

Frank Jacob

Emma Goldman

Frank Jacob

Emma Goldman

Collected Essays on the Life and Impact
of a Transnational Anarchist

DE GRUYTER
OLDENBOURG

ISBN 978-3-11-153921-8
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-154479-3
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-154550-9

Library of Congress Control Number: 2024937999

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2024 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Cover image: Heritage Images / Historica Graphica Collection / akg-images
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Contents

- 1 Introduction: An Inspirational Radical — 1
 - 2 An Anarchist Revolution? Emma Goldman as an Intellectual Revolutionary — 3
 - 3 Emma Goldman, Gender Related Protest, and Anarchist Radicalism as a Crime — 19
 - 4 Marriage as Exploitation: Emma Goldman and the Anarchist Concept of Female Liberation — 35
 - 5 The Russian Revolution, the American Red Scare, and the Forced Exile of Transnational Anarchists: Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and their Soviet Experience — 57
 - 6 Emma Goldman and the United States: The History of a Love-Hate Relationship — 75
 - 7 An Anarchist Has to Live off Something: Emma Goldman as a Capitalist Publicist — 104
- Works Cited — 123
- Index — 133

1 Introduction: An Inspirational Radical

Emma Goldman is simply fascinating. She has so much to offer any reader interested enough to take some time and dive a little deeper into her writings. In her numerous and topically quite diverse works, she talks about revolutions, gender equality, literature and art, and many other things. Goldman lectured about birth control, sexual liberation, and the possibilities to achieve a better society, but also about the Bolsheviks, whom she admired at first but later detested so much that the Russian-American anarchist turned into a persona non grata of the left for having accused Lenin's followers of totalitarianism.

After Goldman was forced to leave the United States in late 1919, she was only allowed to return once for a lecture tour in 1934. However, the female anarchist realized then that her star was not shining as bright as in the late 19th and early 20th century, when she was one of the most prominent radicals in the United States, feared by the state authorities, adored by some of her fellow anarchists, and hated by those who felt attacked by her fearless words. "Red Emma" was as fearless as she was passionate, and what she loved more than anything was freedom. Since anarchism seemed to offer exactly that, the young woman, who had come to America for a better life far from her abusive father, soon joined the anarchist scene of New York City, where she met Alexander Berkman and Johann Most, two men who would introduce her to the world of anarchist thought.

However, Goldman was more than a follower. She wanted to be seen and was courageous enough to use her chances. Since she never backed out of a conflict, Goldman was soon known across the nation, where her name drove all kinds of emotions into people, ranging from admiration to frustration. The numerous men who loved Goldman and spent parts of their lives with her could also relate to these feelings. It was not easy to be with her, but Goldman also struggled with her own need for love, which often collided with her anarchist ideals.

Wherever one looks, Goldman's life is full of both inspirational moments and warnings that one should not take lightly. Her confrontational attitude often put her in danger and worsened her personal life. But Goldman was not somebody to give up. She was a fighter, somebody who believed in ideals and the necessity to awaken societies so that people would eventually understand why anarchism was more than a political philosophy and actually offered a better future. A world without hierarchies, without demands and pressure, a world only determined by individual freedom, personal choices, and collective organization, which does not mean anarchy at all, was what Goldman longed and hoped for.

The present book contains several articles published in the last few years about different aspects that determined Goldman's life and work. Chapter 2 consid-

ers her identity as an anarchist intellectual and revolutionary who, although she never formalized her thoughts about these two theoretical elements, had a clear vision for an anarchist revolution, while chapters 3 and 4 offer an insight into Goldman's "anarcha-feminist" ideas and demands. These thoughts in particular made her so interesting for later feminists in the 20th century, who rediscovered Goldman as an icon who was soon to be seen on T-shirts and posters during protest marches against patriarchic rule.

Chapters 5 and 6 offer deeper insights into Goldman's relationship with post-revolutionary Russia, Leninism, and the Soviet Union on the one hand and explain the complicated love-hate relationship between the anarchist and the United States on the other. Both of these relationships would be especially important for Goldman's life after 1917. However, Goldman's life was spent in exile after 1919, and she needed to survive as an anarchist idealist in a capitalist world. Therefore, the last chapter in this book critically examines her activities as a capitalist writer and publisher who needed to adjust to the publishing market to survive. The way Goldman considered her autobiography to serve as a steady income through royalties and book presentations for the later part of her life is very interesting, but unfortunately, the famous anarchist continued to struggle to stay financially afloat.

Although the present book only offers some glimpses into the exciting and inspirational life of Emma Goldman, it also proves that there is still much to study, even though the works about Goldman are not few in number. Nevertheless, the public interest, beyond the anarchist, scholarly, and anarchist scholarly circles, seems relatively limited, although Goldman is without any doubt somebody whose story deserves more attention. The problems she identified and discussed are still existent and even more pressing now than one and a half centuries ago. It is therefore recommended that we become more familiar with Goldman's story and her works to better understand that nothing has to be accepted as given. The world we live in should reflect freedom as much as it should reflect individuality and a way to choose both without hesitation or repercussion. Without perceiving her as an infallible saint, Goldman can be an important source of inspiration in this regard. I hope you, dear reader, will enjoy the selection of articles, despite some inevitable redundancies. If you are interested in more works about the life and works of Emma Goldman, the works cited section will be of help. Last but not least, I would like to thank Rabea Rittgerodt and Benedikt Krüger at De Gruyter for helping me with this project from the initial idea, through the editorial nightmares, to the final publication.

2 An Anarchist Revolution? Emma Goldman as an Intellectual Revolutionary

When the Russian Revolution changed Russia in February 1917, turning it from an autocratic monarchy into a supposedly democratic republic, the well-known Russo-American anarchist Emma Goldman was cheering¹ – not only because the revolution had ended a political system that was repressive and undemocratic, but also and especially because the masses of people that had taken their fate into their own hands.² Regardless of her joy, Goldman, who in December 1919 was deported from the United States to Soviet Russia – with other radicals, due to the Palmer Raids – had hoped for a revolution on American soil rather than to be a revolutionary in exile.³ It was her work as a leading figure of the anti-militarist No-Conscription League that had brought her to trial, together with her friend and former lover Alexander Berkman, and once both had served a prison sentence until late 1919, they were deported as foreign radicals who had opposed the government and the U.S. war effort by conspiring with others, as the accusation and sentence would claim respectively.

Goldman had also supported the Russian Revolution since early 1917, as well as Lenin and the Bolsheviks, whom she considered to be fulfilling the revolutionary ideals that had been expressed by the Russian masses during the protests that led to the end of the Czarist regime.⁴ For Goldman, a revolution, in accordance with

1 This article was first published in the *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 15, no. 2 (2021): 29–47. I would like to thank the editor of the journal, Arthur Versluis, for the permission to include it in this book as well.

2 Bini Adamczak, *Beziehungsweise Revolution: 1917, 1968 und kommende* (Berlin, Germany: Suhrkamp, 2017), 13. Goldman was cheerful for those who left for Russia, but only supported their preparations and did not seem to have the intention to actually follow them herself: “A contingent of Russian exiles and refugees was preparing to leave for their native land, and we helped to equip its members with provisions, clothing, and money. Most of them were anarchists, and all of them were eager to participate in the upbuilding of their country on a foundation of human brotherhood and equality.” Emma Goldman, *Living My Life* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1931), <http://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-living-my-life>, ch. 42. For a more detailed discussion of Goldman’s views about the Russian Revolution and how they changed from admiration to frustration, see Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution: From Admiration to Frustration* (Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2020).

3 Andrew Cornell, *Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the Twentieth Century* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016), 62; Marshall S. Shatz, “Review: Wexler, Emma Goldman in Exile,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 83, nos. 3–4 (1993): 458.

4 See among other publications, Emma Goldman, “The Russian Revolution,” *Mother Earth Bulletin* 1, no. 3 (1917), accessed April 30, 2024, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/

her anarchist ideals and theoretical considerations, needed to secure freedom for all people and had to be based on equal decisions. In general, she therefore supported the council system, in a way, as a form of grassroots democracy, and Lenin's claim of "All power for the soviets" made her consider the Bolsheviks to be acting in the name of the ideals of the February Revolution. Yet in Soviet Russia, Goldman would have to reconsider her ideas and find a way to not lose faith in a successful revolution that was supposed to bring the anarchist revolutionary ideas back to life.

Goldman's life and works have been discussed in a number of biographies that basically follow her story from Czarist Russia to the United States, and eventually to exile.⁵ Recent works have begun to look at different aspects of Goldman's life and thought in more detail, including her struggle against the U.S. state during the First World War,⁶ her views on the Russian Revolution,⁷ and her identity as an early or kind of proto-feminist,⁸ as well as an anti-Fascist in the interwar period.⁹ All these works analyzed a specific aspect of her life and impact and are in their sum important to critically question the role Goldman had played as a public

ME/mebulv1n3. html; and Emma Goldman, *The Truth About the Bolsheviks* (New York, NY: Mother Earth, 1918), accessed October 30, 2017, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/truthaboutbol.html.

5 The main works, in chronological order, are Richard Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*, Phoenix edition (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982 [1961]); Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life* (New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1984); Kathy E. Ferguson, *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011); Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011); and Paul and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012). On her experience in exile, see Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1989).

6 Erika J. Pribanic-Smith and Jared Schroeder, *Emma Goldman's No-Conscription League and the First Amendment* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2019). Also see Frank Jacob, "Anarchistische Imperialismuskritik und staatliche Repression: Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman und die Kritik an der politischen Ökonomie des Ersten Weltkrieges in den USA, 1917–1919," *PROKLA: Zeitschrift für kritische Sozialwissenschaft* 50, no. 201 (2020): 681–695.

7 Frank Jacob, "Der Anarchismus und die Russische Revolution: Emma Goldman und Alexander Berkman im Kampf gegen den Bolschewismus," *Ne znam: Zeitschrift für Anarchismusforschung* 7 (2018): 3–66; Jacob, *Emma Goldman*; Frank Jacob, "From Aspiration to Frustration: Emma Goldman's Perception of the Russian Revolution," *American Communist History* 17, no. 2 (2018): 185–199.

8 Donna M. Kowal, *Tongue of Fire: Emma Goldman, Public Womanhood, and the Sex Question* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2016).

9 Frank Jacob, "Emma Goldmans Blick auf Bolschewismus, Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus: Eine anarchistische Perspektive auf den Totalitarismus der 1920er- und 1930er-Jahre," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 68, no. 10 (2019): 833–847.

intellectual in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The following analysis contributes to this growing body of specialized Goldman literature, by considering and putting a special focus on her identity as an anarchist revolutionary who, although she did not develop a concrete theory of revolution of her own, through her experiences and writings established an anarchist understanding of revolutionary processes and expressed a demand for its democratic nature, that is, a grassroots democracy, in the future.

This article analyzes Goldman's theoretical reflections in relation to her deportation from the United States, her early exile in postrevolutionary Russia, and her later attempts to enlighten people about the corruption of the Russian Revolution by Lenin and the Bolsheviki. It thus offers a case study of an anarchist intellectual revolutionary and her thoughts about revolutions in a decisive time period of the 20th century when future perceptions of revolutionary processes and a very often negative view of revolutions as such had been generated by the Russian events. After a first section that looks at the revolutionary Goldman on American soil, the second section takes a look at her inner struggles with the Russian Revolution while in exile in Soviet Russia. The final part then emphasizes which ideas in relation to revolutionary processes Goldman had tried to advertise in other countries while continuing her life as a radical in exile.

A Revolutionary on American Soil

Goldman, like many other radicals, was considered an immigrant who had brought such radical ideas with her, but in reality, and as she would later emphasize very often, two things made her an anarchist. First, it was her experience of exploitation in the U.S. garment industry and the related sweatshops where she had to work long hours for low pay, observing the dehumanization of so many other immigrants who, like her, had dreamed of a better future in the United States when they had left their homes in Europe.¹⁰ The German, Italian, Russian, and Jewish communities were consequently seedbeds for radical ideas, as the numerous exploited individuals would turn toward those who promised a better future, namely, socialists or anarchists.¹¹ The New York Lower East Side was a particularly vivid

10 Emma Goldman, "Why I Am an Anarchist," n.d., Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth EGP-IISH), No. 191, 10–13.

11 For a detailed overview of New York's German-American anarchist milieu see Tom Goyens's works: *Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880–1914* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007), and "Johann Most and the German Anarchists," in *Radical Gotham: Anarchism in New York City from Schwab's Saloon to Occupy Wall Street*, ed. Tom Goy-

environment for anarchist ideas, linking the German- and Yiddish-speaking anarchist agitators. Second, for Goldman, her experience of the Haymarket Tragedy was an important aspect of her own radicalization. She would emphasize the role of these events in 1886/1887 when later recalling the roots of her own political radicalism. In her autobiography *Living My Life*, she wrote the following about one night in 1889: “That night I could not sleep. Again I lived through the events of 1887. Twenty-one months had passed since the Black Friday of November 11, when the Chicago men had suffered their martyrdom, yet every detail stood out clear before my vision and affected me as if it had happened but yesterday.... The reports in the Rochester newspapers irritated, confused, and upset us by their evident prejudice. The violence of the press, the bitter denunciation of the accused, the attacks on all foreigners, turned our sympathies to the Haymarket victims.”¹²

Goldman’s anarchism would eventually determine her whole further life, and although Goldman was not as dogmatic as many radical men around her, she demanded an emotional anarchism of freedom, due to which she also demanded a free and self-determined life for women, including, especially, sexual freedom.¹³ Only if women and men were truly equal would they be able to work together for a better future, so it was women whose role in a future revolution needed to be stressed, including by Goldman. She therefore demanded that the liberation of women be a precondition for a revolution in the future.¹⁴ The “woman ques-

ens (Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press, 2017), 12–32. For the Italian–American and Jewish–American anarchist milieu in the urban metropolis see Kenyon Zimmer, *Immigrants Against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America* (Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press, 2015), and Kenyon Zimmer, “Saul Yanovsky and Yiddish Anarchism on the Lower East Side,” in *Radical Gotham: Anarchism in New York City from Schwab’s Saloon to Occupy Wall Street*, ed. Tom Goyens (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2017), 33–53.

¹² Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 1.

¹³ Frank Jacob, “Anarchismus, Ehe und Sex: Emma Goldman (1869–1940) als Anarcha-Feministin,” in *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die “Frauenfrage” aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob (Berlin, Germany: Metropol, 2020), 202–221. On anarcha-feminism in general, see Donna M. Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, ed. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 265–79. Kowal defines anarcha-feminism, a label that did not yet exist in Goldman’s own times, as “a distinct, albeit loosely formed, ‘school of thought’ that was reflected in the transnational activism of anarchist women, especially in Europe and the United States. Anarchist women tended to interpret the anarchist critique of authority through the lens of their experiences as women, especially constraints resulting from sexual double standards and the gendered division of labor.” *Ibid.*, 265.

¹⁴ Emma Goldman, *Marriage and Love* (New York, NY: Mother Earth, 1911); Emma Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” n.d., EGP-IISH, no. 213; Emma Goldman, “The New Woman,” *Free Society*, February 13, 1898: 2, in Emma Goldman: *A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made*

tion” could therefore not wait, but was instead a necessary step toward the beginning of a truly revolutionary process. When Goldman had fought for years for free speech and the female right for abortion, to name just two important elements that determined Goldman’s life in the United States before her later deportation, she turned all her energy toward the criticism of the First World War in general and voices that demanded U.S. preparedness for this global war in particular.

The European Left was very often divided about the question of war and which position to take with regard to the violent conflict, leading to serious splits between those who demanded support for a supposedly “defensive war” and those who demanded its end and did not comply with demands by their national governments.¹⁵ The latter group usually ended up in jail, and European prisons were filled with representatives of the pacifist left. Goldman, together with others, stated early on that the war could not and should not be supported. She also raised her voice against the nationalist demands for U.S. preparedness. In 1915 she published “Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter” in *Mother Earth* to raise awareness of the issue.¹⁶ She argued that “the human mind seems to be conscious of but one thing, murderous speculation. Our whole civilization, our entire culture is concentrated in the mad demand for the most perfected weapons of slaughter.”¹⁷ The political economy of the war would only serve the “privileged class; the class which robs and exploits the masses, and controls their lives from the cradle to the grave.” The workers, who would gain nothing from the war, would solely be exploited again, while “America grows fat on the manufacture of munitions and war loans to the Allies to help crush Prussians [and] the same cry is now being raised in America which, if carried into national action, would build up an American militarism far more terrible than German or Prussian militarism could ever be, and that because nowhere in the world has capitalism become so brazen in its

for *America, 1890–1901*, ed. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 322; Emma Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” n.d., EGP-IISH, no. 266; Emma Goldman, “The Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation,” *Mother Earth* 1, no. 1 (1906): 9–18.

15 For some recent works on the European Left during the First World War see Frank Jacob and Riccardo Altieri, eds., *Krieg und Frieden im Spiegel des Sozialismus 1914–1918* (Berlin, Germany: Metropol, 2018), and Uli Schöler and Thilo Scholle, eds. *Weltkrieg – Spaltung – Revolution. Sozialdemokratie 1916–1922* (Bonn, Germany: Dietz, 2018).

16 With *Mother Earth* Goldman connected different anarchist groups and provided a central press organ for information. Peter Glassgold, “Introduction, The Life and Death of *Mother Earth*,” in *Anarchy! An Anthology of Emma Goldman’s Mother Earth*, ed. Peter Glassgold (Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint, 2012 [2001]), xvii.

17 Emma Goldman, “Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter,” *Mother Earth* 10, no. 10 (1915), accessed April 30, 2024, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-preparedness-the-road-to-universal-slaughter>. The following quotes are taken from this article.

greed and nowhere is the state so ready to kneel at the feet of capital.” U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, “the historian, the college professor,” was nothing more than a servant of the capitalist class, although the President himself had also criticized the nationalist cry for preparedness for war in some of his previous speeches. Ultimately, he and the U.S. government were not concerned with the interests of the common people and would only argue on behalf of capitalism, imperialism, and consequently militarism. Goldman warned of this trend, stating, “Militarism consumes the strongest and most productive elements of each nation. Militarism swallows the largest part of the national revenue. Almost nothing is spent on education, art, literature and science compared with the amount devoted to militarism in times of peace, while in times of war everything else is set at naught; all life stagnates, all effort is curtailed; the very sweat and blood of the masses are used to feed this insatiable monster – militarism.”

However, when the U.S. government introduced the Selective Service Act in 1917, Goldman intensified her criticism and her activities against the war. With her lifelong friend Alexander Berkman and some others, she founded the No-Conscription League and began to publicly argue against this new law.¹⁸ The conscription of young American men represented nothing more than another form of exploitation. These men would be sent to Europe to die for the capitalist elites of the United States. Goldman, at a meeting of the No-Conscription League at Hunts Point Palace, New York, on June 4, 1917, summed up her critical position toward this new law: “I actually believed that this [the United States] was the promised land, the land that rests upon freedom, upon opportunity, upon happiness, upon recognition [sic] of the importance and the value of the young generation.... I have come to the conclusion that when the law for conscription was passed in the United States the Funeral March of 500,000 American youths is going to be celebrated tomorrow, on Registration Day.”¹⁹

Instead of complying with the governmental demands, Goldman proposed that U.S. workers should take a closer look at Russia, where a revolution had swept away the ruling class and, for the first time in history, had made the masses responsible for their own future. In her public speeches, Goldman stressed that the United States had during the First World War turned more autocratic than Czarist Russia and that it was time for the working class to take the torch from Russia

¹⁸ For a detailed discussion of the work of the No-Conscription League and the legal issues it caused for Goldman, see Erika J. Pribanic-Smith and Jared Schroeder, *Emma Goldman's No-Conscription League and the First Amendment* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2019).

¹⁹ Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, Hunts Point Palace, New York, June 4, 1917, Alexander Berkman Papers, Tamiment Library & Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, New York (henceforth ABP-TAM), Box 1, Folder 12, 24.

to spark the revolutionary fire on this side of the Atlantic as well. For this criticism of the new law, Goldman and Berkman were arrested and brought to trial, where they were accused of leading an antigovernmental conspiracy.²⁰ While both anarchists used the possibility to present their ideas to a wider public, it was clear from the beginning that the trial as such was nothing more than a farce. It ended with no surprise: Goldman and Berkman were sentenced to two years in prison and a \$10,000 fine.²¹ Before she had to go to prison in early 1918, however, Goldman once again highlighted the role of the Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviki and published a short pamphlet that aimed to motivate the U.S. working class, and her anarchist readers in particular, to stand up for their rights in revolution.²² Yet nothing happened. Goldman spent her time in prison until late September 1919, and was handed her deportation papers shortly before her release date.²³ She and Berkman were supposed to be deported, according to legal possibilities the government had been preparing in the last few months. Now facing deportation, Goldman had to be ready for an unknown fate. While she herself considered her U.S. citizenship a solid right, the court did not accept her marriage to Jacob Kershner in the early 1880s to be a legitimate act of naturalization to U.S. citizenship, especially since there was no proof for the marriage, which had taken place following a Jewish procedure.²⁴

In December 1919, Goldman and Berkman, with close to 250 other radicals, were sent away on board the transport ship *Buford*, or the “Soviet Arch,” as it was later called. Only a few days after their journey began would they be told that Soviet Russia was their destination.²⁵ At least the two anarchists could thereby help the establishment of a new world, a world born by revolution. Although Gold-

20 Harry Weinberger's documents related to the legal issues during the Red Scare that also involved the defense of Goldman can be found in the Harry Weinberger Papers (MS 553), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, Box 2, Folders 12–19.

21 Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, *U.S. v Goldman and Berkman*, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 14, 93.

22 Goldman, *Truth*.

23 Paul Avrich and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 292; Alix Kates Shulman, *To the Barricades: The Anarchist Life of Emma Goldman* (New York, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1971), 194.

24 Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Stenographer's Minutes, December 8, 1919, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 3, 28 and 30.

25 Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman to Comrades, On Board the U.S. Transport *Buford*, January 10, 1920, in Letters from Berkman, U.S. Transport *Buford*, January 3–13, 1920, Alexander Berkman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth ABP-IISH, No. 127), 9. Also see Avrich and Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 296–97; Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 74. On the journey of the *USAT Buford*, see Torrie Hester, *Deportation: The Origins of U.S. Policy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 121–24.

man had had no interest in going back to Russia, she was now, with no other choice, looking forward to becoming part of the revolution she had previously praised so much in the United States. However, the postrevolutionary realities would turn her admiration of the Russian Revolution into bitter frustration.

Observing the Postrevolutionary Order

Goldman was not the only one who was able to gather information and experience from Soviet Russia while living there.²⁶ But it is important to consider her life there to better understand her development as a revolutionary intellectual whose image of the Russian Revolution was tremendously transformed by her firsthand impressions. After a transatlantic journey that was marked by anxiety, hunger, a fear of diseases, and overcrowded cabins, Goldman, together with the other radicals, reached the Soviet Russian border in January 1920. The anarchists consequently found shelter in the land of the utopian revolution and met with those who had left the United States immediately after the news of the February Revolution, such as Bill Shatov. Like many international anarchists, he had supported the revolution from its start and was dogmatically flexible enough to tolerate the leading position of the Bolsheviks. Goldman, in contrast, realized early on that the postrevolutionary reality of Soviet Russia was far from anything she had hoped for while hailing Lenin and his followers for their revolutionary role in 1917 and 1918, when she had still been in the United States.

