practical knowledge” (Sartre 16). The praxis consists of a group of men of knowledge, who specialize in different fields, forms a body of Technicians of Practical Knowledge, each confined to their respective specialties. Hence, they are not intellectuals because they do not broaden their scopes for further insights. On their background Sartre continues:

These experts are therefore born from and within
the bourgeoisie. They are neither a class nor an

elite: fully integrated into the vast enterprise of commercial capitalism, they provide it with the means to sustain and amplify itself. These scholars and practitioners are not guardians of any ideology, and their function certainly does not involve providing one to the bourgeoisie (Sartre 18).

Based on this understanding, it becomes clear that these Technicians belong to, serve, and assist the Capitalists. They lack autonomy and are devoid of power. Therefore, they find themselves confined within the constraints of their specialty and servitude. This implies their incapacity to acquire a diversity of knowledge and renders them ill-equipped to challenge or resist the Bourgeois Class. Thus, they are unable to protect the well-being of humanity, which is a prerequisite for Sartre's concept of the True Intellectual.

Sartre also explains these Technicians' roles as: "Servants of hegemony" (Sartre 27) and using Gramsci's terms "*fonctionnaires des super-structures*" as such, they acquire a certain power, that of "exercising subordinate functions of social hegemony and political governance" (Sartre 27). This implies that they serve the hegemonic interests represented by the Bourgeoisie and hold power as sub-agents of the government. Thus, we understand that these Technicians are influenced and governed by the prevailing dominant power. Consequently, they reap advantages from their status, and to some extent, they become tainted as they refrain from denouncing the hegemony. In simpler terms, these Technicians serve as obedient puppets to their masters: the Bourgeois Class.

Sartre mentions the aims of their servitudes and writes:

Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals: An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I

At this level, they act as agents of ideological particularism, sometimes openly acknowledged (aggressive nationalism of Nazi thinkers), sometimes concealed (liberal humanism, that is, false universality). It is worth noting that at this level, they are tasked with dealing with matters that do not concern them. However, no one would think to call them intellectuals. This is because they improperly present what is merely the dominant ideology as scientific laws (Sartre 27).

Upon obtaining their esteemed positions, these Technicians assume the role of agents for Particularism, which can be overtly manifested as fervent nationalism (as seen in the case of the Nazis) or subtly disguised as Liberal Humanism, representing a counterfeit form of universalism. According to Sartre, despite their engagement with topics beyond their respective fields, these individuals are not considered intellectuals. In his view, they misuse their knowledge to promulgate scientific laws that ultimately serve the dominant ideology. Consequently, these Technicians can be deemed False Intellectuals as they endorse false principles aimed at furthering the hegemonic agenda. They are false because they do not strive for genuine universalism or the betterment of human welfare. On the contrary, their concerns lie solely with the privileged few at the expense of the masses.

2.3. The True Intellectual

According to Sartre, to become an intellectual, the Technician has to be aware of a contradiction within society and himself; such contradiction entails a deep feeling of alienation, which will make of him a True Intellectual. He explains that the would-be True Intellectuals encounter and uncover alienation

during their research. As agents, they become aware of their inability to question the dominant class, leading to a contradiction arising from the conflicting demands imposed by the latter. The ideology of particularistic obedience to the State, policies, and dominant class generates an internal conflict within them (the Technicians) in light of their pursuit of free and universal research. Through deceptive universalism, they have been deprived of the true social reality since childhood which involves the exploitation of the majority by a privileged few. Humanism prevents them from noticing the actual conditions faced by workers and the ongoing class struggle, while imperialism, colonialism, and racism are concealed under the guise of egalitarianism (Sartre 32). Therefore, in order to attain the status of a True Intellectual, the Technicians must sever ties with the oppressive dominant class or the incumbent in power. They need to transcend the barriers of contradiction and alienation and develop an understanding of the exploitation faced by the masses. Only then will they possess the ability to effectively advocate for human welfare and genuine Universalism.