In Soviet Russia, the anarchists would soon become an opposition force against Lenin's leadership and would attempt to organize a centralized state led by the Bolshevik party. In April 1919, the first violent clashes between the two parties took place and Goldman witnessed how anarchist ideas were suppressed, especially when they were critical of the new postrevolutionary order. The U.S. anarchist was in an awkward position. Other anarchists, including Berkman, were willing to accept these developments as a consequence of international intervention and as a necessary evil that needed to be tolerated for the final achievement of a new social order. Goldman considered a revolution to be something else, namely, a change that needed to be supported by the masses and that should guarantee freedom for the people, even if they had different and maybe even critical opinions about the transformation process the revolution had caused. A revolution

26 Avrich and Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 291–302; Candace Falk, *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman*, rev. ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990 [1984]), 183–96; Shulman, *To the Barricades*, 203–13; Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1989), 57–91.

that denied freedom – and here she shared her theoretical perspective with one of the other leading figures of the international left, Rosa Luxemburg – could not be a true revolution. Goldman consequently had realized early on that the revolution had been corrupted by the Bolsheviks in general, and by Lenin in particular.

Nevertheless, there were several reasons for her to remain inactive with regard to possible criticism: (1) She hoped that Lenin would return to his claim that the soviets should be in power; (2) she agreed with other anarchists that the revolution would be doomed if one attacked it while international interventionist forces were attacking Soviet Russia; and (3) she believed that the revolution could still be saved if the masses were defending their rights to determine their own future. Her concerns were there early on, but the sense that her own security could not be guaranteed if her criticism was too harsh and too open while she was herself in Soviet Russia was also a reason to remain rather quiet.²⁷ On the other hand, that made her and Berkman's immediate criticism after leaving the land of revolutionary utopia in December 1921 more surprising for representatives of the international left, because it seemed to come relatively abruptly.²⁸

Regardless of this impression, Goldman struggled with the revolution and what it had eventually created. Maxim Gorki, with whom she met to discuss such issues, would accuse her of being too idealistic, too theoretical with regard to the course of revolutions, which could never be understood by someone who only read about it. Gorki's "lecture" and how Goldman reacted to it are quoted in some length here, as this shows how hard it seemed to remain critical of the postrevolutionary process after October 1917 for the anarchist during her time in Soviet Russia:

Maxim Gorki, he would surely tell me which side of the Russian face was the real one and which one false. He would help me, he the great realist, whose clarion voice had thundered against every wrong and who had castigated the crimes against childhood in words of fire. I dispatched a note to Gorki, requesting him to see me. I felt lost in the labyrinth of Soviet Russia, stumbling constantly over the many obstacles, vainly groping for the revolutionary light. I needed his friendly, guiding hand, I wrote him.... Maxim Gorki stood before me, his peasant face deeply lined with pain.... I had looked forward with much anticipation to the chance of talking to Gorki, yet now I did not know how to begin. "Gorki knows nothing about me," I was saying to myself.... "He may think me merely a reformer, opposed to the Revolution as such. Or he may even get the impression that I am just fault-finding on account of personal griev-

27 Emma Goldman to [Stella Comyn], Petrograd, November 4, 1920, Papers of Leon Malmed and Emma Goldman, MC 332, M-88, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA (henceforth LMP), Folder 26, 1.

28 Alexander Berkman, "Some Bolshevik Lies about the Russian Anarchists," February 1922, ABP-IISH, No. 183. The article was published in *Freedom* (April 1922), 24–26; Alexander Berkman, "The Russian Revolution: A Review and an Outlook," Stockholm, February 8, 1922, ABP-IISH, No. 182.

ances or because I could not have 'battered toast and grapefruit for breakfast' or other material American blessings." ...[N]ow I was upset by the apprehension lest Maxim Gorki consider me also a pampered bourgeois, dissatisfied because I had failed to find in Soviet Russia the flesh-pots of capitalist America.... Surely the seer who could detect beauty in the meanest life and discover nobility in the basest was too penetrating to misunderstand my groping. He more than any other man would grasp its cause and its pain.... I continued: "I also hope you will believe me when I say that, though an anarchist, I had not been naive enough to think that anarchism could rise overnight, as it were, from the debris of old Russia." He stopped me with a gesture of his hand. "If that is so, and I do not doubt you, how can you be so perplexed at the imperfections you find in Soviet Russia? As an old revolutionist you must know that revolution is a grim and relentless task. Our poor Russia, backward and crude, her masses, steeped in centuries of ignorance and darkness, brutal and lazy beyond any other people in the world!" I gasped at his sweeping indictment of the entire Russian people. His charge was terrible, if true, I told him.... [H]e replied that the "romantic conception of our great literary geniuses" had entirely misrepresented the Russian and had wrought no end of evil. The Revolution had dispelled the bubble of the goodness and naïveté of the peasantry. It had proved them shrewd, avaricious, and lazy, even savage in their joy of causing pain.... The roots were inherent in Russia's brutal and uncivilized masses, he said. They have no cultural traditions, no social values, no respect for human rights and life. They cannot be moved by anything except coercion and force. All through the ages the Russians had known nothing else.... I protested vehemently against these charges. I argued that in spite of his evident faith in the superior qualities of other nations, it was the ignorant and crude Russian people that had risen first in revolt. They had shaken Russia by three successive revolutions within twelve years, and it was they and their will that gave life to "October."²⁹

Goldman and Berkman, on the other hand, were relatively free, so they were able to gather different opinions about the revolution, whether these be from intellectuals or from ordinary people. For the Museum of the Russian Revolution, the two anarchists were allowed to tour postrevolutionary Soviet Russia to collect data and evidence of the greatness of the new Soviet Russia.³⁰ Before their journey throughout the country officially began, they also met Pjotr Kropotkin in Dmitrov in July 1920. The famous anarchist had been exiled from the political centers of power, but he helped Goldman with a discussion of the revolutionary events and the current order, encouraging the latter to divide the revolution and its ideals, that is, the scenario in February 1917, from the current situation, that is, a centralized state under Bolshevik rule:

There was no reason to despair, he had urged. He understood my inner conflict, he had assured me, but he was certain that in time I should learn to distinguish between the Revolu-

²⁹ Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 52.

³⁰ Emma Goldman, *My Disillusionment in Russia* (New York: Doubleday, 1923), <https://the-anarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-disillusionment-in-russia>, ch. 13.

tion and the regime. The two were worlds apart, the abyss between them bound to grow wider as time went on. The Russian Revolution was far greater than the French and of more potent world-wide significance. It had struck deep into the lives of the masses everywhere, and no one could foresee the rich harvest humanity would reap from it. The Communists, irrevocably adhering to the idea of a centralized State, were doomed to misdirect the course of the Revolution. Their end being political supremacy, they had inevitably become the Jesuits of socialism, justifying all means to attain their purpose. Their methods, however, paralyzed the energies of the masses and terrorized the people. Yet without the people, without the direct participation of the toilers in the re-construction of the country, nothing creative and essential could be accomplished.³¹

This advice was well taken by Goldman, who, after having experienced all the suffering in the postrevolutionary order all over the country, determined the Bolsheviks to be the most dangerous Marxist force for the revolution, the ideals of which it had already corrupted. The “Jesuit order in the Marxian Church,”³² as Goldman would refer to them later on, had sacrificed the revolutionary dreams of the masses and taken over a rule that was even more autocratic than that of the Czars had been in the past. Foreigners who visited Soviet Russia during international congresses and conferences could hardly see what she and Berkman had observed because they were well “protected” by the Bolsheviks, who translated for them and only showed them the good sides of Soviet life. Yet Goldman also struggled with Berkman, who, in contrast to her, was unwilling to believe that the revolution was dead and that Bolshevism had replaced the revolutionary dreams with another Marxist police state in which the Cheka, the secret police, was the tool that kept Lenin in power.³³

The events related to the Kronstadt Rebellion in March 1921, this “portent”³⁴ of the postrevolutionary process, were needed to awaken Berkman from the spell the Bolsheviks had put upon him. The sailors who had initially supported the February Revolution in 1917 had now turned against Lenin and his followers. The latter, instead of seeking a discussion with the newly established soviets and their representatives in Kronstadt, just crushed the rebellion in a very violent manner, especially since they could not afford criticism at this time, when all power needed to be secured to prevent both further invasion attempts and a victory of the white

³¹ Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 52.

³² Emma Goldman, *The Crushing of the Russian Revolution* (London, UK: Freedom Press, 1922), University of Warwick Library Special Collections, JD 10.P6 PPC 1684, 7.

³³ Richard Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*, Phoenix edition (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982 [1961]), 235–36.

³⁴ Helmut Bock, “Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921,” in Helmut Bock et al., *Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921 – Kriegskommunismus und Alternativen* (Berlin: Pankower Vorträge, 2011), 5–20.

forces within Soviet Russia.³⁵ However, the events eventually forced Berkman to accept what Goldman had emphasized before: The revolution was dead and the Bolsheviks only ruled in the name of communism; in reality, they had established a centralized capitalist party state backed by the violence threatened and inflicted by their secret police, the Cheka.

Goldman and Berkman could no longer stay in Soviet Russia, especially since the government had executed anarchists in the summer of 1921 without any trial. The danger for the two anarchists from the United States consequently also increased, and they prepared their escape, which eventually was possible in December of that year. They moved to Sweden, which would become only the first station of their further exile in Europe and would be where they began their anti-Bolshevik “crusade” that demanded all their attention in the following years, although it seemed hard to get any support for it. Regardless of her experiences, however, Goldman remained a revolutionary intellectual, demanding and hoping for a better revolution, as she divided between the revolutionary masses and the morally corrupted Bolsheviks who acted in the name of a perverted Marxism, not in the name of a revolution.

Against Bolshevism, but for Revolution

In Sweden, Goldman worked on her first articles about the Russian Revolution that she sent to the United States to draw public attention to the events in Soviet Russia. While Berkman did not want to publish in the so-called “capitalist press,” it was hard to get attention outside of it, while Goldman simply wanted to get the greatest possible audience.³⁶ Her works appeared in the *New York World* and would later be published in a collected form. She was, however, criticized by other left intellectuals for her anti-Bolshevik attitude, which she seemed to sell at the highest price. When Goldman and Berkman eventually had to leave Sweden, they were not sure where and how they would spend their further exile, but they ended up in Berlin, where both worked on their first works about the Russian Revolution. Goldman was initially very melancholic,³⁷ but published a short German pamphlet about

35 For a detailed description of the events see Paul Avrich, *Kronstadt 1921* (New York, NY: Norton, 1974 [1970]). For Berkman’s view see Alexander Berkman, *The Kronstadt Rebellion* (Berlin, Germany: Der Syndikalist, 1922), accessed May 20, 2020, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/alexander-berkman-the-kronstadt-rebellion#toc8>.

36 Alexander Berkman to Fitzie, Stockholm, February 10, 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 1. Emphasis in the original.

37 Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Berlin, August 9, 1922, LMP, Folder 28, 1.

her experiences³⁸ and later also sent a longer manuscript to Doubleday, Page & Co. This, however, caused some problems.

On the one hand, Berkman had provided a lot of material for Goldman's work, a fact that limited the chances for his own manuscript to get some attention. While he supported his friend, Berkman was obviously angry about Goldman exploiting his material. In October 1922, he remarked in a letter to a friend: Goldman's "forte is the platform, not the pen, as she herself knows very well.... As her book will be out first, what interest could my book ...have.... It is a tragic situation. Of course, my writing is different in style, and to some extent in point of view, but the meat I have given away. And yet I could not do otherwise."³⁹

On the other hand, the publisher had not only changed the manuscript's title to *My Disillusionment in Russia*, but had also only published the first 12 chapters. Goldman's manuscript was torn into pieces, but, even worse, almost nobody realized.⁴⁰ Only two reviewers actually read the book carefully enough to remark on the missing chapters. The rest of the manuscript later appeared as *My Further Disillusionment in Russia*,⁴¹ but, like Berkman's book, was not a real bestseller.⁴² Both anarchists seemed to be unable to intrigue the American readers in their view of the Russian Revolution. Conservative readers were not interested in a left critique of the events, and leftist readers were also not interested in reading something negative about it from another left intellectual. The hoped-for impact never realized, and Goldman and Berkman must have felt more than frustrated that the truth about Soviet Russia was not of interest to many.

When Goldman later moved to England, she continued her attempts to shed light on Bolshevik Russia and to expose Lenin's lies. She emphasized what she had seen during her time in Soviet Russia:

What I actually found was so utterly at variance with what I had anticipated that it seemed like a ghastly dream. I found a small political group . . . – the Communist Party – in absolute control.... Labour conscripted, driven to work like chattel-slaves, arrested for the slightest infringement ...the peasants a helpless prey to punitive expeditions and forcible food collection ...the Soviets ...made subservient to the Communist State ...a sinister organisation, known as

38 Emma Goldman, *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution* (Berlin, Germany: Der Syndikalist, 1922).

39 Cited in Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 244.

40 Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 245; Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 118.

41 Emma Goldman, *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1924), accessed April 30, 2024, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-further-disillusionment-in-russia>.

42 Horace B. Liveright to Alexander Berkman, New York, June 17, 1925, ABP-IISH, No. 169.

the “Cheka” (Secret service and executioners of Russia), suppressing thought ...the prisons and concentration camps overcrowded with men and women ...Russia in wreck and ruin, presided over by a bureaucratic State, incompetent and inefficient to reconstruct the country and to help the people realise their high hopes and their great ideals.⁴³

However, she was not allowed to speak in front of larger audiences, nor was she able to persuade leading left intellectuals to take a stand against the Bolsheviks. Bertrand Russell, whom Goldman thought very highly of, was willing to talk with Goldman, yet he would not support her activities as he deemed them unsuitable, considering the higher aims at stake. In February 1925, Goldman would send a letter to Russell expressing her disappointment about his unwillingness to join her for a series of lectures about Bolshevism. She wrote: “[A] series of lectures on various phases of the Russian Revolution [is going] to take place in different parts of this City, in Town Halls. I am telling you this, not because I think you have any interest but simply that you may know that there are a few people in this country who feel the need of light on Russia. I had hoped that you would be among the first to see that need. I confess I am painfully disappointed that you, who so bravely and brilliantly stand out for the truth, should find it necessary to keep aloof from any critical work of the regime which has crushed the truth.”⁴⁴ Russell, however, declared a few days later in some detail why he had denied Goldman’s request:

I am prepared to ...protest to the Soviet Government, on documented statements as to the existing evils; ...But I am not prepared to advocate any alternative government in Russia: I am persuaded that the casualties would be at least as great under any other party. And I do not regard the abolition of all government as a thing which has any chance of being brought about in our lifetimes or during the twentieth century. I am therefore unwilling to be associated with any movement which might seem to imply that a change of Government is desirable in Russia.... I think ill are the Bolsheviks in many ways, but quite as ill as their opponents. I feel that your movement, even against your wishes, will appear as political opposition to the present Soviet Government.⁴⁵

The frustration continued, and Goldman remained unable to unite a larger number of leftists, whether anarchists or socialists, to resist the lies from Moscow. In the end, she had to witness the rise of other evils, namely, Fascism and National Socialism, although she considered them only to be mimicking Lenin, the first to-

⁴³ Emma Goldman, “What I Saw,” Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth EGP-IISH), No. 284.

⁴⁴ Emma Goldman to Bertrand Russell, London, February 9, 1925, Emma Goldman Papers, New York Public Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division, ZL386, Reel 1, 1.

⁴⁵ Bertrand Russell to Emma Goldman, London, February 14, 1925, EGP-IISH, No. 144, 2–3.

talitarian ruler of the 20th century, who had abused an ideology to control the minds of his people.

Regardless of her experiences, Goldman never gave up her hope for another revolution. It must have been tragic that the Spanish Revolution and the Civil War again crushed this hope, as the anarchists, like the Bolsheviks two years before, seemed unable and too morally corrupted to develop a united front, backed by the masses of the people, and lead a revolutionary process to success. In the end, Goldman's revolutionary experience of the 20th century must have been a bitter one, but the anarchist never gave up hope. For her, a revolution was the only way to achieve a better future and to build a better world:

Revolution is the negation of the existing, a violent protest against man's inhumanity to man with all the thousand and one slaveries it involves. It is the destroyer of dominant values upon which a complex system of injustice, oppression, and wrong has been built up by ignorance and brutality. It is the herald of NEW VALUES, ushering in a transformation of the basic relations of man to man, and of man to society. It is not a mere reformer, patching up some social evils; not a mere changer of forms and institutions; not only a re-distributor of social well-being. It is all that, yet more, much more. It is, first and foremost, the TRANSVALUATOR, the bearer of new values. It is the great TEACHER of the NEW ETHICS, inspiring man with a new concept of life and its manifestations in social relationships. It is the mental and spiritual regenerator.⁴⁶

Conclusion

Emma Goldman was an idealist, an emotional anarchist, and a true revolutionary. Early on, she had emphasized the value of emotions and freedom for a revolution, as without emotions they could not happen, and without freedom they could not succeed. When Goldman began to criticize Woodrow Wilson and the military-industrial complex during the First World War, leading to her foundation of the No-Conscription League, she was also hoping for an American revolution in which the working class would be inspired by the events in Russia. However, this revolution did not happen, and Goldman was sent to jail before being deported in late 1919. Arriving in Soviet Russia in January 1920, she had hoped to help to build a new world and a new social order, but soon realized that the revolution in Russia had been betrayed by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Once it was no longer possible to remain there, she and Berkman left and began to openly take a stand against Bolshevism. Goldman, in this period, nevertheless continued to argue for a revolution while warning her readers that every revolution could be morally corrupted.

⁴⁶ Goldman, *My Further Disillusionment in Russia*.

What she theoretically demanded was a revolution leading to a grassroots democracy, just as would have been represented by the soviets immediately after February 1917.

Such an anarchist structure in the postrevolutionary order would be necessary to secure two things: (1) for the masses to remain in charge of the revolution, and (2) for a truly free political order to be established. Only if these two things could be secured would a revolution have the chance to lead to a better world and social order instead of to another dictatorship, which would rule in the name of democracy but in reality be based on violence and its use against anyone who criticized the existent order. It is therefore important to understand Goldman as a revolutionary anarchist intellectual whose ideas about revolution were shaped by her experiences in the United States, Soviet Russia, and her European exile. The only dogmatic aspect Goldman would have agreed upon after all her experiences would have been the following one: Without freedom, there can be no revolution.

3 Emma Goldman, Gender Related Protest, and Anarchist Radicalism as a Crime

Introduction

In an interview for the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch Sunday Magazine* in 1897, the Russian-born American anarchist Emma Goldman was asked, “What does anarchy hold out to me – a woman?”¹ Her answer was relatively short but precise: “More to woman than to anyone else – everything which she has not – freedom and equality.”² Goldman, who was also referred to as the “priestess of anarchy”³ in the same article, was a radical anarchist, a fact that obviously aroused the imagination of the public, especially since she was unexpectedly woman-like: “She is in every sense a womanly looking woman, with masculine mind and courage.”⁴ In the late 19th century, the fact that a woman like her could actually be a political activist, even a radical anarchist, was obviously something that contested the existent gender norms of the United States, and Goldman having been imprisoned due to her political activism before turned her into a well-known ‘celebrity’ in the US context as well. For some, she was a “real champion of freedom”⁵ who demanded more rights and more equality for women. Her statements about women’s suppression within the patriarchic society and particularly by the yoke of marriage,⁶ on the other hand, turned Goldman into a feared radical in the public mind. The anarchist argued that the modern woman “is the slave of her husband and her children. She should take her part in the business world the same as the

1 This article was first published in Frank Jacob and Jowan A. Mohammed, eds. *Gender and Protest: On the Historical and Contemporary Interrelation of Two Social Phenomena* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2023), 85–102.

2 Emma Goldman, “What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?,” in *St. Louis Post-Dispatch Sunday Magazine*, October 14, 1897, 9, in: Candace Falk et al., eds. *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901* (Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 289.

3 Goldman, “What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?,” 289.

4 Goldman, “What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?,” 292.

5 Emma Goldman, “An Anarchist Looks at Life,” Text of a speech by Emma Goldman, held at Foyle’s twenty-ninth literary luncheon (London, UK), March 1, 1933, Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth EGP-IISH), No. 191, 3.

6 Frank Jacob, “Marriage as Exploitation: Emma Goldman and the Anarchist Concept of Female Liberation,” in *Marriage Discourses: Historical and Literary Perspectives on Gender Inequality and Patriarchic Exploitation*, eds. Jowan A. Mohammed and Frank Jacob (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2021), 133–158.

man; she should be his equal before the world, as she is in the reality. She is capable as he, but when she labors she gets less wages. Why? Because she wears skirts instead of trousers.”⁷ Goldman pointed the finger at gendered inequalities that still exist in the United States today, a fact that made her thoughts even more dangerous for the mainstream newspaper reader of her time, expressly making an accusation against the suppression of women by men, i.e., by a patriarchic society: “The woman, instead of being the household queen, told about in story books, is the servant, the mistress, and the slave of both husband and children. She loses her own individuality entirely, even her name she is not allowed to keep.”⁸

For many Americans of her time, Goldman⁹ had an “aura of menace around [her],”¹⁰ and she was often considered to be the “personification of anarchism in America.”¹¹ The anarchist is also often considered by modern-day historians, feminists, and feminist historians alike to have been a proto-feminist or an anarcho-feminist in particular.¹² Nevertheless, Goldman had many facets and different political identities that should be taken into consideration: she was a free speech advocate,¹³ a revolutionary intellectual,¹⁴ an anti-imperialist,¹⁵ a fierce anti-bolshe-

7 Goldman, “What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?,” 291.

8 Goldman, “What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?,” 291.

9 The main biographical works about Goldman are Joseph Ishill, *Emma Goldman: A Challenging Rebel* (Berkeley Heights, N.J.: Oriole Press, 1957); Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life* (New York: Pantheon, 1984); Kathy E. Ferguson, *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011); Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011); Paul and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014); Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman: Ein Leben für die Freiheit* (Leipzig: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2021); Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman: Identitäten einer Anarchistin* (Leipzig: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2022).

10 Kathy E. Ferguson, “Discourses of Danger: Locating Emma Goldman,” *Political Theory* 36, no. 5 (2008): 743.

11 Donna M. Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 274.

12 For works with such a perspective on Goldman, see Wexler, *Emma Goldman*; Candace Falk, *Love, Anarchy and Emma Goldman* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990 [1984]); Lori Jo Marso, “A Feminist Search for Love: Emma Goldman on the Politics of Marriage, Love, Sexuality and the Feminine,” *Feminist Theory* 4, no. 3 (2003): 305–320; Kathy E. Ferguson, “Gender and Genre in Emma Goldman,” *Signs* 36, no. 3 (2011): 733–757; Donna M. Kowal, *Tongue of Fire: Emma Goldman, Public Womanhood, and the Sex Question* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2016).

13 Bill Lynskey, “‘I Shall Speak in Philadelphia’: Emma Goldman and the Free Speech League,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 133, no. 2 (2009): 167–202.

14 Frank Jacob, “An Anarchist Revolution? Emma Goldman as an Intellectual Revolutionary,” *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 15, no. 2 (2021): 29–48. See chapter 2 in this volume.

vik activist,¹⁶ an anti-fascist,¹⁷ and many things more.¹⁸ Wherever she spotted inequality and hierarchical exploitation, Goldman would immediately start a campaign and advocate for anarchist democracy and individual rights, in particular for women. Wherever she spotted hope for a revolution on behalf of a better society, she was, sometimes too enthusiastically and even before knowing the details, fully engaged.¹⁹ Her antagonism toward the state turned her into a personal enemy of the young J. Edgar Hoover²⁰ and eventually into an exile when she was expelled from the United States in 1919.²¹ For a whole generation, the name Goldman probably conjured up the image of the “world’s most dangerous woman,”²² which, in a way, caused an imagined connection of her political radicalism with her gender identity as a woman, two aspects that made her a particularly “dangerous individual”²³ for the mainstream American public on the one hand and an interesting figure on the other.²⁴ Always contesting the state and often considered its adversary,

15 Frank Jacob, “Anarchistische Imperialismuskritik und staatliche Repression: Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman und die Kritik an der politischen Ökonomie des Ersten Weltkrieges in den USA, 1917–1919,” *PROKLA* 201 (2020): 681–695.