For Sartre, the True Intellectual “is compelled to question the ideology that shaped him if he refuses to be a subordinate agent of hegemony and a means to ends he is unaware of or forbidden to challenge. In doing so, the agent of practical knowledge transforms into a monster, that is to say, an intellectual” (Sartre 38). Accordingly, the intellectual is the one who disrupts, for he is the one who refuses to turn a blind eye. Consequently, he is labeled as the "monster," an adversary of the

Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals: An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I

dominant class. Sartre elaborates: “no one seeks him, no one recognizes him (neither the State, nor the power elite, nor pressure groups, nor the apparatuses of the exploited classes, nor the masses)” (Sartre 44). Therefore, he becomes nonexistent and goes unnoticed due to his disruptive nature. He becomes an outcast and is sometimes even treated as an outlaw. In short, the True Intellectual is left alone. In Sartre’s words, he is alone because no one has appointed him (Sartre 59). Thus, he is a free agent, a solitary monster that disturbs. However, he embraces this state without hesitation because he firmly believes in the principles of True Universalism.

According to Sartre, “there is only one adversary for the True Intellectual: the False Intellectual” (Sartre 53). In addition to their responsibilities, the former is engaged in a conflict with the latter. He also emphasizes that the False Intellectual is conscious of the privileges and interests derived from his role as an agent of the dominant class and he adds that “the false intellectual does not say no, like the true intellectual; instead, he cultivates the “no but...” or the “I know well but still” (Sartre 54). Thus, he adopts an apologetic tone when it comes to the decisions of the dominant class. This indicates his awareness of both its wrongdoings and the inherent contradiction. However, he prioritizes his personal interests over daring to challenge the hegemony. In contrast, the True Intellectual disregards privileges and instead chooses to swim against the current of the dominant ideology.

Sartre explains that the True Intellectual “is compelled to refute them (the advocates of the dominant ideology), mainly because he is the monster whom they cannot convince. Thus, he

refuses and rejects ‘reformism’ and instead embraces radicalism which a ‘companion’ of Intellectualism” (Sartre 55). Therefore, the True Intellectual ought to be a radical, opposing reformism and its promoters: the False Intellectuals; as he has to be in constant antagonism with them. Sartre adds that Radical Intellectualism is a response to the attitude of the False Intellectuals. The consequence of their reformism is the maintenance of the status quo, which compels True Intellectuals to become revolutionaries; as they recognize that reformism only serves the interests of the dominant class (Sartre 56). In other words, the radicalism of True Intellectuals serves as a counter-reaction to the reformism of False Intellectuals; its aim is to criticize and challenge the dominant class. For Sartre, the True Intellectual raises awareness about the fallacy of False Universalism and reminds us that the true universalism is still to be achieved (Sartre 57).

Sartre concludes by praising the ethical values embodied by the True Intellectual. For him, he is the guardian of fundamental ends: emancipation, universalism, therefore humanization of man (Sartre 80); thus, he is the defender of Fundamental and Universal values and morals. He explains that His task goes from witnessing to martyrdom. Government uses intellectuals for its propaganda, but remains suspicious, and always starts the purges with them. However, as long as he can write and speak, he remains the defender of the masses against the hegemony of the dominant class (Sartre 81). Sartre hails the True Intellectuals for their selflessness and bravery and he criticizes the government for exploiting them as a tool and

**Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals:
An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I**

subsequently abandoning them. Despite this desolation, Sartre keeps on having faith in the True Intellectual, who remains the protector of the masses. He concludes: “he becomes the guardian of democracy: he challenges the abstract nature of bourgeois "democracy" rights, not because he wants to abolish them, but because he wants to supplement them with the concrete rights of socialist democracy” (Sartre 83). Simply put, the True Intellectual is responsible for the well-being of the masses and ensuring their rights in pursuit of an untainted democracy, free from the influence of bourgeois interests. To put it in other words, the True Intellectual is responsible for the well-being of the masses and ensuring their rights in pursuit of an untainted democracy, free from the influence of bourgeois interests.

After delving into Sartre's theory, the subsequent focus shifts to an examination of the attitudes of certain American intellectuals regarding intervention during World War One. The objective here is to distinguish between False Intellectuals and True Intellectuals.