16 For a detailed analysis of Goldman’s attitude toward the Russian Revolution and bolshevism, see Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution: From Admiration to Frustration* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2020). For a shorter introduction, see Frank Jacob, “From Aspiration to Frustration: Emma Goldman’s Perception of the Russian Revolution,” *American Communist History* 17, no. 2 (2018): 185–199.

17 Frank Jacob, “Emma Goldmans Blick auf Bolschewismus, Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus: Eine anarchistische Perspektive auf den Totalitarismus der 1920er- und 1930er-Jahre,” *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 68, no. 10 (2020): 833–847.

18 For instance, Goldman can also be considered a “capitalist publicist.” See Frank Jacob, “An Anarchist Has to Live off Something: Emma Goldman as a Capitalist Publicist,” *Anarchist Studies* 30, no. 2 (2022): 8–30. See chapter 7 in this volume.

19 An example of this would be her involvement in the Spanish Civil War. See David Porter, *Vision on Fire: Emma Goldman on the Spanish Revolution* (New Paltz, NY: Commonground Press, 1983).

20 J. Edgar Hoover, “Memorandum for Mr. Creighton,” U.S. Department of Justice (August 23, 1919), 2, cited in Ferguson, “Discourses of Danger,” 735.

21 Frank Jacob, “The Russian Revolution, the American Red Scare, and the Forced Exile of Transnational Anarchists: Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman and their Soviet Experience,” *Yearbook of Transnational History* 4 (2021): 113–134. Only three women were expelled in 1919. See *Freiheit: Berliner Organ der Unabhängigen Sozialdemokratie Deutschlands*, December 23, 1919: 1.

22 Theresa and Albert Moritz, *The World’s Most Dangerous Woman* (Vancouver: Subway Books, 2001).

23 Ferguson, “Discourses of Danger,” 736.

24 See, for example, the front page of *The San Francisco Call*, September 11, 1901; “Woman Well Called Queen of Anarchists,” *The Chautau Times*, June 19, 1908: 2; “Poverty and Prostitution Stalk Hand in Hand,” says Emma Goldman,” *The Day Book*, July 17, 1914, noon edition: 22. In one German newspaper, Goldman was named the “Luise Michel of New York’s autonomy group” and “mistress of the assassin Berkman.” *Hannoverscher Kurier*, January 21, 1893: 3.

especially when Goldman was connected with the assassination of US President William McKinley in 1901,²⁵ the female anarchist was known for connecting political and social protest with questions about gender and sex.²⁶ Like many other anarchists at the end of the 19th century, Goldman was “[l]iving and thinking beyond convention, [and she and other anarchists] offered a unique viewpoint on their times and experienced tensions that illuminated American society. Uncomfortable with the present, they remained torn between the simpler past and the possible future.”²⁷

The first part of the present chapter intends to show the extent to which Goldman’s protest against existent gender norms, in a way, gendered her crimes, as she was perceived as a dangerous female anarchist as a consequence of her demands with regard to women’s emancipation and sexual liberation. The second part will show how far the media that reported about Goldman and her gendered forms of protest also created an image of a “femme fatale,” especially in relation to the news coverage of Alexander Berkman’s assassination attempt on Henry Clay Frick in 1892 and the assassination of McKinley by the young anarchist Leon Czolgosz in 1901. The chapter will consequently show how Emma Goldman’s image as a “dangerous woman” in the US context was related to her demands and her perception by the mass media of her time. Her protest was naturally gendered due to these aspects and offers an example of how women who demanded social change were branded as dangerous and seductive troublemakers within the US context of the long 19th century.

Gendered Crimes and the Protest of a Female Anarchist

Regardless of the anti-hierarchical core values of the anarchist movement that also seemed to be particularly promising for women, soon after joining it and her first political activities, Goldman would find out that “[e]ven radicals do not differ

25 Her arrest in relation to the assassination drew international attention. For Norway, for example, see *Bergens tidene*, September 10, 1901: 2; *Trondheims Folkeblad*, September 12, 1901: 2. In Germany, the *Berliner Börsen-Zeitung* called Goldman the “spiritual originator” (*geistige Urheberin*) of the assassination. *Berliner Börsen-Zeitung*, October 8, 1901: 4.

26 Loretta Kensinger, “Radical Lessons: Thoughts on Emma Goldman, Chaos, Grief, and Political Violence Post-9/11/01,” *Feminist Teacher* 20, no. 1 (2009): 53; Blaine McKinley, “‘The Quagmires of Necessity’: American Anarchists and Dilemmas of Vocation,” *American Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (1982), 503; Alix Kates Shulman, “Introduction,” in *Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings and Speeches by Emma Goldman* (New York: Vintage Books, 1972), 11–12.

27 McKinley, “‘The Quagmires of Necessity,’” 503–504.

from the Christians; they do not wish their wives to become radical; even they deem themselves necessary to her protection.”²⁸ Nevertheless, Goldman envisioned a revolution that was supposed to change society, especially since it was based on women’s political and sexual emancipation alike.²⁹ She also wanted to ensure women had full control over their lives and bodies, which is why she advocated on behalf of birth control, another gendered crime that brought her in conflict with the law and the US state.³⁰ Goldman knew from experience that women were often at a disadvantage due to giving birth to numerous children, and “having worked as a nurse-midwife for poor immigrant women in the 1890s, Goldman saw firsthand the painful consequences that arose when women lacked the ability to care for their reproductive health.”³¹ To her, birth control naturally seemed to be more than a health-related factor for women; it was a path to empowerment as well. Consequently, Goldman was willing to take up the fight against the authorities and the patriarchic system and used all means available to her to publicize her views.

In 1905 she founded *Mother Earth*, which was published, from 1913 as a bulletin, until April 1918. Although the journal could not attract a large number of readers or, probably more importantly, subscribers, Goldman, writing with Alexander Berkman, considered its positive results to be more important:

Mother EARTH is such a success. Without a party to back her, with little or no support from her own ranks, and consistently refusing to be gagged by a profitable advertising department, she has bravely weathered the strain of five years, stormy enough to have broken many a strong spirit. She has created an atmosphere for herself which few Anarchist publications in America have been able to equal. She has gathered around her a coterie of men and women who are among the best in the country, and, finally, she has acted as a leaven of thought in quarters least expected by those who are ready with advice, yet unable to help.³²

28 Emma Goldman, “The New Woman,” *Free Society*, February 13, 1898: 2, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, eds. Candace Falk et al (Urbana/Chicago: Illinois University Press, 2008), 322. See also Lucy Nicholas, “Gender and Sexuality,” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 605.

29 Clare Hemmings, “Sexual Freedom and the Promise of Revolution Emma Goldman’s Passion,” *Feminist Review* 106 (2014): 56.

30 “Emma Goldman out of Prison: Will Continue Birth Control Speeches,” *Daily Capital Journal*, May 6, 1916: 14.

31 Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 274–275.

32 Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, “Our Sixth Birthday,” *Mother Earth* 6, no. 1 (1911), accessed February 26, 2020. http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev6n1.html.

Goldman and Berkman, in their review of the journal's initial years, also emphasized why *Mother Earth* had initially been brought to life:

As to the original *raison d'être* of MOTHER EARTH, it was, first of all, to create a medium for the free expres[sion] of our ideas, a medium bold, defiant, and unafraid. That she has proved to the fullest, for neither friend nor foe has been able to gag her. Secondly, MOTHER EARTH was to serve as a gathering point, as it were, for those, who, struggling to free themselves from the absurdities of the Old, had not yet reached firm footing[.] Suspended between heaven and hell, they have found in MOTHER EARTH the anchor of life. Thirdly, to infuse new blood into Anarchism, which – in America – had then been running at low ebb for quite some time.³³

Next to her endeavors as a publicist, Goldman was a political activist who held speeches and appeared at public demonstrations, such that, to quote Kathy E. Ferguson, “her strategic parrhesia combined frontal assault with carefully calculated rhetorical arts and tactical silences.”³⁴

She considered two aspects to be essential for the liberation of women: an end to marriage as a hierarchical institution and sexual freedom. These two demands, in a way, gendered her image as an anarchist radical, as she was not demanding the end of any hierarchical form of rule but the liberation of women as a precondition for a better society. From this perspective, however, Goldman realized the existence of a tragedy that limited such demands: “Liberty and equality for woman! What hopes and aspirations these words awakened when they were first uttered by some of the noblest and bravest souls of those days.”³⁵ For Goldman, “[e]mancipation should make it possible for woman to be human in the truest sense[.], e]verything within her that craves assertion and activity should reach expression; all artificial barriers should be broken, and the road towards greater freedom cleared of every trace of centuries of submission and slavery,” but it seemed that these demands would remain unanswered by society. Instead of reaching these goals, “the results so far achieved have isolated woman and have robbed her of the fountain springs of that happiness which is so essential to her.”³⁶ Due to her observations and personal perception of the previous attempts

33 Goldman and Berkman, “Our Sixth Birthday.”

34 Ferguson, “Discourses of Danger,” 738. The term *parrhesia* is a reference to Foucault, who described it as “a verbal activity in which a speaker expresses his personal relationship to truth, and risks his life because he recognizes truth-telling as a duty to improve or help other people (as well as himself).” Michel Foucault, *Fearless Speech*, ed. Joseph Pearson (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001), 19.

35 Emma Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation,” *Mother Earth* 1, no. 1 (1906): 9–17.

36 Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation.”

to achieve emancipation, Goldman was rather disillusioned and considered the emancipation achieved thus far a tragedy, which naturally brought her into conflict with those who represented this previous process and considered themselves leading forces of female emancipation within US society, e.g., leading members of the suffragist movement.³⁷ In contrast to the latter, Goldman argued that “the emancipation of woman, as interpreted and practically applied today, has failed to reach that great end. Now, woman is confronted with the necessity of emancipating herself from emancipation, if she really desires to be free. This may sound paradoxical, but is, nevertheless, only too true.”³⁸ For the female anarchist, emancipation did not go far enough:

The narrowness of the existing conception of woman’s independence and emancipation; the dread of love for a man who is not her social equal; the fear that love will rob her of her freedom and independence, the horror that love or the joy of motherhood will only hinder her in the full exercise of her profession – all these together make of the emancipated modern woman a compulsory vestal, before whom life, with its great clarifying sorrows and its deep, entrancing joys, rolls on without touching or gripping her soul.³⁹

In 1925, she wrote a letter to Alexander Berkman about this situation, which, even two decades on, did not seem to have improved much:

The tragedy of all of us modern women ... is a fact that we are removed only by a very short period from our traditions, the traditions of being loved, cared for, protected, secured, and above all, the time when women could look forward to an old age of children, a home and someone to brighten their lives. ... The modern woman cannot be the wife and mother in the old sense, and the new medium has not yet been devised, I mean the way of being wife, mother, friend and yet retain one’s complete freedom. Will it ever?⁴⁰

In contrast to more conservative female protest, Goldman was naturally perceived as radical, in particular because she contested existent gender norms and the traditional role of women as wives and mothers. Marriage was especially criticized as a form of patriarchic control and an element of social hierarchization by the female anarchist. She called out “the twin fantasies of protection and social mobility

³⁷ Emma Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” n.d., EGP-IISH No. 266, 1. Goldman argued here that “woman in politics is by no means better than man and her right of suffrage has helped her as little as it did most men to overcome outworn political, social, or moral values.”

³⁸ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation.”

³⁹ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation.”

⁴⁰ Letter to Alexander Berkman, September 4, 1925, in *Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman*, eds. Richard Drinnon and Anna Maria Drinnon (New York: Schocker, 1975), 130–133, cited in Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 736.

through marriage”⁴¹ and demanded to change the way girls were informed about it and “trained” to become supportive wives for exploitative and abusive men.

In an article published in 1897, Goldman argued that “[f]rom its very birth, up to our present day, men and women groan under the iron yoke of our marriage institution, and there seems to be no relief, no way out of it.”⁴² From her point of view, “marriage relations, are the foundation of private property, ergo, the foundation of our cruel and inhuman system” that “always gives the man the right and power over his wife, not only over her body, but also over her actions, her wishes; in fact, over her whole life.”⁴³ As long as marriage existed, women could hardly achieve freedom, and it was the existence of marriage that not only made the inequality between the two sexes possible but further inscribed this inequality into the society of the future. Boys’ and girls’ different upbringings and the values that are taught to them, as well as the expectations the two sexes are supposed to live up to, prevent true equality, as

the boy is taught to be intelligent, bright, clever, strong, athletic, independent and selfreliant; to develop his natural faculties, to follow his passions and desires. The girl has been taught to dress, to stand before the looking glass and admire herself, to control her emotions, her passions, her wishes, to hide her mental defects and to combine what little intelligence and ability she has on one point, and that is, the quickest and best way to angle a husband, to get profitably married.⁴⁴

Young women of the working class were particularly exploited by marriage, which was chosen to achieve social and financial security rather than for love. In contrast to men, women are eventually trapped in their relationships because “[b]oth, the man and the girl, marry for the same purpose, with the only exception that the man is not expected to give up his individuality, his name, his independence, whereas the girl has to sell herself, body and soul, for the pleasure of being someone’s wife; hence they do not stand on equal terms, and where there is no equality there can be no harmony.”⁴⁵

Women, as Goldman would argue in 1906, gave away their freedom too easily “because of the chains of moral and social prejudice that cramp and bind her na-

41 Clare Hemmings, “In the Mood for Revolution: Emma Goldman’s Passion,” *New Literary History* 43, no. 3 (2012): 527–545.

42 Emma Goldman, “Marriage,” *Firebrand*, July 18, 1897, 2, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, ed. Candace Falk (Urbana/Chicago, IL: Illinois University Press, 2008), 269–273, here 269.

43 Goldman, “Marriage,” 269.

44 Goldman, “Marriage,” 270.

45 Goldman, “Marriage,” 271.

ture.”⁴⁶ It was the conservative Church and the state, holding up a patriarchic regime, that Goldman challenged by her demands to end marriage as a hierarchic tool of control and to liberate, even sexually, the modern woman. Naturally, the conservative authorities represented by the government and the Church considered such a woman dangerous, to say the least. However, the anarchist made enemies not only of these forces but also of the bourgeois parts of the women’s movement, who were, in a way, indirectly accused of misunderstanding emancipation as such: “[M]any advanced women ... never truly understood the meaning of emancipation. They thought that all that was needed was independence from external tyrannies; the internal tyrants, far more harmful to life and growth, such as ethical and social conventions, were left to take care of themselves; and they have taken care of themselves.”⁴⁷ In contrast to the existent gender roles and limiting norms that kept women from growing as individuals and achieving emancipation in all areas of life, Goldman “envisioned anarchist love as creating bonds between free individuals that would enhance rather than confine each person. Similarly, she envisioned an anarchist society as a voluntary community of free, self-directing individuals, where individual growth and empowerment are nurtured through collective life.”⁴⁸

To achieve such a utopian ideal, women had to overcome their fear of disappointment and their belief that men were superior, especially since “woman’s political equality with man has contributed precious little to her inner emancipation.”⁴⁹ According to Goldman, educated women in particular “are neither met with the same confidence as their male colleagues, nor receive equal remuneration.”⁵⁰ This was also made possible by the acceptance of such inequalities, but the anarchist herself had experienced that the workers’ movement was often not interested in providing equal labor rights to women, who were also considered competition for the working men.⁵¹ Goldman demanded an end to the sacrifices women were willing to accept to “perform” according to gender roles that had been imposed upon them by a conservative society whose male rulers were unwilling to accept independent and self-supporting women.⁵² In contrast to representa-

⁴⁶ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation.”

⁴⁷ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation.” Similar criticism can be found in Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 1.

⁴⁸ Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 751.

⁴⁹ Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 8^{1/2}.

⁵⁰ Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 12.

⁵¹ For a more detailed analysis, see Sonya O. Rose, “Gender and Labor History: The Nineteenth-Century Legacy,” *International Review of Social History* 38, 1 (1993): 145–162.

⁵² Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 16.

tives of other organizations that demanded women's rights, Goldman considered only her vision to be radical enough to actually achieve a change because "[e]very movement that aims at the destruction of existing institutions and the replacement thereof with something more advanced, more perfect had followers who in theory stand for the most radical ideas, but who, nevertheless, in their every-day practice, are like the average philistine, feigning respectability and clamoring for the good opinion of their opponents. The suffragist and feminist movements made no exception."⁵³

Due to the supposedly existent radicalism of the demands for female liberation, those who demanded a drastic change of the existent gender norms and roles through different forms of protest were labeled as immoral elements of society: "Every member of the woman's rights movement was pictured ... in her absolute disregard of morality. Nothing was sacred to her. She had no respect for the ideal relation between man and woman. In short, emancipation stood only for a reckless life of lust and sin; regardless of society, religion, and morality."⁵⁴ Without the "courage to be inwardly free,"⁵⁵ the modern woman would be able neither to counter such accusations nor to challenge the existent repressive elements of patriarchic rule. For Goldman, it was foolish to support men, especially since they would often exploit women's naive dreams about love and romantic marriage to drag them into a relationship based on dependency and exploitation. Freedom for women could only be achieved through protest and eventually a break with the existent order that, according to Goldman, suppressed women and men alike in many ways.⁵⁶

The liberation the anarchist demanded was based on a female choice to do what women themselves considered best. In addition to lectures about birth control rights, the end of marriage, and female self-control, Goldman often spoke about sexual freedom. This was another aspect that would be used by the authorities to frame the anarchist as a "dangerous woman," especially since the things Goldman spoke about would rile the public, who considered such speeches or lectures a form of nuisance and a threat to a supposedly pious society. Goldman, who claimed to be an expert on sex-related issues as she had "been familiar with ... work on sex psychology for a number of years,"⁵⁷ insisted in her works related

⁵³ Goldman, "The Tragedy of the Modern Woman," 18^{1/2}.

⁵⁴ Goldman, "The Tragedy of the Modern Woman," 19.

⁵⁵ Goldman, "The Tragedy of the Modern Woman," 29.

⁵⁶ Goldman, "The Tragedy of the Modern Woman," 41.

⁵⁷ Emma Goldman, "A Refutation Addressed to Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld," Berlin 1923, EGP-IISH No. 208, 1. One of the specialists Goldman actually knew personally was Magnus Hirschfeld. See Magnus Hirschfeld to Emma Goldman, Paris, November 24, 1933, EGP-IISH, No. 98.

to the sexual liberation of women that the latter's "experiences and sexual freedom must be incorporated into the heart of any sustainable revolution."⁵⁸ A revolution, Goldman hoped, would eventually abolish existent inequalities and offer women complete access to choices that could be taken freely and individually without any interference from society or men. Sex was consequently understood as something highly political by Goldman, and the possibility to freely express one's sexuality without any form of limitation was the element that would prove if a real liberation of the individual took place or not. According to Clare Hemmings, Goldman's "embrace of sexual freedom as both means and (one) end of her anarchist Utopia interrupts the temporal features that govern this relationship of sexuality and capitalism, suggesting alternate ways of understanding and writing that history."⁵⁹

For many prudish and self-assuredly pious elements of US society, however, her claims represented everything that was considered evil. Her approach to anarchism, which was based on an emotional interpretation, had already caused problems with other anarchists, who demanded that Goldman better "behave" so as not to damage or misrepresent the cause of the anarchist movement,⁶⁰ so one can only imagine how her demands and arguments were perceived by the more conservative members of society. Everything that was considered "traditional" and "valuable" according to conservative-patriarchic standards was being openly attacked by a female anarchist whose status as a well-known radical offered her a way to communicate her ideas to larger audiences when she traveled throughout the country to inform women about everything that was supposedly wrong with society in its current state. Only a change to the existent roles for women and the establishment of gender equality would guarantee a better future, but this, according to Goldman, also demanded the sexual liberation of the modern woman and the female body.

As sex "is woven into every fabric of human life and lays its finger on every custom," it was reasonable from the anarchist's perspective to say that "in the free sane acceptance of the human body, in all its faculties, lies the master-key to the art of the future."⁶¹ Regardless of the necessity to know about sex, knowledge about this important element of human life was restricted for women, as the common social evaluation seemed to agree upon the assumption that "[s]ex is disgraceful for nice girls."⁶² Goldman's demands were consequently too radical for many

⁵⁸ Hemmings, "Sexual Freedom," 44.

⁵⁹ Hemmings, "Sexual Freedom," 45.

⁶⁰ Emma Goldman, *Living My Life* (New York: Knopf, 1931), ch. 5, accessed December 17, 2018, <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-living-my-life>.

⁶¹ Emma Goldman, "The Element of Sex in Life," n.d., EGP-IISH No. 213, 7 and 12.

⁶² Goldman, "The Element of Sex in Life," 21.

when she asked for the following: “Let us get rid of the mock modesty so prevalent on the surface of polite society, let us liberate sex from falsehood and degradation.”⁶³ It is therefore hardly surprising that Goldman’s protest and demands were particularly perceived as a form of gendered radicalism, and even some anarchists were repelled by such far-reaching calls for social change. The authorities had considered Goldman to be a dangerous individual before she began lecturing about gender-related problems and inequalities within US society, but the latter aspects of her activism intensified her perception as a “dangerous woman.” The fact that she was supposedly involved in acts of anarchist violence eventually turned her into some kind of “femme fatale” who would seduce men to commit violent acts on behalf of anarchist ideas. The following part of this chapter will take two such events into closer consideration and show how the press turned Goldman into a public outlaw and probably the most dangerous woman in the United States.

Goldman’s Perception as a “Femme Fatale”

A woman who demanded more equality, free love and a liberated sexuality, the end of marriage, and the right to birth control for women naturally appeared dangerous not only to conservative circles of the late 19th century but to a majority of the country. Goldman was far ahead of her time, and many of the debates she initiated and stimulated have still not been concluded today; women are still fighting for rights (or fighting for them again) that the anarchist demanded over a century ago. However, Goldman, who was perceived within the public sphere as a “radical woman,” would, due to some kind of press craze in relation to two famous incidents in US history, ultimately be turned into a “femme fatale,” the “queen” of American anarchism.⁶⁴

In 1892, Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman decided to assassinate Henry Clay Frick⁶⁵ because he was responsible for the use of violence against workers

⁶³ Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” 50.

⁶⁴ *The Evening World* (New York City), October 16, 1893, 1. See also Shari Rabin, “‘The Advent of a Western Jewess’: Rachel Frank and Jewish Female Celebrity in 1890s America,” in “Gender and Jewish Identity,” special issue, *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women’s Studies & Gender Issues* 22 (2011): 121; Andrea Rich and Arthur L. Smith, *Rhetoric of Revolution* (Durham, NC: Moore, 1979), 60.