3. Discerning False from True Intellectuals during W.W.I U.S.A

In his article, “World War I as Fulfillment: Power and Intellectuals”, Murray N. Rothbard studies Progressive intellectuals who enjoyed an ascendancy of power during W.W.I. His target is not only “theorists and academicians, but also all manner of opinion-molders in society-writers, journalists, preachers, scientists, activists of all sorts (Rothbard 82). From this perspective, it becomes clear that Rothbard engages with a diverse group of knowledgeable individuals, or Technicians of Practical Knowledge, who held influential

positions and had close associations with the U.S. government. He argues that the war fulfilled the Progressive trends including militarism, conscription, massive intervention, both domestically and internationally, and the establishment of a collectivized war economy (Rothbard 82). Based on Sartre's theory, it is clear that the inclinations of Progressives align with the principles of the Bourgeois Class. The Progressives serve the interests of the minority under the guise of a "False Democracy." In other words, the Progressive principles, implicitly, advocate for war in order to safeguard their own interests, disregarding the well-being of the masses.

Rothbard highlights the notable impact of the Postmillennial Pietist movement during the war and provides an explanation of their active participation in the affairs of the state, with the primary objective of regulating and safeguarding exemplary behavior. Postmillennialists held the belief that the second coming of Jesus would occur after the millennium. They advocated for the active involvement of the state in assisting citizens to attain salvation and eliminating sin, which was seen as an obstacle to salvation. In essence, the Pietists were strong proponents of Statism, emphasizing the role of the state in spiritual matters and moral guidance. Rothbard reports Professor Timberlake's words on the subject:

Evangelical Protestantism sought to overcome the corruption of the world in a dynamic manner, not only by converting men to belief in Christ but also by Christianizing the social order through the power and force of law... the Christian's duty was to use the secular power of the state to transform

**Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals:
An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I**

culture so that the community of the faithful might be kept pure... Thus the function of law was not simply to restrain evil but to educate and uplift (Rothbard 84).

If we consider Professor Timberlake as a Technician of Practical Knowledge and a proponent of Pietism, we can observe his strong allegiance to the State, or, using Sartre's terminology, the Dominant Class. From the passage, it becomes evident that the State is seen as having a crucial role in overseeing people's behaviors and beliefs, particularly in times of war. It is believed that the State must regulate their lives and conduct in order to achieve the ultimate goal of "salvation." In other words, the Pietists resort to religious arguments to cluster the masses and exert control over them. They claim pure and 'humanist' motives in order to improve the American society. However, in reality, their principles limit the individual's freedom and impose restrictions. They only serve the interests of a select group of Pietists, who hold valuable positions. Therefore, Professor Timberlake aligns with a "False" Universalism that serves the Dominant Class while disregarding the well-being of the masses. He fails to condemn this oppression and instead benefits from his position as a professor. Consequently, he does not embody the qualities of Sartre's True Intellectual and can be classified as a False Intellectual.

Rothbard points out that Pietism gathered both the Prohibition Party and the Anti Saloon League in a campaign against alcohol; he also mentions the Social Gospel leaders as "fervent advocates" (Rothbard 84) of such campaign. He reports Reverend Josiah Strong's words, in his journal *The Gospel of the Kingdom*: "'Personal Liberty" is at last an uncrowned, dethroned

king, with no one to do him reverence. The social consciousness is so far developed, and is becoming so autocratic, that institutions and governments must give heed to its mandate and share their life accordingly... it is the business of government to be just that-paternal” (Rothbard 85). Rev. Strong's statement strongly opposes "personal liberty" during times of war. Furthermore, he believes that the government should assume a paternal role to restrict personal liberty. According to him, the Dominant Class (represented by the government) should restrict individual freedom through the imposition of prohibitions. His stance explicitly aligns with the Pietists' goal of achieving nationwide salvation. However, implicitly, he seeks to exert dominance over the majority, using the government and laws as a means to that end. Applying Sartre's insights, if we consider Rev. Strong as a Technician of Practical Knowledge, he cannot be considered a True Intellectual. In reality, he promotes a "False" form of Humanism that serves the Dominant Class, disregarding the well-being of the masses. Thus, he becomes a False Intellectual, blinded by his position of power; he fails to denounce the restrictions of individual liberty and instead acts as an agent of the government, which aims to tightly control the masses during times of war.