⁶⁵ On Frick, see Kenneth Warren, *Triumphant Capitalism: Henry Clay Frick and the Industrial Transformation of America* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996); Quentin R. Skrabec, *Henry Clay Frick: The Life of the Perfect Capitalist* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2010).

during the Homestead Steel Strike⁶⁶ in Pennsylvania. Private security guards, the so-called Pinkerton Boys, were sent to the Homestead Works of the Carnegie Steel Company and killed several workers during the incident.⁶⁷ Since Frick had become a famous figure representing the suppression of workers' rights, Berkman attempted to assassinate Frick on 23 July, while Goldman would use the attention this action was supposed to generate to explain why Berkman had used violence to respond to the exploitation of the workers. The anarchists' strategy was consequently based on shared work and responsibilities. While Berkman would go to prison for 14 years, Goldman's task was to coordinate the propaganda, and she gave interviews related to the assassination attempt in which she defended her friend's actions. For instance, she stated that it was Berkman's "belief that if the capitalists used Winchester rifles and bayonets on workingmen they should be answered with dynamite."⁶⁸ While Goldman was not directly involved in the assassination attempt, she became more well-known throughout the country due to her relationship with Berkman and respective reports about the events, which claimed, for example, that the "Goldman woman" was "worse than Berkman."⁶⁹ Some newspaper reports went further and explained how Goldman had seduced her fellow anarchist to make him take action. The *New York Tribune* reported the following on 25 July:

To Berkman's intimacy with Emma Goldman could be ascribed his fearful Anarchy; for she is probably the most bitter and best known woman Anarchist in New York: She is a strong-minded woman, and would naturally exercise a great influence over a weak man like Berkman. ... Many persons who are familiar with the Anarchists of this city remember having seen Emma Goldman and Berkman together frequently. Socialists were seen yesterday who did not hesitate to hold this young woman responsible for Berkman's murderous attack on Mr. Frick.⁷⁰

Other newspaper reports presented Goldman as the "most vicious anarchist in New York"⁷¹ and further analyzed her relationship with Berkman, although many of these newspaper articles mainly provided a collection of hearsay and

⁶⁶ Paul Krause, *The Battle for Homestead, 1890–1892: Politics, Culture, and Steel* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992).

⁶⁷ Alexander Berkman, *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist* (New York: Mother Earth, 1912).

⁶⁸ "Goldman's Cry Against Society," *Pittsburgh Post*, November 27, 1896, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, ed. Candace Falk et al (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 249.

⁶⁹ *Pittsburg Dispatch*, July 28, 1892: 1.

⁷⁰ *New-York Tribune*, July 25, 1892: 1.

⁷¹ *Pittsburg Dispatch*, July 29, 1892: 1.

speculation about the private lives of the two anarchists.⁷² Goldman was also presented as some kind of “anarchist mastermind,” a central figure who controlled the men within the anarchist movement and decided who was considered to be a “good anarchist.” An article in the *Portland Daily Press* from 1 August 1892 states in this regard:

Emma Goldman and Johann Most [another famous German-American anarchist active in New York City, F.J.], owing to the fact that they have not been arrested, have regained some of the bravado, and the Goldman woman especially, who has become known as “Queen of the Reds,” now makes no effort to hide either herself or her endorsement of Berkman as a “brave man” and a “good Anarchist.” The Queen has not yet given her definition of a bad Anarchist, but she says Johann Most is one, because he has never done anything. Berkman, her example of a good Anarchist, has done something.⁷³

Even more attention was paid to Goldman’s influence after President McKinley was assassinated by Leon Czolgosz in early September 1901.⁷⁴ Since the latter had mentioned Goldman as an intellectual source of inspiration for his actions, the famous female anarchist was arrested as well, but she was not actually directly involved in the assassination at all. Nevertheless, newspapers worldwide reported on the incident and the fear the female anarchist had caused among the US police and governmental authorities.⁷⁵ For the press, Goldman was responsible for the death of the president, and the *San Francisco Call* referred to her as the “Chief in [a] Foul Conspiracy” on 11 September 1901.⁷⁶ It only took a short while before papers provided proof of the involvement of the “high priestess of anarchy,” who had been arrested in Chicago, in the assassination. Around a week later, the *Honolulu Republican* reported that the “President was the victim of an anarchist plot.”⁷⁷ While many papers reproduced the apparently central role of Goldman within a larger anarchist conspiracy to kill the president, descriptions of her usually included prejudices and stereotypes about the well-known radical

72 *Morning Journal and Courier* (New Haven, CT), July 27, 1892: 4.

73 *The Portland Daily Press*, August 1, 1892: 1. Such a categorization would also be related to the idea of the “propaganda of the deed.” On concepts and key texts related to it, see Mitchell Abidor ed. *Death to Bourgeois Society: The Propagandists of the Deed* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2015).

74 Sidney Fine, “Anarchism and the Assassination of McKinley,” *The American Historical Review* 60, no. 4 (1955): 777–799; Scott Miller, *The President and the Assassin* (New York: Random House, 2011).

75 In Germany, Kurt Eisner reported about the events in the *Sonntagsplauderei*, *Unterhaltungsblatt des Vorwärts*, No. 33, February 16, 1902: 130–131, in Federal Archives of Germany (Bundesarchiv) Berlin (BARCh Ber), Kurt Eisner Papers, NY 4060/34, 221–222.

76 *The San Francisco Call*, September 11, 1901: 1.

77 *The Honolulu Republican*, September 19, 1901: 1.

woman. An article from 25 October 1901 in the *Camden Chronicle* (Tennessee) describes Goldman in detail and shall therefore be quoted here at some length:

Emma Goldman is thirty-three years old, short, pudgy of figure, hard featured and frowsy in appearance. Her hair is light brown and her eyes bluish gray. Her chin shows determination. She is a remarkably fluent talker, and never fails to excite her Anarchist hearers to a high pitch. She speaks Russian, German, English and French and writes Spanish and Italian. She was born in Russia and educated in Germany. She was married when she was seventeen, and according to report has had several husbands since. When she is in New York the Goldman woman makes her home on the East Side. She spends much of her time in back rooms of saloons where Anarchists gather. A crowd of admirers constantly surrounds her. She hates women, and her life has been passed mostly among men. Her features are almost masculine. She formerly worked in a sweat-shop and is said to have been a trained nurse.⁷⁸

Such articles further reproduced and intensified Goldman's image as a "dangerous woman" who mainly lived a life that did not suit a woman while surrounded by male anarchists who listened to her ideas. This image fit the narrative of the seducing "femme fatale" or "evil witch" who controlled men and made them act according to her wishes. The image of Goldman was consequently extremely gendered, and the fact that a woman protested against the patriarchy perfectly fit the narrative that was established and spread within the mass printings of the late 19th century, in particular in relation to the reports about Berkman's attempted assassination of Henry Clay Frick in 1892 and the violent death of President McKinley in 1901.

Conclusion

Although Emma Goldman "wanted a world without jealousy, insecurity, or possessiveness,"⁷⁹ she was unable to achieve these goals. In the US context, she was perceived as a "dangerous woman" who controlled even more "dangerous foreign men" who would act according to her wishes. The leading anarchist of the country, according to the press reports in the 1890s and early 1900s, was a woman. Her protest was consequently gendered in different ways. Of course, Goldman's demands for gender equality, sexual liberation, and an end to marriage as an exploitative instrument to further secure the role and influence of the patriarchy was a form of gendered protest, but during the press campaigns against her person after the (attempted) assassinations by Alexander Berkman and Leon Czolgosz,

⁷⁸ *The Camden Chronicle*, October 25, 1901: 6.

⁷⁹ Ferguson, "Gender and Genre," 751.

the whole anarchist movement was gendered. Anarchist radicalism was turned into a gendered crime because although it could not be proven that Goldman was involved, it was her “seductive spell,” a negatively gendered perception, that was supposedly responsible for the tragedy of a US president’s violent death.

Considering this, one could argue here that gender-related reform demands discredited Goldman as a “dangerous woman” whose ideas had to be kept in check, while the violent acts described here and by the contemporary press added a gender component to the perception of anarchism as a radical crime, orchestrated within a national syndicate that was led and directed by Emma Goldman, the “high priestess” of American anarchism.

4 Marriage as Exploitation: Emma Goldman and the Anarchist Concept of Female Liberation

Asked in an interview in 1897 “What does anarchy hold out to me – a woman?” the famous American anarchist Emma Goldman (1869–1940)¹ replied: “More to [a] woman than to anyone else – everything which she has not – freedom and equality.”² Goldman, whose feminist positions and role as a leading anarcho-feminist have been discussed in recent works,³ was considered to be the “priestess of anarchy”⁴ by many of her contemporaries, and often her female appearance surprised

1 This article was first published in Jowan A. Mohammed and Frank Jacob, eds. *Marriage Discourses: Historical and Literary Perspectives on Gender Inequality and Patriarchal Exploitation* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 133–158. Many biographical works and edited volumes about Goldman’s life and impact have been published, including Paul Avrich and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2014); Richard Drinnon and Anna Maria Drinnon, eds., *Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman* (New York: Schocken Books, 1975); Richard Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*, Phoenix edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982 [1961]); Candace Falk, *Love, Anarchy and Emma Goldman* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990 [1984]); Bonnie Haaland, *Emma Goldman: Sexuality and the Impurity of the State* (Montréal et al.: Black Rose Books, 1993); Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011); Joseph Ishill, *Emma Goldman: A Challenging Rebel* (Berkeley Heights, NJ: Oriole Press, 1957); Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman: Ein Leben für die Freiheit* (Berlin: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2021); Theresa Moritz and Albert Moritz, *The World’s Most Dangerous Women: A New Biography of Emma Goldman* (Vancouver: Subway Books, 2002); David Porter, *Vision on Fire: Emma Goldman on the Spanish Revolution* (New Paltz, NY: Common-ground Press, 1983); Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life* (New York: Pantheon, 1984).

2 Emma Goldman, “What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch Sunday Magazine*, October 14, 1897, 9, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, eds. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana/Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 289.

3 Kathy E. Ferguson, “Gender and Genre in Emma Goldman,” *Signs* 36, no. 3 (2011): 733–757; Frank Jacob, “Anarchismus, Ehe und Sex: Emma Goldman (1869–1940) als Anarcha-Feministin,” in *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die “Frauenfrage” aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, eds. Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob (Berlin: Metropol, 2020), 202–221; Donna M. Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 265–279; Donna M. Kowal, *Tongue of Fire: Emma Goldman, Public Womanhood, and the Sex Question* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2016); Lori Jo Marso, “A Feminist Search for Love: Emma Goldman on the Politics of Marriage, Love, Sexuality and the Feminine,” *Feminist Theory* 4, no. 3 (2003): 305–320; Penny A. Weiss and Loretta Kensinger, eds., *Feminist Interpretations of Emma Goldman* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).

4 Goldman, “What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?” 289.

the men who met her: “She is in every sense a womanly looking woman, with masculine mind and courage.”⁵ In fact, Goldman surprised many of her contemporaries, but not only with regard to her appearance but also with her ideas of unlimited freedom for everyone. She was praised as a “real champion of freedom”⁶ by those who supported her political struggles against exploitation, the state, or the dominance of patriarchy in American society, but she was also considered the evil personification of anarchism,⁷ which caused an “aura of menace around Emma Goldman.”⁸ Her criticism of the First World War and American imperialism,⁹ as well as her support of the Russian Revolution, which she initially had high hopes for before realizing after her deportation to Soviet Russia that the revolutionary process had been corrupted by the Bolsheviks around Lenin,¹⁰ made the well-known anarchist one of the main targets of the new laws the US government used during the war to suppress resistance against the state’s official war policy. When Goldman and many of her anarchist friends were deported in 1919, it was the young J. Edgar Hoover (1895–1972) who personally oversaw that “two of the most dangerous anarchists in America”¹¹ were successfully expelled from the United States.

Goldman would nevertheless continue her “rebellious life” and criticized not only Bolshevism but also Fascism and National Socialism in the years that followed

5 Goldman, “What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?” 292.

6 Emma Goldman, *An Anarchist Looks at Life*, Text of a speech by Emma Goldman, held at Foyle’s twenty-ninth literary luncheon (London, UK), March 1, 1933, Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth EGP-IISH), No. 191, 3.

7 Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 274.

8 Kathy E. Ferguson, “Discourses of Danger: Locating Emma Goldman,” *Political Theory* 36, no. 5 (2008): 743.

9 Frank Jacob, “Anarchistische Imperialismuskritik und staatliche Repression: Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman und die Kritik an der politischen Ökonomie des Ersten Weltkrieges in den USA, 1917–1919,” *Prokla* 50, no. 201 (2020): 681–695; Erika J. Pribanic-Smith and Jared Schroeder, *Emma Goldman’s No-Conscription League and the First Amendment* (New York: Routledge, 2019).

10 Frank Jacob, “Anarchism and the Perversion of the Russian Revolution: The Accounts of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman,” *Diacronie* 33, no. 1 (2018): <https://doi.org/10.4000/diacronie.7405>; Frank Jacob, “Der Anarchismus und die Russische Revolution – Emma Goldman und Alexander Berkman im Kampf gegen den Bolschewismus,” *Ne znam: Zeitschrift für Anarchismusforschung* 7 (2018): 3–66; Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution: From Admiration to Frustration* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020); Frank Jacob, “From Aspiration to Frustration: Emma Goldman’s Perception of the Russian Revolution,” *American Communist History* 17, no. 2 (2018): 185–199.

11 J. Edgar Hoover, “Memorandum for Mr. Creighton,” U.S. Department of Justice, August 23, 1919, 2, cited in Ferguson, “Discourses of Danger,” 735.

the beginning of her exile.¹² Regardless of Goldman's many political struggles, the freedom of the modern woman was one essential aspect of her personal agenda, especially since women were far away from equality. For the anarchist Goldman, the woman "is the slave of her husband and her children. She should take her part in the business world the same as the man; she should be his equal before the world, as she is in the reality. She is capable as he, but when she labors, she gets less wages. Why? Because she wears skirts instead of trousers."¹³ The patriarchy continued to abuse and exploit women for several reasons, which is why "[t]he woman, instead of being the household queen, told about in story books, is the servant, the mistress, and the slave of both husband and children. She loses her own individuality entirely, even her name she is not allowed to keep."¹⁴ When, early on in her political life, Goldman began to criticize the exploitation of women by marriage as an institutionalized form of control in the name of the patriarchy, it was not surprising that she made enemies, who would later establish her public image as a "dangerous individual."¹⁵ While this image stretched back to the assassination of US President William McKinley (1843–1901) and was intensified by a press campaign,¹⁶ Goldman was probably one of the most influential anarchists in the United States and one of the anarcha-feminists whose ideas about equality made her quite appealing for feminists in later times as well.¹⁷

As American scholar Blaine McKinley emphasized, "[a]s men and women whose aspirations contrasted with those of most Americans, the anarchists saw the contradictions and inequalities of modern America,"¹⁸ and Goldman expressed her criticism of these inequalities quite loudly and prominently. Like other anarchists, Goldman "offered a unique viewpoint on their times and experienced tensions that illuminated American society. Uncomfortable with the present, they remained torn between the simpler past and the possible future."¹⁹ However, and regardless of the political demands of her own political movement, Goldman

12 Frank Jacob, "Emma Goldmans Blick auf Bolschewismus, Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus: Eine anarchistische Perspektive auf den Totalitarismus der 1920er- und 1930er-Jahre," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 68, no. 10 (2019): 833–847.

13 Goldman, "What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?" 291.

14 Goldman, "What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?"

15 Ferguson, "Discourses of Danger," 736.

16 Alix Kates Shulman, "Introduction," in *Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings and Speeches by Emma Goldman*, ed. Alex Kates Shulman (New York: Vintage Books, 1972), 11–12.

17 Loretta Kensinger, "Radical Lessons: Thoughts on Emma Goldman, Chaos, Grief, and Political Violence Post-9/11/01," *Feminist Teacher* 20, no. 1 (2009): 52–53.

18 Blaine McKinley, "'The Quagmires of Necessity': American Anarchists and Dilemmas of Vocation," *American Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (1982): 503.

19 McKinley, "The Quagmires," 503–504.

could also observe a kind of anarcho-sexism, which was often expressed by male comrades who demanded equality and freedom, but only for men.²⁰ Or as Goldman herself worded it: “Even Radicals do not differ from the Christians [sic]; they do not wish their wives to become radical; even they deem themselves necessary to her protection.”²¹ For the female anarchist, it was important that women gained emancipation from exploitative marriage structures and thereby sexual emancipation as well to become an essential part of the anarchist revolution of the future.²² Donna M. Kowal, who studied Goldman’s anarcho-feminist positions in great detail, highlights the feminist elements in her political agenda, as “Goldman’s approach to anarchism emphasised the economic and psychosocial necessity of emancipating women, which she believed could only be accomplished through anarchism’s ability to transcend artificial differences and class divisions between women and men.”²³ Regardless of such views, Goldman also struggled with her political demands as they rarely tallied with her own life, in which the anarchist, e.g. in her relationship with Ben Reitman, remained what feminist Goldman biographer Alice Wexler called a “slave to sexual passion,”²⁴ seemingly unable to live up to her own ideals.²⁵

The present chapter is nevertheless interested in Goldman’s views on marriage and sexual liberation. While the former was considered to be an instrument of suppression, the latter, for the anarchist Goldman, meant a form of liberation of the female body and the female mind. After a short elaboration of Goldman’s anarcho-feminist identity, this chapter will consequently take a closer look at her discourses about marriage and her ideas about the sexual liberation of women. It will thereby show that her thoughts about emancipation were quite ahead of her time and that freedom was one of the values Goldman would only consider and accept in its most total form and if applied or available for all, men and women alike.

20 Lucy Nicholas, “Gender and Sexuality,” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 605.

21 Emma Goldman, “The New Woman,” *Free Society*, February 13, 1898, 2, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, eds. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana/Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 322.

22 On Goldman’s concept of an anarchist revolution, see Frank Jacob, “An Anarchist Revolution? Emma Goldman as an Intellectual Revolutionary,” *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 15, no. 2 (2021), 8–30. See chapter 2 in this volume.

23 Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 274.

24 Wexler, *Emma Goldman*, 160.

25 Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 735.

Emma Goldman: An Early Anarcha-Feminist

Goldman was active in numerous ways: she was an anarchist revolutionary, but she also fought for the right of abortion, she was an anarchist, but also a proto-feminist. It is consequently appropriate consider one of her many different identities to be an anarcha-feminist one.²⁶ Kowal emphasized that “anarcha-feminists presented an alternative model of womanhood” and that

[w]ithin the anarchist political and intellectual milieu of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, anarcha-feminism emerged as a distinct, albeit loosely formed, ‘school of thought’ that was reflected in the transnational activism of anarchist women ... [who] tended to interpret the anarchist critique of authority through the lens of their experiences as women, especially constraints resulting from sexual double standards and the gendered division of labor.²⁷

The label “anarcha-feminist” as such was, however, not used by these women themselves but later introduced by researchers who studied their cases.²⁸ It must nevertheless be seen as a consequence of the exclusion of women from political and public affairs, something that was not only criticized by female anarchists during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.²⁹ The stand against discrimination and for full emancipation nevertheless, as in other national contexts as well, led to a struggle within the predominantly male political movements, be they anarchist or socialist.³⁰

At the same time, “anarcha-feminist thought is not uniform”³¹ but as diverse as anarchism itself.³² Although the anarcha-feminists were also quite different

26 For a discussion of Goldman’s different identities see Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution*, 17–46 and the forthcoming Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman: Die Identitäten einer Anarchistin* (Berlin: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2021).

27 Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 265.

28 Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 266.

29 For a different example in the US context see Jowan A. Mohammed, “Mary Hunter Austin und die Forderungen nach einer Veränderung der Geschlechterrollen in den USA, 1914–1918,” in *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die “Frauenfrage” aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, eds. Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob (Berlin: Metropol, 2020), 222–239.

30 For a recent analysis of this question within German social democracy, see Vincent Streichhahn, “Zur ‘Frauenfrage’ und Sozialdemokratie im deutschen Kaiserreich Zwischen Antifeminismus und Emanzipation,” in *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die “Frauenfrage” aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, eds. Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob (Berlin: Metropol, 2020), 48–77.

31 Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 267.

32 Benjamin Franks, Nathan Jun and Leonard Williams, eds., *Anarchism: A Conceptual Approach* (New York/London: Routledge, 2018); Sean Sheehan, *Anarchism* (London: Reaktion, 2003).

with regard to their upbringing, social background, and the arguments they used, they were unified by “[r]ejecting compulsory marriage and motherhood, [and] they sought to enact their unconventional ideas of autonomous living and sexual agency.”³³ Their aim was consequently to change the existent social order and gender norms alike, and it is no surprise that the “early anarchist feminist focus was on the rejection of state-sanctioned marriage but also on the imagination and prefiguration of alternative, non-dominative gender and sexual relations such as ideals of free love.”³⁴ This does not, however, mean that there was no struggle among the anarcha-feminists, who would criticize each other. Voltairine de Cleyre (1866–1912),³⁵ for example, criticized Goldman for living off and not for the anarchist movement,³⁶ although the latter used hardly any money she made for her personal life, instead reinvesting most of her income from lectures into publications of friends and herself to support the anarchist movement further.³⁷

New York, where Goldman would start her activities as an anarchist speaker, was more than a metropolis of the United States in the late 19th century; it was a melting pot for anarchist immigrant communities from Germany, Italy, Czarist Russia, and other places,³⁸ whose ideas about “abolitionism, free thought, and the labor movement” were exchanged as they “were troubled by the economic inequalities, centralized power, and mass society they saw arising at the expense of local self-sufficiency and personal initiative.”³⁹ Especially for Jewish immigrants, America did not fulfill the expectations for a better life than the one they had left behind in Central and Eastern Europe, a region French historians Alain Brossat and Sylvia Klingberg referred to as “revolutionary Yiddishland”⁴⁰ and which Gold-

33 Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 275.

34 Nicholas, “Gender and Sexuality,” 606–607.

35 Eugenia C. DeLamotte, *Gates of Freedom: Voltairine de Cleyre and the Revolution of the Mind* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2004); Sharon Presley and Crispin Sartwell, *Exquisite Rebel: The Essays of Voltairine De Cleyre – Anarchist, Feminist, Genius* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005).

36 Voltairine de Cleyre to Saul Yanovsky, October 18, 1910, Joseph Ishill Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University; Voltairine de Cleyre to Joseph Cohen, October 26, 1910, Joseph Cohen Papers, Bund Archives of the Jewish Labor Movement, YIVO Archives, New York. Both letters are cited in McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 519.

37 McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 512 and 519–520.

38 Kenyon Zimmer, *Immigrants against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America* (Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press, 2015).

39 McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 504.

40 Alain Brossat and Sylvia Klingberg, *Revolutionary Yiddishland: A History of Jewish Radicalism*, trans. David Fernbach (London/New York: Verso, 2016). On the Jewish radical community in New York, also see Tony Michels, *A Fire in Their Hearts: Yiddish Socialists in New York* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 2005); Frank Jacob, “Radical Trinity. Anarchist, Jew, or New

man had also intended to leave behind for a better life with her sister Helena in America.⁴¹ She described her own transformation in relation to the changing of her dreams, especially with regard to the harsh US experience later, as follows:

Naturally, life presents itself in different forms to different ages. Between the age of eight and twelve I dreamed of becoming a Judith. I longed to avenge the sufferings of my people, the Jews, to cut off the head of their Holofernos. When I was fourteen I wanted to study medicine, so as to be able to help my fellow-beings. When I was fifteen I suffered from unrequited love, and I wanted to commit suicide in a romantic way by drinking a lot of vinegar. I thought that would make me look ethereal and interesting, very pale and poetic when in my grave, but at sixteen I decided on a more exalted death. I wanted to dance myself to death. ... Then came America, with its huge factories, the pedalling of a machine for ten hours a day at two dollars fifty a week.⁴²

For Jewish immigrants like Goldman, the United States represented the same misery they had tried to escape, and there was almost no difference with regard to poverty and sorrow.⁴³ When the female anarchist compared the lives of the Jewish immigrants in the “New World” with their former one in Europe, there was nothing much to cheer about: “There [in Russia] he must work like a galley slave whether he will or no. Here he is free – free to starve, free to be robbed and swindled on every hand. But the moment he seeks to organize labor, or assert his rights or strike for the defense of his dearest interests he is no longer free, but is apprehended and thrown in prison.”⁴⁴

What must be understood here is that Goldman turned into an anarchist in the United States, meaning that her radical ideas and her identity as an anarchist were American in origin. When she was a young female in Russia, she dreamed of the land of opportunities: “There was still America, the gloriously free land where one is free to develop and to grow. The reception given immigrants even to-day is enough to outrage one’s sensibilities, but forty years ago the treatment meted out of the people who pilgrimmed to America as to the promised land was so utterly appalling that it helped to deepen my hatred of man’s inhumanity to man.”⁴⁵ After

Yorker?” in *Jewish Radicalisms: Historical Perspectives on a Phenomenon of Global Modernity*, eds. Frank Jacob and Sebastian Kunze (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2019), 153–180.

41 Kowal remarks that Goldman “immigrated to the United States in 1886 to fell a restrictive Orthodox life.” Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 273.

42 Goldman, “An Anarchist Looks at Life,” 4–5.

43 “A Woman Anarchist,” *Pittsburgh Leader*, November 22, 1896, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, eds. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana/Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 243–244.

44 “A Woman Anarchist,” 244.

45 Emma Goldman, “Why I am an Anarchist,” n.d., EGP-IISH, No. 191, 2–3.

a failed marriage⁴⁶ and her own “inauguration into the economic life in the States,” due to which she had to work hard to make ends meet at the factory, she experienced “harsh treatment, [when the workers were] driven like slaves.” And, almost naturally, her “whole being rebelled”⁴⁷ against this form of unjust exploitation, as it was showing Goldman “how utterly corrupt and unscrupulous are those who grow rich on the toil of others. It also increased my contempt for the system which grinds human beings into gold dust.”⁴⁸ In addition to this event, it was the Haymarket Tragedy⁴⁹ – when anarchists were tried and executed based on suspicions but without any proof of being involved in a bomb attack on the police in Chicago in 1886 – that “gave [her] feeling, form, and reality.”⁵⁰ Goldman later claimed that “[t]he colossal crime of the State of Illinois, the bloodthirstiness of the press, the madness from [the] pulpit, and platform, the whole brutal business made a conscious Anarchist of me”⁵¹ and that “[t]he death of those Chicago martyrs was my spiritual birth: their ideal became the motive of my entire life.”⁵² All in all, these events and experiences would turn the young immigrant into an anarchist, and after her deportation from the US in December 1919, she would continue to argue that “the exploitation of the masses is nowh[e]re quite so intensive as in the United States.”⁵³ For the anarchist, it was obvious that the people there needed to embrace anarchist ideas to overcome the existent systemic problems because “[p]ower over others corrupts, brutalises and destroys the sense of proportion. It makes for conflict, strife and disintegration.”⁵⁴

In contrast to many unknown anarchists⁵⁵ who were not as popular as Goldman or her lifelong companion Alexander Berkman (1870–1936), she could later afford to leave this hard experience of being exploited behind her to focus on her anarchist works as a publisher of the journal *Mother Earth*. At the same

46 Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Stenographer's Minutes, December 8, 1919, Alexander Berkman Papers, Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, New York University, New York City, NY, United States of America (henceforth ABP-TAM), TAM.067, Box 1, Folder 3, 28 and 30.

47 Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Stenographer's Minutes, 3.

48 Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Stenographer's Minutes, 3.

49 Paul Avrich, *The Haymarket Tragedy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984).

50 Goldman, “Why I am an Anarchist,” 3.

51 Goldman, “Why I am an Anarchist,” 3.

52 Goldman, “An Anarchist Looks at Life,” 5.

53 Emma Goldman, “Good and Evil points in the Makeup of America,” n.d. [1924], EGP-IISH, No. 189, 3.

54 Emma Goldman, “Anarchism and What It Really Stands For,” n.d., EGP-IISH, No. 191, 5^{1/2}.

55 On the different types of anarchists according to four categories related to their income and living conditions, see McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 505.

time, however, Goldman would be perceived as a dangerous woman, as the “dominant personality among American anarchists,”⁵⁶ and as a threat to the existent political and social order. When Berkman attempted to assassinate Henry Clay Frick (1849–1919), “the man responsible for the violence against striking workers at the Carnegie steel mills in Homestead, Pennsylvania”⁵⁷ in 1892, Goldman, who in general did not favor the use of violence, defended Berkman’s decision, because “it was his belief that if the capitalists used Winchester rifles and bayonets on workmen they should be answered with dynamite.”⁵⁸ Berkman was nevertheless sentenced to spend 22 years in prison, but was released after 14 in 1906.⁵⁹ The moment he was able to leave prison, as Berkman described it,

was a moment of supreme joy when I felt the heavy chains, that had bound me so long, give way with the final clang of the iron doors behind me and I suddenly found myself transported, as it were, from the dreary night of my prison-existence into the warm sunshine of the living day; and then, as I breathed the free air of the beautiful May morning – my first breath of freedom in fourteen years – it seemed to me as if a beautiful nature had waved her magic wand and marshalled her most alluring charms to welcome me into the world again.⁶⁰

Regardless of his time spent in prison, Berkman immediately joined the anarchist movement again and supported Goldman in her work for *Mother Earth*. The latter took the release of her friend as a reason to sum up the causes and events of 1892 for their readers:

In looking over the events of 1892 and the causes that led up to the act of Alexander Berkman, one beholds Mammon seated upon a throne built of human bodies, without a trace of sympathy on its Gorgon brow for the creatures it controls. These victims bent and worn, with the reflex of the glow of the steel and iron furnaces in their haggard faces, carry their sacrificial offerings to the ever-insatiable monster, capitalism. In its greed, however, it reaches out for more; it neither sees the gleam of hate in the sunken eyes of its slaves, nor can it hear the murmurs of discontent and rebellion coming forth from their heaving breasts. Yet, discontent

⁵⁶ McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 516.

⁵⁷ Ferguson, “Discourses of Danger,” 744.

⁵⁸ “Goldman’s Cry Against Society,” *Pittsburgh Post*, November 27, 1896, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, eds. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana/Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 249.

⁵⁹ Alexander Berkman, *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist* (New York: Mother Earth Publishing, 1912).

⁶⁰ Alexander Berkman, “A Greeting,” *Mother Earth* 1, no. 4 (1906), accessed October 17, 2019, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev1n4.html.

continues until one day it raises its mighty voice and demands to be heard: Human conditions! higher pay!⁶¹

Goldman intended to use *Mother Earth* to awaken the political consciousness of the readers, who might get in contact with anarchist ideas for the first time. And it was her most important project, once she had decided to fully invest all her energy and financial capacity in this journal. In 1905, a year before *Mother Earth* was founded, Goldman had “borrowed money to open a facial and scalp massage parlor for middle-class, ‘professional’ women.”⁶² The parlor went well, and the anarchist Goldman made a profit for the first time. Maybe this was one reason for her to give up this opportunity when she was able to establish her own journal the next year. Finally, “[b]y earning her livelihood from the movement itself, she avoided the problems of a double life which had troubled her.”⁶³ Although Goldman herself was never truly the “modern woman” she considered herself to be, *Mother Earth* was supposed to act as a platform of all kinds of anarchist ideas and to provide a possibility for the exchange of different views on society.⁶⁴ Goldman and Berkman themselves later formulated the *raison d’être* of *Mother Earth* as follows:

As to the original *raison d’être* of MOTHER EARTH, it was, first of all, to create a medium for the free expression of our ideas, a medium bold, defiant, and unafraid. That she has proved to the fullest, for neither friend nor foe has been able to gag her. Secondly, MOTHER EARTH was to serve as a gathering point, as it were, for those, who, struggling to free themselves from the absurdities of the Old, had not yet reached firm footing Suspended between heaven and hell, they have found in MOTHER EARTH the anchor of life. Thirdly, to infuse new blood into Anarchism, which – in America – had then been running at low ebb for quite some time. All these purposes, it may be said impartially, the magazine has served faithfully and well.⁶⁵

Goldman used her journal to confront existent gender and social norms, as well as for political criticism of the US government. Referencing Michel Foucault, Kathy E. Ferguson called her “bold confrontations with authorities” acts of “anarchist par-

61 E.[mma] G.[oldman], “Alexander Berkman,” *Mother Earth* 1, no. 3 (1906), accessed October 17, 2019, http://www.gutenberg.org/files/27262/27262-h/27262-h.htm#Page_22.

62 McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 517.

63 McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 517.

64 Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 743–744.

65 Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, “Our Sixth Birthday,” *Mother Earth* 6, no. 1 (1911), accessed February 26, 2020, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev6n1.html.

rhesis, fearless speech, a relentless truth-telling practice that risked her own security in pursuit of her 'beautiful ideal.'"⁶⁶

One of the other aspects Goldman reflected upon in *Mother Earth* was the "Tragedy of Women's Emancipation."⁶⁷ She wanted to point out why women should have the same liberties as men and why equality was a precondition for true emancipation. Goldman emphasized that "[p]eace and harmony between the sexes, and individuals does not necessarily depend on a superficial equalization of human beings; nor does it call for the elimination of individual traits or peculiarities. The problem that confronts us, to-day, and which the nearest future is to solve, is how to be oneself, and yet in oneness with others, to feel deeply with all human beings and still retain one's own innate qualities."⁶⁸ The anarchist Goldman demanded that female emancipation should not be considered as a hostile project for society, because "man and woman can meet without antagonism and opposition. *The motto should, not be forgive one another; it should be, understand one another.*"⁶⁹

It was emancipation that was supposed to "make it possible for [women] to be human in the truest sense," but to achieve it, "all artificial barriers should be broken and the road towards greater freedom cleared of every trace of centuries of submission and slavery."⁷⁰ The tragedy with regard to previous emancipation attempts, however, was clearly visible for Goldman, as

the results so far achieved have isolated woman and have robbed her of the fountain springs of that happiness which is so essential to her. Merely external emancipation has made of the modern woman an artificial being ...; anything except the forms which would be reached by the expression of their own inner qualities. Such artificially grown plants of the female sex are to be found in large numbers, especially in the so-called intellectual sphere of our life.⁷¹

Consequently, Goldman argued that "the emancipation of woman, as interpreted and practically applied to-day, has failed to reach that great end [i. e. true freedom and equality]. Now, woman is confronted with the necessity of emancipation from emancipation, if she really desires to be free. This may sound paradoxical, but is,

⁶⁶ Ferguson, "Discourses of Danger," 738. For Foucault's text see Michel Foucault, *Fearless Speech*, ed. Joseph Pearson (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001), 19.

⁶⁷ Emma Goldman, "Tragedy of Women's Emancipation," *Mother Earth* 1, no. 1 (1906): 9–17, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev1n1.html#tra.

⁶⁸ Goldman, "Tragedy of Women's Emancipation."

⁶⁹ Goldman, "Tragedy of Women's Emancipation." My emphasis.

⁷⁰ Goldman, "Tragedy of Women's Emancipation."

⁷¹ Goldman, "Tragedy of Women's Emancipation."

nevertheless, only too true.”⁷² While “economic equality” could have been achieved in some professions, “[v]ery few [women] ever succeed, for it is a fact that women doctors, lawyers, architects and engineers are neither met with the same confidence, nor do they receive the same remuneration.”⁷³

The achievements of emancipation were consequently not good enough to have fully freed women from the suppression of the patriarchy, and Goldman would therefore criticize it by calling the previous emancipation a tragedy for women:

The narrowness of the existing conception of woman’s independence and emancipation; the dread of love for a man who is not her social equal; the fear that love will rob her of her freedom and independence, the horror that love or the joy of motherhood will only hinder her in the full exercise of her profession – all these together make of the emancipated modern woman a compulsory vestal, before whom life, with its great clarifying sorrows and its deep, entrancing joys, rolls on without touching or gripping her soul.⁷⁴

In a letter to Berkman on 4 September 1925, i.e. almost 20 years later, Goldman would again emphasize the “tragedy of all of us modern women,” which for her was based on the “fact that we are removed only by a very short period from our traditions, the traditions of being loved, cared for, protected, secured, and above all, the time when women could look forward to an old age of children, a home and someone to brighten their lives.” For Goldman, it was clear that “[t]he modern woman cannot be the wife and mother in the old sense, and the new medium has not yet been devised, I mean the way of being wife, mother, friend and yet retain one’s complete freedom. Will it ever?”⁷⁵ Two aspects were essential for Goldman’s view that emancipation had failed, namely the continuation of traditional means of patriarchic control, i.e. marriage, and the lack of sexual freedom for women. These two aspects shall now be taken into closer consideration.

⁷² Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation.”

⁷³ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation.”

⁷⁴ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women’s Emancipation.”

⁷⁵ Letter to Alexander Berkman, September 4, 1925, in *Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman*, eds. Richard Drinnon and Anna Maria Drinnon (New York: Schocken Books, 1975), 130–133, cited in Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 736.

Against Marriage

The continuation of the traditional views on marriage was, from Goldman's point of view, based on "the twin fantasies of protection and social mobility through [it]."⁷⁶ Women should rather be revolutionary and contest the contemporary perspective on marriage. Although such demands would also arouse criticism from her male anarchist comrades, Goldman did not back away from her demand that a true emancipation of women also needed to contest the existent idea of marriage. As Clare Hemmings, professor of feminist theory at the London School of Economics, worded it, "[f]or Goldman, marriage is the basis of private property and the particular oppression of women."⁷⁷ Marriage had turned out to be often nothing more than "an economic arrangement, an insurance pact"⁷⁸ for women, who were exploited in their marriage as they were as workers in the factories. Women would be dependent on men for the rest of their lives and doomed to live a life as parasite-like creatures, unable to achieve true freedom and equality as individuals.⁷⁹

In an article for *Firebrand* in 1897, Goldman expressed her views on marriage quite outspokenly: "From its very birth, up to our present day, men and women groan under the iron yoke of our marriage institution, and there seems to be no relief, no way out of it."⁸⁰ The relationship between women and men had been diminished to a capitalist form of exploitation because, as Goldman continued in her evaluation, "marriage relations, are the foundation of private property, ergo, the foundation of our cruel and inhuman system."⁸¹ Goldman considered marriage to be a tool of patriarchic control as "[i]t always gives the man the right and power over his wife, not only over her body, but also over her actions, her wishes; in fact, over her whole life."⁸² The relationship between men and women was not equal but privileged for the former, who could exploit the latter as mother and housewife. With regard to the two sexes, it was "[p]ublic opinion [that] separate[d]

⁷⁶ Clare Hemmings, "In the Mood for Revolution: Emma Goldman's Passion," *New Literary History* 43, no. 3 (2012): 527.

⁷⁷ Clare Hemmings, "Sexual Freedom and the Promise of Revolution: Emma Goldman's Passion," *Feminist Review* 106 (2014): 49.

⁷⁸ Emma Goldman, *Marriage and Love* (New York: Mother Earth Publishing, 1911), 4.

⁷⁹ Goldman, *Marriage and Love*, 4.

⁸⁰ Emma Goldman, "Marriage," *Firebrand*, July 18, 1897, 2, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, eds. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana/Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 269.

⁸¹ Goldman, "Marriage," 269.

⁸² Goldman, "Marriage," 269.

their rights and duties, their honor and dishonor very strictly from each other.”⁸³ At the same time, women were not granted their individual freedom, especially with regard to sex: “The subject of sex is a sealed book to the girl, because she has been given to understand that it is impure, immoral and indecent to even mention the sex question.”⁸⁴ Women who were married were kept sexually uneducated on purpose to limit them in their liberation as females who could feel sexual pleasure as well. In addition to this form of exploitation of their bodies, women were also exploited in marriage because such relationships could hardly be called equal:

Both, the man and the girl, marry for the same purpose, with the only exception that the man is not expected to give up his individuality, his name, his independence, whereas the girl has to sell herself, body and soul, for the pleasure of being someone's wife; hence they do not stand on equal terms, and where, there is no equality there can be no harmony. The consequence is that shortly after the first few months, or to make all allowance possible, after the first year, both come to the conclusion that marriage is a failure.⁸⁵

It was therefore obvious for Goldman early on that marriage was an essential part of the systemic exploitation of women. She therefore could not believe that “many emancipated women prefer marriage with all its deficiencies to the narrowness of an unmarried life; narrow and unendurable because of the chains of moral and social prejudice that cramp and bind her nature.”⁸⁶ The tragedy for Goldman was based on the fact that many women did not understand the full “meaning of emancipation. They thought that all that was needed was independence from external tyrannies; the internal tyrants, far more harmful to life and growth, such as ethical and social conventions, were left to take care of themselves; and they have taken care of themselves.”⁸⁷ Full emancipation could consequently not be achieved as long as women continued to live according to old-fashioned and outdated traditions like marriage that would force them to give up their individual freedom. Goldman therefore argued: “Indeed if the partial emancipation is to become a complete and true emancipation of woman it will have to do away with the ridiculous notion that to be loved, to be sweetheart and mother, is synonymous [sic] with being slave or subordinate. It will have to do away with the absurd notion of the dualism of the sexes, or that man and woman represent two antagonistic worlds.”⁸⁸ Only together were women and men able to become equal, and only

⁸³ Goldman, “Marriage,” 270.

⁸⁴ Goldman, “Marriage,” 270.

⁸⁵ Goldman, “Marriage,” 271.

⁸⁶ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women's Emancipation.”

⁸⁷ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women's Emancipation.”

⁸⁸ Goldman, “Tragedy of Women's Emancipation.”

together and without any hierarchy could both be truly free. Kathy E. Ferguson summed up this vision of the US anarchist as follows:

For Goldman, love between two people should create an intensified microcosm of the more general relation between individuals and the community in a liberated society. She envisioned anarchist love as creating bonds between free individuals that would enhance rather than confine each person. Similarly, she envisioned an anarchist society as a voluntary community of free, self-directing individuals, where individual growth and empowerment are nurtured through collective life.⁸⁹

Regardless of her many later political endeavors, Goldman never gave up the hope for an honest and full emancipation of women, but in her later years she would continue to lecture about “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman.”⁹⁰

Goldman outlined that women had achieved political rights in the past, but the course of history had shown “that woman in politics is by no means better than man and her right of suffrage has helped her as little as it did most men to overcome outworn political, social, or moral values.”⁹¹ In particular, since women had been unable to leave the limiting forces of tradition behind, they had been unable to fully free themselves. It was women who still kept worshipping men to a level of self-denial: “When she [the modern woman] loves the man, she turns him into a god and surrounds him with a sacred hallow. In her blind idolization she falls to see that her deity is but human, all too human. The poor fool knows only too well that he is far from the hero imagined by his mother, wife, daughter, or mistress.”⁹² Yet instead of freeing the woman, the modern man would exploit her in multiple ways. Goldman also accused the modern women for their blind obedience, as they “were the most ardent supporters of war to the extent of using their sex charms and persuasion to drive the youth of the land into the trenches and death.”⁹³ And regardless of the political rights the suffragette movement had been able to secure in the past, “woman’s political equality with man has contributed precious little to her inner emancipation.”⁹⁴ At the same time, she continued to point out that the exploitation of women was not limited to their private life but also with regard to their working conditions: “As to the great mass of working girls and women, how much independence is gained if the narrowness and lack of freedom of the home is exchanged for the narrowness and lack of freedom of the fac-

⁸⁹ Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 751.

⁹⁰ Emma Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” n.d., EGP-IISH, No. 266.

⁹¹ Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 1.

⁹² Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 3.

⁹³ Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 7.

⁹⁴ Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 8^{1/2}.

tory, sweat-shop, department store, or office?”⁹⁵ The tragedy of the modern woman was consequently an exploitation that existed in a twofold way and could only be overcome by a political and social change.

The working conditions of poor women made it relatively unsurprising “that hundreds of girls are so willing to accept the first offer of marriage, sick and tired of their ‘independence’,”⁹⁶ although this decision would only lead to another form of exploitation. This “so-called independence which leads only to earning the merest subsistence is not so enticing, not so ideal, that one could expect woman to sacrifice everything for it. Our highly praised independence is, after all, but a slow process of dulling and stifling woman’s nature, her low need, and her mother instinct.”⁹⁷ The possibility to live free and independent was eventually given up due to the circumstances of being economically exploited in a capitalist system. The fact that representatives of the women’s movement, especially the suffragettes, accepted the continuation of this system in exchange for a small share of political power was another of the reasons Goldman identified with regard to the tragedy of the modern woman: “Every movement that aims at the destruction of existing institutions and the replacement thereof with something more advanced, more perfect had followers who in theory stand for the most radical ideas, but who, nevertheless, in their every-day practice, are like the average philistine, feigning respectability and clamoring for the good opinion of their opponents. The suffragist and feminist movements made no exception.”⁹⁸

A true and full emancipation, however, needed more than just political rights. It needed freedom and equality, the two pillars of Goldman’s interpretation of anarchism. The modern man, as she argued, “still wants woman as his housekeeper and caretaker of his home and his children. But he wants her in modern clothes.”⁹⁹ The modern woman, on the other hand, “lacks courage to be inwardly free. Even with herself she is not frank.”¹⁰⁰ Women in general did still accept the existent social norms and were therefore “still swayed by sentimental considerations. [The modern woman] still has too many gods. The result is lack of concentration and sticktoitiveness so essential to every goal one wishes to reach.”¹⁰¹ For Goldman, it was consequently foolish women who would pave the way for men while they denied their own freedom: “woman has not yet learned to march to victory regard-

95 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 13^{1/2}.

96 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,”

97 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 14.

98 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 18^{1/2}.

99 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 22.

100 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 29.

101 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 30.

less of the defeat of those in her way. Hence she has not reached greatness.”¹⁰² What kept women from fully emancipating was the fear of losing men’s interest in them because, as Goldman continued in her argument, “the higher the mental development of [the modern] woman, the less possible it is for her to meet a congenial mate who will see in her, not only sex, but also the human being, the friend, the comrade and strong individuality, who cannot and ought not lose a single trait of her character.”¹⁰³ If women were unable to be loved for their individuality but solely because they could be exploited, they would never be free, and “[i]f love does not know how to give and take without restrictions, it is not love, but a transaction that never fails to lay stress on a plus and a minus.”¹⁰⁴ The modern woman, who “is in need of unhampered growth out of old traditions and habits”¹⁰⁵ therefore must resist traditional role models and disobey social expectations like marriage. For Goldman, it was instead “necessary that women learn to accept themselves and to value themselves as beings possessing a worth at least equal to that of the other sex, instead of unthinkingly accepting standards based on masculine psychology.”¹⁰⁶ All in all, it was and still is important for a successful emancipation to “do away with the absurd notion of the conflict of the sexes, or that man and woman represent two antagonistic worlds.”¹⁰⁷ These considerations are still important today and, as emphasized before, “[o]nly if the microcosms of romantic love and interpersonal relationships are freed from all forms of male domination and dominance could a better and freer society be created.”¹⁰⁸ To achieve this aim, Goldman, however, did not only want to increase awareness of the problems related to marriage as a traditional tool of patriarchic control over women; she also wanted women to gain their freedom with regard to their own sexuality and the possibilities to experience sexual pleasure.

102 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 31.

103 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 33.

104 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 36^{1/2}.

105 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 39.

106 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 40.

107 Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” 41.