As an example of the feud between the False and True Intellectuals, Rothbard mentions Richard T. Ely's 'crusade' against Robert M. Lafollette. Ely was “the leading Progressive economist... As an ardent postmillennialist pietist, [he] was convinced that he was serving God and Christ as well” (Rothbard 102). Similarly to Pr. Timberlake and Rev. Strange,

**Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals:
An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I**

Ely was an activist, during W.W.I, who believed in the almighty power of the State. Rothbard reports his words: “God works through the State in carrying out His purposes more universally than through any other institution” (Rothbard 102). Ely's words reflect his unwavering allegiance to the State, driven by his strong adherence to Pietism. As an advocate of "False" Humanism, it comes as no surprise that he wholeheartedly supported the War. He even encouraged conscription as a means to educate the youth and to impose prohibition (Rothbard 104). Considering Ely as a Technician of Practical Knowledge, it becomes apparent that he operates as a supporter of the Dominant Class, advocating for the dominance of the State. His focus does not encompass the well-being of the masses. Consequently, Ely falls short of embodying the qualities of a True Intellectual, as defined by Sartre.

Rothbard explains that Ely He advocated for the complete suppression of academic freedom, going to the extent of stating that any professor expressing opinions that impede the progress of the ongoing conflict should be dismissed from their positions, or even worse, subjected to severe consequences, including physical harm (Rothbard 104). Similarly to the False Intellectual who despises the opponents of the Dominant Class, Ely abhorred any fellowman who dared opposing the War. Among his ‘preys’ was Robert M. La Follette. Rothbard accounts for Ely’s campaign in attempts to expel La Follette from the U.S. Senate, because of his opposition to U.S. intervention.

As a False Intellectual and a subordinate agent of the hegemony, Ely was unwilling to tolerate La Follette's criticism of the state. La Follette, in Sartre's terms, is the "monster" who

disrupts the status quo. The petition against Lafollette accused him of supporting Germany and its allies, which Ely deemed as treasonous. However, Sartre views Lafollette's opposition to the war and his support for Germany as an act of integrity. Lafollette's stance demonstrates his commitment to "True" universalism and humanism. He opposed the war not out of disloyalty to the nation, but because he recognized its true nature: a destructive force that inflicted harm upon the masses—a reality that Ely failed to acknowledge. Lafollette, therefore, sought to challenge and expose the dominance of the Pietists in order to safeguard the well-being of the masses and uphold the principles of "True" democracy.

Lafollette's actions and declarations demonstrate his integrity as a True Intellectual. He boldly confronted the President and refused to blindly follow mainstream rules. This independence of thought allowed him to recognize the government's wrongdoing and distance himself from the Dominant Class. He actively opposed war intervention due to its immorality and the harm it inflicted, particularly on the masses. In short, Lafollette acknowledged the contradictions in his environment and chose to embody the role of a True Intellectual, striving for "True" democracy and universalism.

Following the same path, Randolph Bourne, an American journalist, social critic, and political activist, also opposed intervention and war. He, too, could not abide by the mainstream doctrine of the time. Therefore, he indulged in a staunch resistance against pro-war arguments. Simply put, Bourne was a True Intellectual, following Sartre's standards. First, as a

**Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals:
An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I**

Technician of Practical Knowledge, he became aware of the contradiction among his peers and within his academic upbringing. Bourne was the disciple of John Dewey, a Progressive intellectual, who supported intervention and attacked its opponents (Rothbard 97). Hence, Dewey is a False Intellectual, according to Sartre. The reason is that he was praising war for the sake of ‘liberties’ and ‘highest ideals of civilization’ that belong to the Dominant Class; he was defending the ‘Fake’ Democracy.

Bourne as his disciple observed deficiency in his tutor’s moral and intellectual values. After that, he experienced alienation and a sentiment of estrangement. John A. Thompson reports Bourne’s feelings towards the war as follows: “I seem to disagree on the war with every rational and benevolent person I meet, I feel ... very much out of touch with my times” (Thompson 178). His statement conveys a strong feeling of solitude vis-à-vis his peers and the American society. Despite alienation and persecution, Bourne kept on voicing his opinion and denouncing government and intellectuals in one of his essays: *The War and the Intellectuals* (1917)