108 Jacob, “Anarchismus, Ehe und Sex,” 216.

For Sexual Liberation

Goldman was familiar with the works of German sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935),¹⁰⁹ and she “admired the brave struggle [Hirschfeld] ha[d] made for the rights of people who, by their very nature, can not find sex expression in what is commonly called ‘the normal way’.”¹¹⁰ Goldman was interested in sexuality, as she considered it an important part of women’s liberation. Like the American poet Walt Whitman (1819–1892), the anarchist highlighted “the beauty and wholesomeness of sex ... freed from the rags and tatters of hypocrisy.”¹¹¹ Goldman’s “insistence that women’s experiences and sexual freedom must be incorporated into the heart of any sustainable revolution”¹¹² consequently does not surprise, as her appeal to the feminists of the 1960s and 1970s seemed to be quite natural, given this element of the anarchist’s revolutionary considerations. Sexual liberation would allow women to break out of the social system that kept them hostages and exploited them physically and mentally. Only a free form of sexual self-expression would allow women equality with men, freeing their identities from the mother roles they were supposed to imitate in their lives after having been forced into marriage by social pressure. Goldman therefore, as Clare Hemmings has pointed out, “consistently situate[s] sexuality in a broad political context of the sexual division of labour; the institutions of marriage and the church, consumerism, patriotism and productive (as well as reproductive) labour; [and] she frames sexual freedom as both the basis of new relationships between men and women and as a model for a new political future.”¹¹³

To achieve freedom and equality, the basis and aim for Goldman’s anarchist vision was important for sexual identity as well, because sexuality had to be separated from any form of capitalist exploitation to allow for a better, i. e. freer, life. While left intellectuals had been “suspicious of attention to desire and pleasure,”¹¹⁴ Goldman embraced these aspects and made them an essential part of

109 For Hirschfeld’s life and work, see Manfred Herzer, *Magnus Hirschfeld und seine Zeit* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017).

110 Emma Goldman, “A Refutation Addressed to Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld,” Berlin 1923, EGP-IISH, No. 208, 1. Some years later, Goldman would also meet Hirschfeld in Paris. Magnus Hirschfeld to Emma Goldman, Paris, November 24, 1933, EGP-IISH, No. 98.

111 Emma Goldman, “Walt Whitman” (1916), in *The Emma Goldman Papers: A Microfilm Edition*, ed. Candace Falk with Ronald J. Zboray et al., reel 54 (Alexandria, VA: Chadwyck-Healey, 1990), 2, cited in Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 747.

112 Hemmings, “Sexual Freedom,” 44.

113 Hemmings, “Sexual Freedom,”

114 Lisa Rofel, “Queer Positions, Queering Asian Studies,” *Positions* 20, no. 1 (2012): 185, cited in Hemmings, “Sexual Freedom,” 46.

her political agenda. Beyond their daughter- or mother-identity, women should consider their sexuality and sexual pleasure as a way to express themselves as females, who should naturally not be restricted by traditional roles with regard to their desire. If sexuality continued to be considered as something unrelated to the suppression of women, it would not allow women to break the co-constitution of sexuality and labor and its impact on different ways of exploitation.¹¹⁵ Sexual freedom was a precondition for every passionate revolutionary, and a famous episode from Goldman's life emphasizes that she would not accept being part of an unpassionate liberation movement:

At the dances I was one of the most untiring and gayest. One evening a cousin of Sasha [Alexander Berkman], a young boy, took me aside. With a grave face, as if he were about to announce the death of a dear comrade, he whispered to me that it did not behoove an agitator to dance. Certainly not with such reckless abandon, anyway. It was undignified for one who was on the way to become a force in the anarchist movement. My frivolity would only hurt the Cause. I grew furious at the impudent interference of the boy. I told him to mind his own business, I was tired of having the Cause constantly thrown into my face. I did not believe that a Cause which stood for a beautiful ideal, for anarchism, for release and freedom from conventions and prejudice, should demand the denial of life and joy. I insisted that our Cause could not expect me to become a nun and that the movement should not be turned into a cloister. If it meant that, I did not want it. "I want freedom, the right to self-expression, everybody's right to beautiful, radiant things." Anarchism meant that to me, and I would live it in spite of the whole world – prisons, persecution, everything. Yes, even in spite of the condemnation of my own closest comrades I would live my beautiful ideal.¹¹⁶

This call for freedom included sexual freedom, as the life of women was one determined by "sorrow, misery [and] humiliation"¹¹⁷ in relation to their sex. Hemmings emphasized how Goldman interpreted the co-dependency between sexuality and capitalist exploitation as follows:

Goldman locates the economy of women's sexuality firmly within the means of production and the exploitation of surplus labour. Women are not only commodities themselves, but also producers of the next generation of exploitable labour, within the twin evils of capitalism and militarism. Not only is women's experience of sex and love one of ignorant misery, her reproductive labour is bound as to what President Roosevelt saw as a national duty to provide offspring for the nation.¹¹⁸

115 For a detailed discussion of this interrelationship, see Emma Goldman, *The White Slave Traffic* (New York: Mother Earth Publishing, 1909).

116 Emma Goldman, *Living My Life* (New York: Knopf, 1931), accessed December 17, 2018, <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-living-my-life>, ch. 5.

117 Goldman, "Marriage."

118 Hemmings, "Sexual Freedom," 50.

The capitalist exploitation of women made Goldman also realize that birth control was a form of empowerment for women, who could decide on their own when and how to have children, without dooming the next generation to become a cog in the machine of the overall capitalist exploitation mechanism.¹¹⁹ The revolutionary transformation of society consequently needed a transformation of the idea of marriage, and related to this a reconsideration of female sexuality, especially by women themselves. She was not the only left intellectual who consequently considered the orgasm to be an experience of liberation.¹²⁰ The sexual revolution Goldman envisioned would have ended the inequality between men and women and instead would pave the way to a unification of the sexes in the struggle against capitalism and for a better future for all.

For Goldman, sex was “woven into every fabric of human life and lays its finger on every custom. To the debit side of the sex account we must charge many silly stupidities and some of the foulest injustices which go to make the thing we call human culture the amazing and variegated mosaic that it is.”¹²¹ She nevertheless demanded “the free sane acceptance of the human body, in all its faculties” because this acceptance presented “the master-key to the art of the future.”¹²² In contrast to men, women still suffered from all kinds of limitations: “The man rarely starves sexually. The flourishing business of prostitution is proof for that.”¹²³ It was traditions, like marriage, that demanded this kind of self-restriction for women because “[s]ociety demands that the young adult man and woman (especially woman) shall repress the sex-impulse for a number of years – often for the whole of their life.”¹²⁴ The common opinion therefore emphasized that “[s]ex is disgraceful for nice girls,”¹²⁵ and young women were supposed to preserve their virginity for marriage instead of freeing their body and mind by experiencing sexual pleasure. While women consequently suffered from marriage and other role-model-related restrictions, “[m]ost men are brought up to believe that woman must be taken and not give herself gladly and joyously in love and passion. That also prevents the more sensitive of the male species to give themselves freely

119 Emma Goldman, “The Social Aspects of Birth Control,” *Mother Earth* 11, no. 2 (1916): 468–475.

120 Wilhelm Reich, *Die Funktion des Orgasmus: Zur Psychopathologie und zur Soziologie des Geschlechtslebens* (Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1927); Wilhelm Reich, *Die sexuelle Revolution: Zur charakterlichen Selbststeuerung des Menschen* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1966).

121 Emma Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” n.d., EGP-IISH, No. 213, 7–8.

122 Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” 12.

123 Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” 14.

124 Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” 15.

125 Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” 21.

– they are afraid to outrage and shock the sensibilities and innocence of their wives.”¹²⁶

As long as sex was supposed to be a taboo for women and not a pleasure to enjoy, there was neither a chance for emancipation nor one for a revolution that could change society as a whole. Or, as Goldman worded it with regard to the negative impact of sexual restrictions:

Take frigidity in some women largely due to the deadening effect of the sex taboo. Such women cannot even if they try desperately respond to the sex urge in the man. In fact, the very thought of the sexual embrace to such women is torture. Even if the man lacks refinement and imposes his needs on his wife he will find no satisfaction. In the end he seeks gratification elsewhere. There is quite a percentage of married men among the clientele of prostitution. Sex is more powerful than all decisions. The man will grow indifferent and in the end insist on divorce.¹²⁷

Goldman consequently asked for an unlimited and unconditional sexual liberation for women: “Let us get rid of the mock modesty so prevalent on the surface of polite society, let us liberate sex from falsehood and degradation.”¹²⁸ It is unfortunate that this liberation has not yet been achieved and that countless women around the world still suffer from the same exploitation of their sexuality with regard to labor-related and marriage-related exploitation by capitalism and men alike.

Conclusion

Emma Goldman, as a strong anarchist woman, “wanted a world without jealousy, insecurity, or possessiveness, and she fought those feelings in herself, with limited success.”¹²⁹ Having experienced the exploitation of women in the US garment industry as well as a rather unsuccessful marriage, she knew how hard it was for female workers and wives to gain equality and freedom. Goldman therefore dedicated her political struggle as an anarchist toward a revolution that would free women and men alike, because only as equal partners would they be able to change the world. When Goldman fought against the traditional idea of marriage, as it had been representing the yoke that prevented women from liberation, she without any doubt fought against the exploitation of the idea of love as a precondition for human relationships, but not love as such. Goldman loved her life, and

¹²⁶ Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” 24.

¹²⁷ Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” 26–27.

¹²⁸ Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” 50.

¹²⁹ Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 751.

she wanted women to love themselves as well. A free sexual experience of love and pleasure was important for the passionate revolutionary, as it was essential for the female anarchist that the individual freedom of women was not limited by antiquated and outdated models of companionship, i.e. marriage.

However, many of her demands came too early, and Goldman would not live long enough to witness the consequences of some of her demands in later years. Yet, when she wrote to Rose Pesotta, an anarcha-feminist union organizer and vice-president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, in 1935, Goldman had not given up her hope that the anarchist movement would eventually be able to trigger change: “Yes, our movement is in a bad state. The old ones have either died out or have become hoary with age. And the young ones are in the Communist ranks. There is unfortunately no one who could gather them up even if they were interested in our ideas. My only consolation is the certainty that the present trend to dictatorship is not for all times. Our ideas will have their day in the world court, though I may not live to see it. You are so much younger, you probably will.”¹³⁰ The fact that Goldman’s writings were revived in the second half of the 20th century and continue to appeal to feminists all over the world even today highlights how important her ideas were with regard to true emancipation based on freedom and equality. One can therefore only hope that Goldman’s demands will eventually be addressed in the 21st century, liberating women and men alike to face the causes for the existence of sorrow and misery in the world: exploitation and inequality, which is unfortunately still, around a century after Goldman expressed her thoughts, a gender inequality.

130 Emma Goldman to Rose Pesotta, Montreal, March 7, 1935, EGP-IISH, No. 129, 2.

5 The Russian Revolution, the American Red Scare, and the Forced Exile of Transnational Anarchists: Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and their Soviet Experience

The Russian Revolution of February 1917 and the events of the following October attracted international attention and inspired the revolutionary zeal of many women and men around the globe.¹ For the first time, it seemed, a social revolution had realized the historical dialectic described by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831),² leading to a “dictatorship of the proletariat”³ that Karl Marx (1818–1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820–1895) had claimed to be an important step toward a classless society. However, like many other revolutions before and after, the Russian Revolution would not remain what German historian Manfred Kossok (1930–1993), termed a “nice revolution.”⁴ It was, instead, corrupted, especially by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, who buried the ideals of the February Revolution and established a party regime based on terror and suppression.⁵ Like other revolutions, the process in Russia stimulated not only a wave of global protests in dif-

1 This article was first published in *Yearbook of Transnational History* 4 (2021): 113–134 and I would like to thank the yearbook's editor, Thomas Adam, for the permission to include the article in the present book as well. The author would like to thank the journal editor and the three anonymous peer reviewers for their invaluable comments and remarks. On the perception of the revolutionary events of 1917 and the frustration with the Bolshevik regime see: Frank Jacob and Riccardo Altieri, eds., *Die Wahrnehmung der Russischen Revolutionen 1917: Zwischen utopischen Träumen und erschütterter Ablehnung* (Berlin: Metropolis 2019). For a long-term perspective of the perception of the revolution also see: Jan C. Behrends, Nikolaus Katzer, and Thomas Lindenberger, eds. *100 Jahre Roter Oktober: Zur Weltgeschichte der Russischen Revolution* (Berlin: Ch. Links 2017).

2 Julie E. Maybee, “Hegel's Dialectics,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (Winter 2019 Edition), accessed April 1, 2020, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/hegel-dialectics/>.

3 The term first appeared in Karl Marx, “Die Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich 1848 bis 1850” (1850). Engels had written the preface. Karl Marx, “Die Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich 1848 bis 1850,” in *Marx-Engels-Werke* (MEW), vol. 7 (Berlin: Dietz, 1960), 9–107. On the concept and its historical development see: Wilfried Nippel, “Diktatur des Proletariats: Versuch einer Historisierung,” in *Zyklos* 5 (2019): 71–130.

4 Manfred Kossok, “Requiem auf die schöne Revolution,” in Manfred Kossok, *Sozialismus an der Peripherie: Späte Schriften*, edited by Jörn Schütrumpf (Berlin: Dietz, 2016), 25.

5 For a detailed discussion of this corruption see: Frank Jacob, *1917 – Die korruptierte Revolution* (Marburg: Büchner, 2020).

ferent national contexts, where protesters looked to Russia as an example of a supposedly successful upheaval of the masses against the ruling classes,⁶ but also produced forced migration and exile and, thereby, created several different angry groups.⁷ These included the counterrevolutionaries who had to leave Russia⁸ and the political enemies of the Bolshevik party⁹ who also had to seek asylum abroad, as well as those who had supported Lenin's rise to power but became too critical of his policies and were, therefore, persecuted in the post-revolutionary period.¹⁰ These men and women joined different transnational diasporas, but the impact of the Russian Revolution went even further. It created another form of exile, namely of those American radicals who were in favor of the Russian Revolution and were deported to Soviet Russia as a consequence of the first "Red Scare" in the United States.

The story of two of these "famous radicals," the anarchists Emma Goldman (1869–1940) and Alexander Berkman (1870–1936), and their trial, deportation, and exile experience shall be taken into closer consideration in the present chapter and will demonstrate how revolutionary events in Russia led to the formation of transnational exiles, sometimes multiple exiles from an individual's perspective – as supporters of the Russian Revolution could also be forced out of Soviet

6 On the global protests at the end of World War I see: Marcel Bois and Frank Jacob, eds. *Zeiten des Aufbruchs (1916–1921): Globale Proteste, Streiks und Revolutionen gegen den Ersten Weltkrieg und seine Auswirkungen* (Berlin: Metropol, 2020). For a special consideration of global pacifism during the war see: Justin Quinn Olmstead, ed. *Reconsidering Peace and Patriotism During the First World War* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017). On the American perspective with regard to the social conflicts during World War I see: David M. Kennedy, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*, 25th anniversary edition (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Karsten H. Piep, *Embattled Home Fronts: Domestic Politics and the American Novel of World War I* (Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 2009).

7 Frank Jacob, "Revolution, Emigration, and Anger: Angry Exile Groups in the Aftermath of the French and Russian Revolutions," in *Understanding Angry Groups: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Their Motivations and Effects on Society*, eds. Susan C. Cloninger and Steven A. Leibo (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2017), 169–188.

8 Karl Schlögel, ed. *Der große Exodus: Die russische Emigration und ihre Zentren 1917–1941* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1994); Natalie K. Zelensky, *Performing Tsarist Russia in New York: Music, Émigrés, and the American Imagination* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2019).

9 Exemplary, especially for an anarchist perspective, see: Paul Avrich, *The Anarchists in the Russian Revolution* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1973); Philippe Kellermann, ed. *Anarchismus und Russische Revolution* (Berlin: Dietz, 2017). On the development of the Russian Left between February and October 1917 see: Wladislaw Hedeler, ed. *Die russische Linke zwischen März und November 1917* (Berlin: Dietz, 2017).

10 Exemplary see: Gregory Petrovich Maximoff, *The Guillotine at Work: The Leninist Counter-revolution* (Sanday: Cienfuegos Press, 1979).

Russia due to a critical attitude – including the forced departures of non-Russian citizens who witnessed the revolutionary events from afar.¹¹ While the US government had experienced problems with foreign immigrant radicals before,¹² the reaction to radical elements during the First Red Scare – particularly expressed in the so-called Palmer Raids – was harsher than before, as many foreign-born radicals were expelled from the country.¹³

Goldman's and Berkman's cases are particularly interesting, as they were not representing those supporters of the Russian Revolution, who voluntarily ended up in Soviet Russia to support the building of a new society,¹⁴ but were forced into exile. This case study consequently shows how prerevolutionary attitudes and anti-American criticism could in combination provoke an exile experience that was transnational in nature. When Goldman and Berkman became witnesses of the postrevolutionary order and the Bolshevik failures, at least from an anarchist perspective, their critical attitude made a permanent life in Soviet Russia impossible. It caused them to continue their exile in a different national context and marked the beginning of their open attacks on bolshevism and the results of Lenin's policies.

11 For a more detailed analysis see: Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution: From Admiration to Frustration* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020).

12 Kenyon Zimmer, *Immigrants against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2015).

13 Emily Pope-Obeda, "National Expulsions in a Transnational World: The Global Dimensions of American Deportation Practice, 1920–1935," in *Deportation in the Americas: Histories of Exclusion and Resistance*, eds. Kenyon Zimmer and Cristina Salinas (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2018), 18–49; Kenyon Zimmer, "The Voyage of the *Buford*: Political Deportations and the Making and Unmaking of America's First Red Scare," in *Deportation in the Americas: Histories of Exclusion and Resistance*, eds. Kenyon Zimmer and Cristina Salinas (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2018), 132–163. For a long-term survey of American deportation policies see Daniel Kanstroom, *Deportation Nation: Outsiders in American History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

14 Paul Hollander, *Political Pilgrims: Western Intellectuals in Search of the Good Society*, 11th edition (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2009), 102–176 describes the appeals of the Soviet society. For some discussion of those in favor of the Soviet idea and their experiences in Soviet Russia and the Soviet Union see, among others, see Julia L. Mickenberg, *American Girls in Red Russia: Chasing the Soviet Dream* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017), 129–162 and Frank Jacob, "Transatlantic Radicalism: Socialist and Anarchist Exchanges in the 19th and 20th Centuries," in *Transatlantic Radicalism: Socialist and Anarchist Exchanges in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, eds. Frank Jacob and Mario Keffler (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2021), 151–169.

On Trial in the United States

Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were born in Czarist Russia, but their radicalization was a product of their experiences in the United States. In her reflection “Why am I an Anarchist?” Goldman¹⁵ claimed that she had initially high hopes for her future in the United States, “The gloriously free land where one is free to develop and to grow. ... [The reception given to] the people who [made a pilgrimage] to America as to the promised land was so utterly appalling that it helped to deepen my hatred of man’s inhumanity to man.”¹⁶ While Berkman’s radicalization began in Russia, Goldman was one of the many Jewish immigrants who adopted radical views in response to the sweatshops of the garment industry. After her political awakening following the Haymarket Riot in Chicago in 1886,¹⁷ which gave her “feeling, form, and reality,”¹⁸ Goldman became involved in radical circles in New York City. There, she and Berkman worked together with the German socialist turned anarchist Johann Most (1846–1906)¹⁹ to spread anarchist ideas, before Berkman attempted to kill the industrialist Henry Clay Frick (1849–1919).²⁰ It took many years before Goldman, after having worked as a nurse and owning a

15 On Goldman and her role as anarcha-feminist see: Frank Jacob, “Anarchismus, Ehe und Sex: Emma Goldman (1869–1940) als Anarcha-Feministin,” in *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die “Frauenfrage” aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, eds. Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob (Berlin: Metropol, 2020), 202–221.

16 Emma Goldman, “Why I am an Anarchist,” n.d., Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth EGP-IISH), No. 191, 2–3.

17 Paul Avrich, *The Haymarket Tragedy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984); Timothy Messer-Kruse, *The Trial of the Haymarket Anarchists: Terrorism and Justice in Gilded Age* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

18 Goldman, “Why I am an Anarchist,” 8. With regard to her own radicalization, Goldman emphasized the impact of this event: “The colossal crime of the State of Illinois, the bloodthirstiness of the press, the madness from pulpit, and platform, the whole brutal business made a conscious Anarchist of me ... It was therefore “free” America and not “darkest” Russia, as the land of my birth used to be called, which gave my instinctive Anarchism form and direction.” Goldman, “Why I am an Anarchist,” 3–4.

19 Donna M. Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 274. On the German anarchist milieu around most in New York City during these years see: Tom Goyens, *Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880–1914* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007); Tom Goyens, “Johann Most and the German Anarchists,” in *Radical Gotham: Anarchism in New York City from Schwab’s Saloon to Occupy Wall Street*, ed. Tom Goyens (Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press 2017), 12–32.

20 For his attempt Berkman subsequently served fourteen years of a twenty-one-year prison sentence. Alexander Berkman, *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist* (New York: Mother Earth Publishing, 1912).

“facial and scalp massage parlor for middle-class, ‘professional’ women,”²¹ resolved to focus solely on her work as a lecturer, writer, and anarchist activist. She not only demanded an overthrow of state power and a revolution that was to follow anarchist ideas, but also criticized marriage as well as the suppression of the “modern woman.”²² She encouraged women to fight for both their political and sexual freedom.²³

The entrance of the United States into World War I caused many anarchists to turn against the US government and a struggle that had been going on for decades was eventually reaching its climax.²⁴ Left-wing activists’ “hopes were greatly magnified by the outbreak of the Russian Revolution in 1917, leading some anarchists ... to go all out when choosing how to respond, tactically, to conscription, press censorship, and police repression of their activities.”²⁵ Goldman and Berkman also raised their voices against the war and for a revolution, which is why they became particularly dangerous from the government’s perspective. Following the introduction of a new conscription law in May 1917, the two radicals organized the No-Conscription League (NCL), whose members were to work against that law and its consequences. In the first serial letter of the NCL, Berkman described the threat that American pacifists faced: “We are sure that you are interested in the anti-war agitation. You cannot fail to realize that the patriotic clap-trap which is now propagated on such a huge scale by the press, the pulpit and the authorities only represent a desperate effort to blind the people to the real issue confronting them. The main issue now is the Prussianiz[ation] of America.” He therefore asked prospective members and sympathizers “for moral and financial support to enable us to carry on an effective campaign by means of meetings ... manifestos and, above all, through the channels of MOTHER EARTH and THE BLAST.”²⁶

In June of the same year, the US Congress passed the Espionage Act that “prohibited organized resistance to the war.”²⁷ Attorney General Alexander Mitchell Palmer (1872–1936) made sure that this new tool was used against all those who

21 Blaine McKinley, “‘The Quagmires of Necessity’: American Anarchists and Dilemmas of Vocation,” in *American Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (1982): 517.

22 Emma Goldman, “The Tragedy of the Modern Woman,” n.d., EGP-IISH No. 266.

23 Emma Goldman, “The Element of Sex in Life,” n.d., EGP-IISH No. 213.

24 Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 2011), 92.

25 Andrew Cornell, *Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the Twentieth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press 2016), 54.

26 Alexander Berkman, No-Conscription League, Serial Letter No. 1, New York, May 25, 1917, Alexander Berkman Collection, Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Archives, New York (henceforth ABC-TAM), Box 1, Folder 7.