The War and the Intellectuals describes and explains the betrayal of the American Intellectuals after the outbreak of the War. Bourne laments their tolerance regarding the war and accuses them of causing it, “a war made deliberately by the intellectuals!” (Bourne). His essay serves as a critique against False Intellectuals. Bourne discusses the background of those who support war, highlighting that they “came from the ranks of big business” (Bourne). This implies that they are part of the Bourgeois Class, specifically the Capitalists; therefore, they

promote war as it solely benefits their economic interests. Bourne adds that “The nerve of the war feeling centered, of course, in the richer and older classes of the Atlantic seaboard, and was keenest where there were French or English business” (Bourne). This reveals the connection between the wealthy (Bourgeois) and war, indicating that war serves as a means to safeguard the power and wealth of the Bourgeois, even if it comes at the expense of the masses.

Bourne explains that the intellectuals have aligned themselves with the least democratic elements in American society. It is ironic that in the name of global liberalism and democracy, the intellectual class would lead illiberal groups into war. In a world devoid of irony, there seems to be no one left to highlight the undemocratic nature of this war-driven liberalism (Bourne). He emphasizes that the intellectuals have aligned with undemocratic forces, specifically the government and the Dominant Class. However, they should advocate True Democracy and Universal values for the improvement of the masses. He argues that war lacks both democracy and liberalism, contrary to the claims made by the Bourgeois and Statist groups and he laments the fact that his fellow intellectuals failed to recognize and condemn the undemocratic objectives of war. Consequently, Bourne found himself isolated, seen as a "monster," opposing the irrational justifications of war supporters.

Bourne further attacks the ineffectiveness of his peers during wartime for he believes that they could have used their intellect to promote education while maintaining a stance of

**Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals:
An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I**

neutrality. Instead, “the time was spent not in clarification and education, but in mulling over of nebulous ideals of democracy and liberalism and civilization which had never meant anything fruitful to those ruling classes who now so glibly used them, and in giving free rein to the elementary instinct of self-defense” (Bourne). These words reflect Bourne's awareness and fulfillment as a True Intellectual. He recognizes the falseness of the supposed 'values' of war and the hidden agenda of the ruling class. Furthermore, he expresses regret over the complacency of the intellectual class. This highlights a clear distinction between him as a True Intellectual and his peers, whom he denounces and criticizes.

As a True Intellectual, Bourne continues his lamentation of the war and its supporters. He writes:

An intellectual class that was wholly rational would have called insistently for peace and not for war... Our war followed, as all wars follow, a monstrous failure of diplomacy. Shamefacedness should now be our intellectuals' attitude, because the American play for peace was made so little more than a play. The intellectuals have still to explain why, willing as they now are to use force to continue the war to absolute exhaustion, they were not willing to use force to coerce the world to a speedy peace (Bourne).

From this, we can comprehend the irrationality of the intellectual class in the United States. Bourne considers accepting and endorsing war as a senseless reaction. He strongly emphasizes the undemocratic nature of the war, which sharpens his awareness as a True Intellectual. Consequently, he feels ashamed of the choice to support the war and blames the

government for exploiting intellectuals to advance their war agenda (such as Professor Timberlake, Reverend Strong, and Richard Ely). According to Bourne, they have been manipulated. He asserts that his peers could have utilized their intellectual capacities to advocate for peace, following the example of Robert M. Lafollette. In other words, Bourne embodies the characteristics of Sartre's True Intellectual. He is the radical intellectual who condemns the intellectual reformism of his contemporaries. Bourne is the revolutionary who fearlessly denounces and criticizes the immorality of the war in all of his writings.

4. CONCLUSION

In short, Sartre's perspective on the Intellectual is presented as follows: The Intellectual must transcend their specialized domain to gain deeper insights and critical thinking abilities. This enables them to question and critique the actions of the government, with the aim of promoting the well-being of individuals and society as a whole. In other words, the Intellectual is driven by the pursuit of humanitarian values.

Sartre distinguishes between Technicians of Practical Knowledge, or False Intellectuals, and True Intellectuals. False Intellectuals are limited in their perspectives and serve the interests of the Dominant Class. They are unable to effectively advocate for societal welfare due to the privileges they derive from their association with the ruling elite. On the other hand, True Intellectuals go beyond their specific fields and actively

**Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals:
An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I**

oppose the government when necessary. They prioritize the welfare of society above personal gain, disregarding their own status and rejecting narrow interests in favor of a broader Universalism.

The True Intellectual, by rejecting his role as a tool of the ruling elite, becomes a disruptive figure that challenges the status quo. As a consequence, he faces persecution from both their peers and the government, resulting in a conflict. His primary objective is to confront False Intellectuals who have succumbed to submission and corruption. Moreover, he actively opposes the government's wrongdoings, particularly in relation to war, which he considers immoral. In response to the reformist tendencies of False Intellectuals, the True Intellectual embraces radical intellectualism. In short, he defends Universal values and the well-being of the masses against the oppressive forces of the ruling elite and he fights for a genuine democracy, one that is not disguised by the trappings of war

During World War One, in the United States, the emergence of various Technicians of Practical Knowledge became evident. Among them, Pr. Timberlake and Rev. Strong who were Statists and used the war to advance their Pietist agenda. As a result, they can be categorized as False Intellectuals since they not only disregarded the perils of war but also actively promoted it. Being entrenched in positions of power within the hegemonic structure, they were unable to detach themselves and critically analyze the war. Consequently, they do not meet the criteria for Sartre's definition of a True Intellectual.

Similarly, Richard Ely, also a Technician of Practical Knowledge, engaged in an intellectual battle against Robert

Lafollette. This conflict positioned Ely as a False Intellectual, while Lafollette emerged as a True Intellectual. Ely's strong commitment to statism led him to disregard the principles of Universalism and moral considerations. Moreover, he persecuted Lafollette simply because he dared to denounce the war. Ely's actions revealed his falseness while simultaneously reinforcing Lafollette's authenticity and truthfulness.

As far as Randolph Bourne is concerned, his essay establishes his position as a True Intellectual, according to Sartre's perspective. Throughout his journey, he underwent a transformative process, transitioning from a Technician to a True Intellectual. This evolution began with his sense of alienation, which heightened his consciousness regarding the shortcomings of both the intellectual class and the government, particularly during the war. Subsequently, he adopted a resolute stance and commenced denouncing his peers and the government. In his essay, he criticizes their subservience to the hegemony, as well as their lack of initiative and passivity.

Based on the aforementioned points, we gain insight into the distinctions between False and True Intellectuals, particularly during times of war. A True Intellectual is obligated to take a firm stance against any transgressions of Humanitarian or Universal values, disregarding personal privileges or the prevailing corruption. It is essential for them to steadfastly adhere to their principles and embrace their role as True Intellectuals, safeguarding the ideals of True Democracy. In the context of World War I, Lafollette and Bourne accomplished their respective tasks and fulfilled their "mission." However,

**Distinguishing Between False and True Intellectuals:
An Examination of American Intellectuals during World War I**

regrettably, they were unable to prevent False Intellectuals (such as Professor Timberlake, Reverend Strong, and Richard Ely) or the government from engaging in warfare. In conclusion, Sartre's concept of the True Intellectual does exist, albeit in rarity.

5. References:

- Blake, Casey Nelson. (1990). *Beloved Community: The Cultural Criticism of Randolph Bourne, Van Wyck Brooks, Waldo Frank, & Lewis Mumford*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Bourne, Randolph. (1917). *The War and the Intellectuals*. 1
- Halpin, John and Williams, Conor. P. (2010). *The Progressive Intellectual: Tradition in America Part One of the Progressive Tradition Series*. Washington: Center for American Progress. <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wpcontent/uploads/issues/2010/04/pdf/progressiveintellectualism.pdf>
- Pestritto, Ronald. J and Otto, William. J (Eds). (2008). *American Progressivism A Reader*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Rothbard, Murray. N. (1989), *World War One as a Fulfillment: Power and the Intellectuals*, *The Journal of Libertarian Studies*: Vol. IX, N.1 1989.
- _____ (2015), *Rothbard: World War I as the Triumph of Progressive Intellectuals*. November 11 2015.
- <https://mises.org/blog/rothbard-world-war-i-triumph-progressive-intellectuals>
- Sartre, Jean Paul. (2008). *Plaidoyer pour les Intellectuels*, Gallimard.
- Thompson, John. A. (1987). *Reformers and War: American Progressive Publicists and the First World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.