27 Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 59.

posed a threat to the American war effort. Ultimately, close to 1,500 people were arrested and approximately 1,000 convicted during the so-called Palmer Raids.²⁸ Goldman and Berkman were among those arrested the day after the Espionage Act took effect²⁹ as they had organized mass meetings at Hunts Point Palace (4 June 1917)³⁰ and Forward Hall (14 June 1917)³¹ in New York in protest of the new law. Accompanied by applause, cheers, and boos from the crowd, Berkman declared on 4 June that “conscription in a free country means the cemetery of liberty and if conscription is the cemetery then registration is the undertaker.... Those who want to register should certainly register, but those who know what liberty means, and I am sure there are thousands in this country, they will not register.”³² In her speech at the meeting, Goldman emphasized her antagonism against conscription:

I actually believed that this was the promised land, the land that rests upon freedom, upon opportunity, upon happiness, upon recognition [*sic*] of the importance and the value of the young generation. ... I have come to the conclusion that when the law for conscription was passed in the United States, the Funeral March of 500,000 American youths is going to be celebrated tomorrow, on Registration Day.³³

Ten days later, Berkman further criticized the conscription law. Conscription, he argued, was merely another form of exploitation of the (working) masses. If soldiers only “knew their real interests they would know they are really being used to advance and multiply the profits of the bosses of the workers, who are at the same time the bosses of the police, who are at the same time the bosses of the militia and of the army and of everything else. If they realized their true interest, the soldiers, the police and the militia, they would know they ought to make common cause with the working men, not with the bosses.”³⁴ On 15 June,

²⁸ Robert K. Murray, *Red Scare: A Study in National Hysteria, 1919–1920* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955), 210–38. On the impact of the Palmer Raids see: Kennedy, *Over Here*, 45–92.

²⁹ Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 60–62.

³⁰ Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, Hunts Point Palace, New York, June 4, 1917, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 12.

³¹ Stenographer's Minutes of Alexander Berkman's Speech in Forward Hall, New York, June 14, 1917, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 12.

³² Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, Hunts Point Palace, New York, June 4, 1917, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 12, 18–19.

³³ Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, Hunts Point Palace, New York, June 4, 1917, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 12, 24.

³⁴ Stenographer's Minutes of Alexander Berkman's Speech in Forward Hall, New York, June 14, 1917, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 12, 1.

the two anarchists were arrested in New York by a US marshal and twelve city policemen. Goldman “changed into a royal purple dress, grabbed a small toilet case (always at the ready for police station confinements) and a copy of James Joyce’s *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*³⁵ (a book was also always at the ready), and marched out.”³⁶ *The New York Times* reported the arrest and the ensuing trial and confirmed that “[t]he Federal authorities, backed by the full power of the New York Police Department, are determined to put an end to anarchy in New York.”³⁷

Goldman and Berkman were accused of having violated the law by their actions against conscription. Both defended themselves in the most eloquent way, and thereby, also impressed judge, jury, and the attorney, although they could not change the verdict.³⁸ In his closing speech, Berkman declared on behalf of himself and his fellow anarchist Goldman:

Gentlemen of the jury, in looking over the testimony in this case it strikes me, and I am sure it will convince any intelligent man, that the District Attorney proved only one thing, and that thing is that we are anarchists. That thing did not need any proof, Mr. District Attorney.... I am not arguing to keep myself from going to prison. I am not afraid of prison. I am willing to suffer for my ideas in prison if necessary. Life is dear, but not so dear that I should be at liberty without self-respect. I would rather be in prison with my ideals, with my convictions, true to myself, than be outside with my soul damned in my own estimation. So I am not pleading to save ourselves from prison.³⁹

Berkman wanted to emphasize again that the trial’s outcome was predictable and that the two anarchists were considered dangerous to the state and its current war policies. Consequently, it was only possible to claim in his last speech, that even prison would not silence himself nor Goldman, who intended to continue to speak up against the exploitation of young conscripts, the American workers, and everyone else who were exploited by the American government.

The prosecutor, Assistant District Attorney Harold A. Content, eventually declared: “When I [propose] this sentence I am [doing] it on the one hand with regret that these abilities were not better used. I impose it on the other hand with the profound conviction that I am speaking for organized law, for the kind of liberty that we know and we understand ...[and the women and men] who have been

³⁵ James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (New York: B. W. Huebsch 1916).

³⁶ Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 96.

³⁷ “Government to End All Anarchy Here,” in *The New York Times*, June 17, 1917, 7.

³⁸ Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 97. Even Assistant United States District Attorney Harold A. Content admitted the defendants eloquence and rhetoric skills. See: Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, *U.S. v Goldman and Berkman*, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 14, 2.

³⁹ Alexander Berkman’s Closing Speech, *U.S. v Goldman and Berkman*, 1917, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 15, 15 and 57. Also see: “Anarchists Close Their Defense,” *New York Times*, July 7, 1917: 10.

privileged to live in this country that we believe is a true democracy.”⁴⁰ Following their conviction the two anarchists were sentenced to the maximum fine of \$10,000 each and two years’ imprisonment.⁴¹ Content brought the case further to the attention of the commissioner of labor who determined whether Berkman and Goldman could be deported. New legal powers given to the government under the Immigration Act of 1917 allowed for the speedy deportation of anarchist immigrants.⁴² While Berkman was sent to a penitentiary in Atlanta, Georgia, Goldman was sent to a facility in Jefferson City, Missouri.⁴³ On her way to prison, Goldman – in the form of a pamphlet directed to the readers of *Mother Earth* and the wider American public – highlighted the achievements of the Bolsheviks in Russia, and her last words before going to prison for two years were written in support and “in appreciation of their glorious work and their inspiration in awakening Bolshevism in America.”⁴⁴ For the suppressed anarchist, the Bolshevik alternative in Russia represented the only form of liberty that was also to be achieved in the United States by a Communist revolution. Goldman wrote:

The Bolsheviks have no imperialistic designs. They have libertarian plans, and those that understand the principles of liberty do not want to annex other peoples and other countries. Indeed, the true libertarian does not want even to annex other individuals, for he knows that so long as a single nation, people or individual is enslaved, he too is in danger. That is why the Bolsheviks demand a peace without annexations and without indemnities. They do not feel ethically called upon to live up to the obligations incurred by the Tsar, the Kaiser or other imperialistic gentlemen.⁴⁵

Goldman highlighted things she rather assumed than knew at the time and painted a too idealistic image of bolshevism and Lenin’s achievements. However, once released from prison the two anarchists, together with some hundred other radicals, were deported and forced into exile in Soviet Russia and found out that almost nothing matched their idealistic image of bolshevism.

⁴⁰ Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, *U.S. v Goldman and Berkman*, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 14, 93.

⁴¹ Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, *U.S. v Goldman and Berkman*, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 14, 92–93; “Affirms Sentence on Emma Goldman,” *New York Times*, January 15, 1918: 10.

⁴² Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 62.

⁴³ “Reds Coming From Prison,” *New York Times*, June 26, 1917: 6.

⁴⁴ Emma Goldman, “The Truth About the Bolsheviks,” *New York Times*, 1918, accessed October 30, 2017, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/truthaboutbol.html.

⁴⁵ Goldman, “The Truth About the Bolsheviks.”

Deportation and Forced Exile

While the radicals were in prison, the government prepared for their deportation. The Southern District of New York judge Julius M. Mayer was assigned to hear the deportation case. The “radical attorney” Harry Weinberger⁴⁶ attempted to save at least Goldman from deportation, claiming that she was a naturalized American citizen due to her marriage to Jacob A. Kershner in 1887.⁴⁷ However, proving her naturalization seemed to be especially difficult as the ensuing dialogue between Weinberger and the Court attests:

Weinberger: Emma Goldman married the said Jacob Kershner, I believe in the year 1887.

The Court: Does the record say where?

Mr. Weinberger: In the City of Rochester.

The Court: And is the exact date given or just the year?

Mr. Weinberger: February 1887. I do not think we have the exact date.

The Court: Was the marriage –

Mr. Weinberger: By a rabbi.

The Court: Was it recorded in any way?

Mr. Weinberger: I do not believe so.⁴⁸

Eventually, Goldman and Berkman were sentenced to be deported to Soviet Russia. Although the anarchists and their attorney claimed this would be impossible to enforce as the United States did not yet have diplomatic relations with the Bolshevik government,⁴⁹ their arguments did not alter the court’s judgment:

The Court views both of these defendants as enemies of the United States of America and of its peace and comfort. The defendant Berkman has a criminal record that began with his attempt to assassinate Mr. Frick. At the beginning of the war, both of these defendants sought to injure the United States by preventing the carrying out of the Selective Service Draft Law. They were convicted, and their conviction was sustained. They did everything they could to destroy the welfare, the stability and the integrity of this Government.⁵⁰

Goldman and Berkman were confined to Ellis Island where they awaited their deportation. There, with the support of other convicted radicals with whom they had

⁴⁶ Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 73.

⁴⁷ Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Stenographer’s Minutes, December 8, 1919, ABC-TAM, Box 1, Folder 3, 28.

⁴⁸ Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, 30.

⁴⁹ Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, 19; “Emma Goldman to Fight,” *New York Times*, September 29, 1919: 5.

⁵⁰ Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, 68.

to wait, they established a handwritten weekly journal⁵¹ and worked on their last message to the American public.⁵² In it, the two anarchists declared, that “[l]iberty is dead, and white terror on top dominates the country” while “[f]ree speech is a thing of the past.”⁵³ They argued that their deportation was related to the fear the Russian Revolution had evoked within the hearts and minds of the American elites – especially those in the financial world. That ideas like the “dictatorship of the proletariat” or workers’ councils “should threaten the rich men of this free country is intolerable. Nothing must be left undone to prevent such a calamity. It would be terrible to be put on a level with the common laborer,” and therefore “Bolshevik ways and Soviet ideas must gain no foothold in America.”⁵⁴ Goldman’s case in particular seemed to prove further that even citizens could no longer be in favor of such ideas.⁵⁵

Regardless of such protests, the 248 men and 3 women – Ethel Bernstein and Dora Lipkin, along with Goldman – were placed aboard a naval vessel for an as yet unknown destination.⁵⁶ Uncertainty was not the worst aspect of the journey. The three women shared a cabin but were not allowed to see the men, who had to share three cabins between them. In Berkman’s cabin there lived forty-eight men, and there was more to complain about: “2 inches of water on the floor, everything wet. No steam heat. Food at first so-so; now rotten.”⁵⁷ Eventually, the deportees were told about their destination: “After 20 days of anxiety ...we have, at last, found out – unofficially – where we are bound. It is to be Libau [Liepāja] ...and there we will be turned over to Soviet Russia.”⁵⁸ In contrast to the recent experi-

51 An issue of the *Ellis Island Anarchist Weekly* can be found in Miscellaneous Manuscripts, Joseph A. Labadie Collection, Special Collections Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

52 Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, “Deportation: Its Meaning and Menace – Last Message to the People of America,” *Ellis Island*, NY, December 1919, Alexander Berkman Papers, International Institute of Social History (henceforth ABP-IISH), No. 126. The handwritten pamphlet was finished on December 20, 1919, one day before the deportation began.

53 Berkman and Goldman, “Deportation,” 13.

54 Berkman and Goldman, “Deportation,” 26–27.

55 Berkman and Goldman, “Deportation,” 51.

56 Alexander Berkman to Eleanor Fitzgerald, On the Way Somewhere, U.S. Transp. Buford, January 9, 1920, in: Letters from Berkman, U.S. Transport Buford, January 3–13, 1920, ABP-IISH N. 127. The US transport ship *Buford*, an “old leaky tub,” initially appeared to the exiles like a “M[y]stery Ship.” Alexander Berkman, “The Log of the Transport Buford,” in: *The Liberator* (April 1920): 9–12, in: ABP-IISH No. 127.

57 Alexander Berkman to Eleanor Fitzgerald, On the Way Somewhere, U.S. Transp. Buford, January 3, 1920, in Letters from Berkman, U.S. Transport Buford, January 3–13, 1920, ABP-IISH No. 127.

58 Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman to Comrades, On Board the U.S. Transport Buford, January 10, 1920, in Letters from Berkman, U.S. Transport Buford, January 3–13, 1920, ABP-IISH No. 127, 1.

ences of the people on board, Russia seemed to be a much more promising destination, as the dichotomous description of the two countries in a letter by Goldman and Berkman to their American comrades showed:

Thus has the great United States Government treated the men against whom no crime was charged, but who were merely accused of entertaining ideals of human brotherhood. Not even at the height of the war did America treat actual alien enemies with such utter barbarity.... [In contrast] [p]oor Russia, bled and starved, blockaded and besieged, is not yet dead. But she is still ...strong in spirit, Russia defies the world of greed and sham, and holds her own against the combined power of the international conspiracy of murder and robbery. Russia, the incarnation of a planning ideal, the inspiration of the New Day.⁵⁹

The deported radicals were eventually brought to Finland, where a meeting with representatives of the Soviet government was arranged.⁶⁰ It seemed as if the anarchists had finally found a new home that would appreciate their revolutionary potential.

From Soviet Utopia to Another Exile

The experience of Goldman and Berkman in Soviet Russia revealed that the reality of bolshevism was anything but the classless utopia for which the American radicals had hoped. Initially, Goldman was full of praise for Russia. In a letter to Elizabeth Gurley Flynn (1890–1964) dated 10 January 1920, she expressed hope for her new Russian life: “Faint in body, yet strong in spirit, Russia defies the world of greed and sham, and holds her own against the combined power of the international conspiracy of murder and robbery. Russia [is] the incarnation of a flaming ideal, the inspiration of the New Day.”⁶¹ Yet in an interview recorded just a few months after her arrival, Goldman’s view had changed; she pointed out the tyranny that Bolshevik rule had established in Russia:

We always knew the Marxian theory was impossible, a breeder of tyranny. We blinded ourselves to its faults in America because we believed it might accomplish something. I’ve been here four months now, and I’ve seen what it has accomplished. There is no health in it. The

59 Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman to Comrades, On Board the U.S. Transport Buford, January 10, 1920, in *Letters from Berkman*, U.S. Transport Buford, January 3–13, 1920, ABP-IISH No. 127, 6–9.

60 “Bolsheviki Admit All Deported Reds,” in *New York Times*, January 21, 1920: 17.

61 Emma Goldman to Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, January 10, 1920, in Elizabeth Gurley Flynn papers, Wisconsin State Historical Society, cited in Harold J. Goldberg, “Goldman and Berkman View the Bolshevik Regime,” in *The Slavonic and East European Review* 53, no. 131 (1975): 273.

State of Socialism or State of Capitalism ...has done for Russia what it will do for every country. It has taken away even the little freedom th[at] man has under individual capitalism and has made him entirely subject to the whims of bureaucracy which excuses its tyranny on the ground it all [has] done for the welfare of the workers.⁶²

It took Goldman and Berkman quite some time to fully disentangle their utopian ideals and hopes from the realities of the Russian Revolution.⁶³ They had to adjust to their new life in Russia. Goldman in particular had problems with this process. In a later letter to Arthur Ross, she described her deportation from the United States as having caused a caesura in her life: "Misery [. . .] has been mine [ever] since."⁶⁴ It was the "portent of Kronstadt"⁶⁵ that made them change their minds and start to criticize the Bolsheviks openly, once they had left Soviet Russia for another forced exile. At Kronstadt, a rebellion against bolshevism had begun and the protesters demanded a return to the ideals of the February Revolution and the re-establishment of the council system in late February 1921. The Bolshevik leadership, however, was not willing to negotiate with the rebels and instead violently crushed the uprising with the Red Army under Leon Trotsky's command in mid-March.⁶⁶

62 "Emma Goldman Sees Tyranny in Russia," in *New York Times*, June 18, 1920: 7.

63 For a detailed discussion of their perspective on the Russian Revolution see: Frank Jacob, "From Aspiration to Frustration: Emma Goldman's Perception of the Russian Revolution," in *American Communist History* 17, no. 2 (2018): 185–199; Frank Jacob, "Anarchism and the Perversion of the Russian Revolution: The Accounts of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman," in *Diacronie* 33, 1 (2018): <https://doi.org/10.4000/diacronie.7405>; Frank Jacob, "Der Anarchismus und die Russische Revolution – Emma Goldman und Alexander Berkman im Kampf gegen den Bolschewismus," in *Ne znam: Zeitschrift für Anarchismusforschung* 7 (2018): 3–66; Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution*. For a discussion of their experiences in Russia see Paul Avrich and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012, 291–323.

64 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St. Tropez, October 10, 1929, in Emma Goldman Papers, Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Archives, New York (henceforth EGP-TAM), Box 1, Folder 4.

65 Helmut Bock, "Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921," in Helmut Bock et al., *Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921 – Kriegskommunismus und Alternativen* (Berlin: Pankower Vorträge, 2011), 5–20. For a more detailed discussion and evaluation of the Kronstadt Rebellion see: Paul Avrich, *Kronstadt 1921* (New York: Norton, 1974 [1970]).

66 For more detailed studies see Alexander Berkman, *The Kronstadt Rebellion* (Berlin: Der Syndikalist 1922), accessed May 20, 2020, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/alexander-berkman-the-kronstadt-rebellion#toc8>; Robert V. Daniels, "The Kronstadt Revolt of 1921: A Study in the Dynamics of Revolution," in *The American Slavic and East European Review* 10, no. 4 (1951): 241–254; David A. Longley, "Some Historiographical Problems of Bolshevik Party History: The Kronstadt Bolsheviks in March 1917," in *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, Neue Folge* 22, no. 4 (1974): 494–514; J. Neu-

Goldman and Berkman soon began to publish their evaluations of Bolshevik rule in Soviet Russia and confessed their own disillusionment. Their hopes of February 1917 had been buried by the consequences of the “Red October,” and Lenin had established nothing more than a new regime in the form of a Bolshevik, that is, perverted Marxist state.⁶⁷ Berkman expressed his sadness about these developments and at the same time highlighted that it had taken him much energy to come to this conclusion:

I admit, I did not want to be convinced that the Revolution in Russia had become a mirage, a dangerous deception. Long and hard I struggled against this conviction. Yet proofs were accumulating, and each day brought more damning testimony. Against my will, against my hopes, against the holy fire of admiration and enthusiasm for Russia which burned within me, I was convinced – convinced that the Russian Revolution had been done to death.⁶⁸

Goldman drew similar conclusions while noting that anarchists especially had helped Lenin to achieve and then stay in power: “Throughout Russia the Anarchists worked with and for the Bolsheviks in the belief that they were advancing the cause of the Revolution. But the devotion and zeal of the Anarchists in no way deterred the Communists from relentlessly persecuting the Anarchist movement.”⁶⁹ Regardless of the initial joy anarchists must have felt about the Russian Revolution,⁷⁰ the situation in Soviet Russia left no doubt that the “Bolsheviks [were] the Jesuit order in the Marxian Church” and that “it was the internal policies of the Bolshevik State that alienated the Russian people from the revolution and filled them with hatred of everything emanating from it.”⁷¹ The two anarchists left Soviet Russia voluntarily in December 1921. They began a new period of exile in different European countries (starting in Sweden), during which time they publicly

mann, “A Note on the Winter of the Kronstadt Sailors’ Uprising in 1921,” in *Soviet Studies* 44, no. 1 (1992): 153–154.

⁶⁷ Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, “Bolsheviks Shooting Anarchists,” in *Freedom* 36, no. 391 (1922): 4; Alexander Berkman, *The Russian Tragedy: A Review and An Outlook* (Berlin: Syndikalist, 1922); Emma Goldman, *The Crushing of the Russian Revolution* (London: Freedom Press, 1922), University of Warwick, Library Special Collections, JD 10.P6 PPC 1684; Emma Goldman, *My Disillusionment in Russia* (New York: Doubleday, 1923); Alexander Berkman, *The Bolshevik Myth* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1925).

⁶⁸ Berkman, *The Russian Tragedy*, 8.

⁶⁹ Goldman, *My Disillusionment in Russia*, 205.

⁷⁰ Bini Adamczak, *Der schönste Tag im Leben des Alexander Berkman: Vom womöglichen Gelingen der Russischen Revolution* (Münster: Edition Assemblage, 2017).

⁷¹ Goldman, *The Crushing of the Russian Revolution*, 7.

criticized Lenin and his Bolshevik regime.⁷² Goldman reported the things she had found in Russia in many different forms, be it at events at which she spoke or in longer pamphlets, book manuscripts or articles:

I found a small political group – the Communist Party – in absolute control.... Labour conscripted, driven to work like chattel-slaves, arrested for the slightest infringement ...the peasants a helpless prey to punitive expeditions and forcible food collection ...the Soviets ...made subservient to the Communist State ...a sinister organisation, known as the “Cheka” (Secret service and executioners of Russia), suppressing thought ...the prisons and concentration camps overcrowded with men and women ...for opinion’s sake ...Russia in wr[a]ck and ruin, presided over by a bureaucratic State, incompetent and inefficient to reconstruct the country and to help the people realise their high hopes and their great ideals.⁷³

During their self-imposed second exile, the two American radicals found themselves waging a two-front battle against both American capitalism and Soviet bolshevism.

Regardless of the fact that these two eminent anarchists had firsthand knowledge of Soviet Russia and its political system, it was hard for them to generate support for their anti-Bolshevik agenda among other leftists whose well-known representatives, like Bertrand Russell (1872–1970) or Roger N. Baldwin (1884–1981), were unwilling to openly criticize the only self-proclaimed communist government

72 Berkman/Goldman, “Bolsheviks Shooting Anarchists.” After having spent time in Sweden and Germany together, yet at different places, Goldman moved to Great Britain and Berkman stayed in Germany, before both reunited some years later in France. Alexander Berkman to Michael A. Cohen, Stockholm, February 12, 1922, in Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research (henceforth MCP-YIVO), New York, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 2. For details on their living situation in Berlin see: Alexander Berkman to Michael A. Cohen, Berlin, April 13, 1922, in MCP-YIVO, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder. That the two began immediately after their departure from Russia to become active critics of Bolshevism can be highlighted by the following quote from a letter by Alexander Berkman to Eleanor Fitzgerald on Stockholm on February 10, 1922: “Enclosed herewith an article – a rather long one. It is a complete review and an outlook in re[gards to] Russia. I have tried to do careful work. Every quotation is correct. Every fact verified. I do not want this for the Freie Arb[eiter] St[imme]. I am very anxious to have this appear in English.... May be [sic] the Nation would take it, to be published in two installments, perhaps. If you can induce the Editor to read it, I think he’d be interested. I do not want it to appear in any out and out capitalistic paper. As for the liberal press, use your own judgement, for I am very eager to have it appear in English. Of course, nothing must be changed. I permit no editorial corrections whatever on my work. But you know all that, dear. – The Forward would probably take it, except the last part, especially the criticism of Marxism. I am afraid that if they take the whole, they might on the quiet change my Marxian attacks. I do not trust Cahan or the others in such matters. At any rate, I want at least \$250.00 for this article, whoever takes it. But that, too, is left in your hands.” Alexander Berkman to Eleanor Fitzgerald, Stockholm, February 10, 1922, in: MCP-YIVO, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 1.

73 Emma Goldman, “What I saw in Russia,” EGP-IISH, No. 284.

at the time. Berkman's publication *Bolshevik Myth* only sold one thousand copies by June 1926.⁷⁴ Goldman's attempts to work against bolshevism in Britain were not successful, as she was unable to attract large crowds for her lectures about Soviet Russia. After establishing the British Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners in Russian Prisons in February 1925,⁷⁵ the famous American anarchist had considerable difficulties recruiting members for it. Goldman tried to persuade Bertrand Russell to lend his name to the committee, but he seemed uninterested. On February 9, 1925, Goldman wrote to him: "I appeal to you, Mr. Russell, if you do not want to ally yourself with me, that is of course your right, but do not remain silent in the face of such wrongs as are being perpetrated every day by the Cheka and by those in power in the Russian Government."⁷⁶ Russell, however, remained adamant. He explained his reluctance in detail a few days later:

I am prepared to ...protest to the Soviet Government, on documented statements as to the existing evils; ... But I am not prepared to advocate any alternative government in Russia: I am persuaded that the casualties would be at least as great under any other party. And I do not regard the abolition of all government as a thing which has any chance of being brought about in our lifetimes or during the twentieth century. I am therefore unwilling to be associated with any movement which might seem to imply that a change of Government is desirable in Russia.⁷⁷

It must have been particularly sad for Goldman to learn that her name did not any longer carry weight within the international leftist movement. Her exile had weakened her ties to the United States, while Soviet Russia had not offered her the life for which she had hoped. She confronted growing criticism over her writings about the Bolsheviks' rule.

Ben Reitman (1879–1942), Goldman's former manager and lover, sent her a particularly bitter letter on 10 July 1925, after he had read her and Berkman's works on Russia. In it, he expressed his compassion for the Bolsheviks, who had rejected the two anarchists. Reitman wrote:

Your first book on Russia left me sympathetic to Russia. I felt that Russia gave you a chance in the world, that they put themselves out to let you and Sasha work and be helpful but true to yourselves. YOU WERE AS YOU ALWAYS WERE HARD* CRITICAL* BITTER* SELFDETERMINED* UNWILLING TO FALL IN WITH NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY* ...What I am trying to say [is] that you and Sasha wanted your way (and that is characteristic of the ANTI-Mind) and refused to work for God, for society, for humanity or whatever you may call it,

⁷⁴ Royalty Statement for Alexander Berkman, Boni & Liberight, June 30, 1926, ABP-IISH, No. 169.

⁷⁵ Emma Goldman to Alexander Berkman, London, February 5, 1925, ABP-IISH No. 23.

⁷⁶ Emma Goldman to Bertrand Russel, London, February 9, 1925, EGP-IISH, No. 144, 2.

⁷⁷ Bertrand Russel to Emma Goldman, London, February 14, 1925, EGP-IISH, No. 144, 2–3.

unless it was your way.... You are always knocking, kicking, criticizing, seeing the worst side of everything, whining until you have your reader HATING ...when I understood that the Bolshevik has to deal with minds like your[s] I was not surprised at the Kronstadt bombardment and Prisons [sic] and all the terrible [sic] things they did to the ANTIMINDS – yes you are a typical *antimind* you always oppose the thing that is.... How in the hell could the [B]olsheviks live and thrive if they allowed you and minds like you[rs] to have power.... Your and Sa[s] ha[s] books convince any thoughtful student that MINDS like your[s] will never permit the world to have anything that approaches Socialism or much less Anarchism. I think the Bolsheviks were kind to you and you were most unjust to them.⁷⁸

These insults must have felt harsh, especially since Goldman and Berkman had witnessed the postrevolutionary order in Soviet Russia, yet the information they could provide was rather considered a result of their emotional depression or their anarchist “antimind” than a true report about Lenin and the Soviet system. Consequently, few appeared willing to believe what Goldman had to say. She bemoaned the fact that too many stuck to the “really childish” idea that the Bolsheviks had established a dictatorship in the name of the workers and peasants.⁷⁹ Goldman had personally experienced the Bolshevik spell in Russia. While she endeavored to persuade left-wing comrades in Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States that the Russian Revolution, like many before, had failed, nobody wanted to listen to her arguments. Doing so would have meant accepting that another revolution had simply produced disaster. Goldman did not give up and emphasized the obvious again and again:

The Soviet Government with its experiment and method has had a most deteriorating and disintegrating effect both on revolutionary thinking and organization. In fact, it has poisoned the whole social and revolutionary movement. It has inculcated distrust, espionage and cynicism in the ranks of the masses unknown since the days of Jesuitism; it has discredited everything of any value ever fought for by revolutionary men and women the world over. To my mind, it has perverted revolutionary thinking and organization.⁸⁰

Conclusion

This chapter was not intended to detail all aspects related to the deportation of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, their exile in Russia and other European

⁷⁸ Ben Reitman to Emma Goldman, Chicago, Ill., July 10, 1925, EGP-IISH, No. 132, 1–2.

⁷⁹ Emma Goldman to Roger Baldwin, Norwich, April 20, 1925, Emma Goldman Papers, New York Public Library (henceforth EGP-NYPL), ZL-386, Reel 1, Letters, 1923–1928, 2.

⁸⁰ Excerpts from a letter from Emma Goldman to Roger Baldwin, November 1924, EGP-NYPL, ZL-386, Reel 1, Letters, 1923–1928, 2.

countries, their steady fight against Bolshevism after 1921–1922, and their attempts to use their knowledge while in exile to make the world a better place. It has shown, however, how the revolutionary process after 1917 created exile for Goldman and Berkman, when representatives of the politically radical spectrum, who supported the Russian Revolution in the United States during the last phase of World War I, were expelled. Criticisms of the new conscription law in combination with support for the supposed achievements of the Bolsheviks caused exile experiences for many radicals, even multiple ones in the case of the anarchists Goldman and Berkman. Once they arrived in Soviet Russia, they realized that the ideals of February 1917 had been corrupted by Lenin and his supporters, who had ended the council system and turned it into a centralized Bolshevik state and begun a witch hunt against anarchists, social revolutionaries, and everyone else who did not comply with Lenin's course of action. Due to this and the violent culmination at Kronstadt, the two exiles eventually left Soviet Russia again, looking for a home and a sense of belonging on the one hand, but above all for support with regard to their anti-Bolshevist activities on the other hand. It is tragic that they were not able to find both for a long time.

Being equipped with firsthand migrant knowledge about the Russian realities was not enough to persuade representatives and the “big names” of the international left to turn their backs on Lenin and his revolutionary achievements. The multiple postrevolutionary exiles of Goldman and Berkman must, therefore, have been extremely bitter. Berkman tried relentlessly to let people know what went wrong, especially from an anarchist perspective, to prevent similar mistakes from occurring in future revolutions:

Lenin's Marxism has completely triumphed in Russia, in so far as the establishment of an all-powerful Communist Party State is concerned. At the same time it has reduced itself ad absurdum by paralyzing the revolutionary development, initiative, and social activities of the people, with the result of being compelled to re-introduce capitalism. The dictatorship of a small minority cannot escape this vicious circle.⁸¹

Too late, their former friends and comrades, especially in the United States were willing to accept that Lenin had become “the sole dictator in Russia.”⁸² And when Joseph Stalin (1878–1953) took over the position of Soviet leader and corrupted the political system of the Soviet Union even further, Goldman argued that from its “very inception the Bolshevik dictatorship was over the proletariat and not of

⁸¹ Alexander Berkman, *A Few Words about Lenin and the Probable Effects of His Death*, January 26, 1924, ABP-IISH, No. 188.

⁸² Emma Goldman, *Dictatorship, Bolshevik and Fascist*, n.d., EGP-IISH, No. 209, 9.

the proletariat.”⁸³ The anarchists, and prominently among them Goldman and Berkman, were the first harsh critics of bolshevism. This position was also a consequence of their transnational experiences as exiles, who were able to witness the developments in Soviet Russia. That they were ignored by a majority of the international left was tragic, but their case remains important even a century later, as it highlights how the entanglement of transnational events, local politics, and information networks determined the exile experience of radicals and revolutionaries in the early twentieth century.

83 Goldman, *Dictatorship, Bolshevik and Fascist*, 10.

6 Emma Goldman and the United States: The History of a Love-Hate Relationship

America is the best proof that social tyranny and economic despotism are safest under the mask of political phrases. Never before in all history has a nation been so successfully oppressed and exploited in the very name of liberty, in the name of its own fictitious sovereignty. How make the blind see? That is the difficult problem that propagandists must face...¹

Emma Goldman, who arrived in the United States in 1885 and tried to "make the blind see" for decades, hated the United States as much as she loved it.² While many other Europeans shared a love-hate relationship based on their respective image of what it meant to be American, Goldman's views – on the US government, the US working class, and the latter's revolutionary potential – are particularly interesting, and not just for scholars interested in the history of anarchism in the US.³ Even today, she remains one of the country's most famous radicals, the "queen of anarchists."⁴ Goldman's texts were revived by the feminist movement in the second half of the twentieth century and a global anarchist movement

1 "Observations and Comments," *Mother Earth* 2, no. 2 (1907): 62. The author would like to thank the three anonymous reviewers for their invaluable comments to improve this article. It was first published in *Left History* 25, no. 2 (2023): <https://doi.org/10.25071/1913-9632.39673> and I would like to thank the editors for the possibility to include it in this book.

2 The main works on Goldman's life, in chronological order, are Richard Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982 [1961]); Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984); Kathy E. Ferguson, *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011); Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011); Paul and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012). When the present article refers to America or the United States, it must be emphasized that these terms refer to an image of the latter that was related to Goldman's evaluation or perception and not the historical realities. When it is said Goldman hated the US, this is often related to the existence of a capitalist and exploitative system she had suffered from, and in her case, her love was more or less dedicated to the people that surrounded her in the workers' or anarchist movements. Goldman herself seemed to be uncertain where and if the America she longed for actually existed. Therefore, the love-hate relationship reflected upon in the present article is one that refers to Goldman's ideas and perceptions about her life and experiences in the United States. For a more detailed analysis of Goldman's image of the US, see Anthony Ashbolt, "Love and Hate in European Eyes: Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman on America," *Australasian Journal of American Studies* 22, no. 1 (2003): 1–14.

3 Ashbolt, "Love and Hate," 1.

4 Kathy E. Ferguson, "Discourses of Danger: Locating Emma Goldman," *Political Theory* 36, no. 5 (2008): 736; Carl Levy, "Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 126–127.

that was prematurely declared dead.⁵ Anthony Ashbolt's emphasis on individuals of the international left also applies to Goldman's view of the United States because "America, in the eyes of European socialists from the mid-nineteenth century on, could be both the promised land and hell-hole of exploitation and excess. For some it was one or the other, for many it was both, while some flitted between these perspectives, depending upon time and place."⁶ Naturally, in Goldman's case, her respective experiences contributed to her feelings towards the United States throughout (or during) certain periods of her life.

As a victim of the first "red scare" after the Russian Revolution of 1917, Goldman, who had criticized conscription and US participation in the First World War more generally, was deported in late 1919 and, due to restrictions by the US government, was, only allowed to return to her "home country" once for a lecture tour in 1934.⁷ Together with her fellow anarchist and lifelong companion Alexander Berkman, Goldman was "waxing lyrical about the possibilities of liberty, while at the same time recoiling from the horrors of American capitalism."⁸ In addition, the female anarchist, who had initially been radicalized in New York, held high hopes for a revolution in the United States, especially after the successful Russian example of 1917. Although born in Czarist Russia, she considered herself to be an American anarchist and, in a way, was heartbroken that she had to spend the rest of her life abroad.⁹ She was nevertheless unwilling to admit that she missed her life as a famous anarchist in the United States.

On 23 October 1920, *The New York Times* reported on the "Discontent of Emma Goldman," who, when interviewed by a representative of the newspaper in Soviet Russia, "had a tiny American flag in her room and was enthusiastic about the United States, to which she desired to return. In fact, she had been spoiled in America and became soft. In America she was regarded as a little god in her circles, but when she arrived in Russia she was forced to discover that quite a different spirit reigned there; specifically, that the proletarian movement had left her far be-

5 Andrew Cornell, *Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the Twentieth Century* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2016), 71.

6 Ashbolt, "Love and Hate," 1.

7 Frank Jacob, "The Russian Revolution, the American Red Scare, and the Forced Exile of Transnational Anarchists: Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and their Soviet Experience," *Yearbook of Transnational History* 4 (2021): 113–134 (see chapter 5 in this volume); Erika J. Pribanic-Smith and Jared Schroeder, *Emma Goldman's No-Conscription League and the First Amendment* (New York: Routledge, 2019); "Entry Permitted to Emma Goldman: Anarchist Deported in 1919 Wins Authority for 90-Day Visit with Relatives," *Special to The New York Times*, January 10, 1934: 23.

8 Ashbolt, "Love and Hate," 1.

9 On her years in exile see Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).

hind.”¹⁰ This report continues with an emphasis on Goldman’s realization that the Russian utopia was not in any way close to her life in the US: “In America her way of living was certainly not proletarian, but for many years comfortably bourgeois. And now, in proletarian Russia, where the shortage forces everyone to the greatest restrictions, she suddenly had to give up many comforts and to be content with the meagre rations of the Russian people.”¹¹

Goldman herself would comment on such reports, highlighting her ambivalence toward the US in a letter to her niece Stella in early November 1920 as follows:

That I long for America is quite true, but let no one think it is the America of ... reaction, the America which is robbing and exploiting the people, the America which has sacrificed her ablest youth on the fields of France ... for profits and for the strengthening of her Imperialist power. The America I long for is the one of my beloved people, of my numerous devoted friends – of my brave comrades, the America where I have ... struggled for 30 years to awaken a real understanding for liberty among the masses and a deep love for what is worth while and true in the country. I do indeed long for that America. ... I have not and shall not change my attitude towards capitalist America. I shall fight it always. As to the America[n] government both stupid and brutal, nothing can change my hatred for it.¹²

Goldman consequently seems to have loved the American working class and other radical intellectuals, especially her friends, but hated the US government at the same time. Her view toward the United States was consequently as ambivalent as her position toward the Russian Revolution; she loved the revolution as it was initially and ideally represented by the Russian people, but hated the ensuing corruption by Lenin and the Bolsheviks, whom she would later attack for their role in the perversion of the ideals of February 1917.¹³

¹⁰ “Confirms Discontent of Emma Goldman,” *New York Times*, October 23, 1920: 10.

¹¹ “Confirms Discontent of Emma Goldman.”

¹² Emma Goldman to [Stella Cominsky] and [M.E. Fitzgerald], Petrograd, November 3, 1920, Papers of Leon Malmed and Emma Goldman, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, MC 332; M-88 (henceforth LMP), Folder 26, 1–2.

¹³ For a more detailed description of Goldman’s views about the Russian Revolution see her works *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution* (Berlin: Der Syndikalist, 1922), *My Disillusionment in Russia* (New York: Doubleday, 1923), accessed May 20, 2020, <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-disillusionment-in-russia>, and *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1924), accessed May 10, 2020, <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-further-disillusionment-in-russia>. Also see Emma Goldman, “What I Saw,” Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth EGP-IISH), No. 284.

The following article, which in a way further broadens the view on Goldman beyond purely biographical works and adds to the more specialized research of the last few years that focus on aspects of the anarchist's life and impact, intends to provide an analysis of Goldman's love-hate relationship with the United States. This analysis begins with Goldman's radicalization as a young immigrant, whose hopes and dreams for a better life could not be fulfilled in the "New World," causing her to turn to anarchism.¹⁴ Regardless of the transnational nature of the anarchist movement of the late nineteenth century and the genuine or at least theoretical anti-nationalism of the political left, including American anarchists, Goldman had developed a sense of belonging to the US, which, however, would be destroyed by an experience of forced exile.¹⁵ Therefore, Goldman's anti-state activities, leading to the climax of her struggles during the First World War and her eventual deportation to Soviet Russia in late 1919, must also be taken into consideration to illustrate which personal experiences would stimulate her anarchist's anti-American attitude in the years after 1920. Lastly, the article will demonstrate

¹⁴ These works include, among others, Donna M. Kowal, *Tongue of Fire: Emma Goldman, Public Womanhood, and the Sex Question* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2016); Erika J. Pribanic-Smith and Jared Schroeder, *Emma Goldman's No-Conscription League and the First Amendment* (New York: Routledge, 2019); Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution: From Admiration to Frustration* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2020); Rachel Hui-Chi Hsu, *Emma Goldman, Mother Earth, and the Anarchist Awakening* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2021); Frank Jacob, "An Anarchist Revolution? Emma Goldman as an Intellectual Revolutionary," *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 15, no. 2 (2021): 29–48 (see chapter 2 in this volume); Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman: Identitäten einer Anarchistin* (Leipzig: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2022).

¹⁵ Constance Bantman, "Internationalism without an International? Cross-Channel Anarchist Networks, 1880–1914," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 84, no. 4 (2006): 961–981; Constance Bantman and Bert Altena, "Introduction: Problematizing Scales of Analysis in Network-Based Social Movements," in *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies*, eds. Constance Bantman and Bert Altena (London/New York: Routledge, 2014), 3–22; Constance Bantman, "The Dangerous Liaisons of Belle Epoque Anarchists: Internationalism, Transnationalism, and Nationalism in the French Anarchist Movement (1880–1914)," in *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies*, eds. Constance Bantman and Bert Altena (London/New York: Routledge, 2014), 174–192; Frank Jacob and Mario Keßler, "Transatlantic Radicalism: A Short Introduction," in *Transatlantic Radicalism: Socialist and Anarchist Exchanges in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, eds. Frank Jacob and Mario Keßler (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2021), 1–20. In reality, the theoretical antagonism between nationalism and the political left was often not really antagonistic when one considers the political realities. On this crux, see, among others, Ephraim Nimni, *Marxism and Nationalism: Theoretical Origins of a Political Crisis* (London: Pluto Press, 1991); Stefan Berger and Angel Smith, eds., *Nationalism, Labour and Ethnicity 1870–1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999). See also some individual perspectives on these issues as gathered and presented in Vivian Gornick, *The Romance of American Communism* (London: Verso, 2020).

how far Goldman's anti-American views, which should be understood here first and foremost as anti-state, anti-governmental, and anti-capitalist (which have been deemed particularly interesting by other scholars before) were also related to her own experience as an expelled radical, cut off from her friends and political audiences.¹⁶ I will also explain how Goldman's fading status as an important intellectual in the US was related to the overall decline of anarchism in the aftermath of the First World War, although the female anarchist herself must have either not recognized or not accepted this fact, which eventually left her even more bitter in her evaluation of the US, or at least what she considered the country and its government to be. The article thus connects Goldman's personal experiences with the development of her anti-American criticism and shows the extent to which her emotional sorrows stimulated the latter.

Radicalization in America

Goldman left Czarist Russia with her half-sister Helena to search for a new and better life in the United States in 1885. In her later autobiography *Living My Life* (1931), she stated that "All that had happened in my life until that time was now left behind me, cast off like a worn-out garment. A new world was before me, strange and terrifying. But I had youth, good health, and a passionate ideal. Whatever the new [world] held in store for me, I was determined to meet unflinchingly."¹⁷ Carrying nothing more than five dollars, a small handbag, and a sewing machine, Goldman when she arrived in New York City in 1889, was full of hope and anticipated living the "American dream" as it was reported repeatedly in all corners of her part of the world, which French scholars Alain Brossat and Sylvia Klingberg referred to as "Revolutionary Yiddishland."¹⁸ Her dreams, like those of many other Jewish immigrants, were shattered by the US garment industry. With her sister, Goldman had initially moved to Rochester, New York and worked

16 Anthony Ashbolt, for example, stated, "The dialectic of love and hate reflected in early writings and in correspondence between Goldman, Berkman and others, is a fascinating instance of the European radical imagination coming to grips with a society itself full of contradictions." Ashbolt, "Love and Hate," 2.

17 Emma Goldman, *Living My Life* (New York: Knopf, 1931), accessed December 17, 2018, <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-living-my-life>.

18 Alain Brossat and Sylvia Klingberg, *Revolutionary Yiddishland: A History of Jewish Radicalism*, transl. by David Fernbach (London/New York: Verso, 2016). For an example of the stories about the unlimited wealth of the United States see Michael L. Zlatovski, "A Russian Chronicle," Michael L. Zlatovski Papers, Immigration History Research Center Archives, University of Minnesota, IHRC2914, 4 and 32.

in a factory. In 1887, she married Jacob Kershner, "an attractive young man," who had immigrated to the United States from Odessa six years before. The relationship, however, did not develop well, and Goldman took a bold and, for her times, radical step when she requested a divorce. In this quite desperate personal situation, the anarchist later claimed that she "was [only] saved from utter despair by my interest in the Haymarket events."¹⁹ The so-called Haymarket tragedy was one part of Goldman's radicalization process or what Candace Falk called Goldman's "political birth."²⁰ Her "strong emotional reaction to the execution of the Haymarket anarchists"²¹ raised Goldman's political awareness, and the anarchist's sleep was still disturbed by the memory even two years after the execution of the anarchists in Chicago.²² On the other hand, her political radicalization intensified as a result of her exploitative experience working in the US garment industry. An experience that was drastically different from the America she had anticipated: "America with its huge factories, the pedaling of a machine for ten hours a day at two dollars fifty a week."²³

The experience of a shattered dream in combination with the Haymarket affair, a "crime against the US working class," led Goldman toward anarchism. This naturally presented "a releasing and liberating force because it [taught] people to rely on their own possibilities, [taught] them faith in liberty, and inspire[d] men and women to strive for a state of social life where everyone [could] be free and secure."²⁴ Goldman came into contact with leading anarchist figures after she moved to New York City, especially when she became part of the radical German milieu, which was dominated by anarchists and socialists who had left Europe in response to Bismarck's anti-socialist repression.²⁵ These anarchists pointed

19 Goldman, *Living My Life*. The failed marriage might have had a long-term impact on the young woman, who would later also become an activist against women's exploitation in general, and marriage in particular. See Donna M. Kowal, "Anarcha-Feminism," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 265–279.

20 Candace Falk, "Introduction," in Emma Goldman, *Living My Life: An Autobiography* (Salt Lake City, UT: Peregrine Smith, 1982 [1931]),

21 Martha Solomon, *Emma Goldman* (Boston, MA: Twayne Publishers, 1987), 1.

22 Goldman, *Living My Life*. See also Emma Goldman, "On the Road," *Mother Earth* 2, no. 3 (1907): 128–131. Also see Paul Avrich, *The Haymarket Tragedy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984).

23 Emma Goldman, "An Anarchist Looks at Life," text of a speech by Emma Goldman, held at Foyle's twenty-ninth literary luncheon (London, UK), March 1, 1933, EGP-IISH, no. 191, 4–5.

24 Goldman, "An Anarchist Looks at Life," 5.

25 Emma Goldman, "The American Labor Movement," n.d., EGP-IISH, No. 190, 1. On that radical German milieu see Tom Goyens, *Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880–1914* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007); Tom Goyens, "Johann Most

their finger at the hypocrisy of the American dream and, as historian Blaine McKinley stated, “[l]iving and thinking beyond convention, they offered a unique viewpoint on their times and experienced tensions that illuminated American society. Uncomfortable with the present, they remained torn between the simpler past and the possible future.”²⁶ Most prominent among Goldman’s contacts were Alexander Berkman and the German immigrant Johann Most, who acted as a mentor during her first anarchist activities and was eager to turn the young woman into a successful public speaker.²⁷ Most, who was referred to as the “the king bee of anarchists” by the *Pittsburgh Post*, was the leading anarchist of New York City’s Lower East Side, where “foreign” anarchists dominated the radical milieu of the metropolis.²⁸ Most edited the anarchist newspaper *Freiheit*, and his public speeches proved that he “could electrify audiences with his fiery oratory.”²⁹ He became Goldman’s idol relatively quickly, and it did not take long before the latter was one of “the newly converted who became enthusiastic proclaimers of the anarchist worldview.”³⁰ Goldman’s involvement in anarchist activities, like public speeches and protests against the exploitation of the US working people by industrial plutocrats or the government, made her well-known across the country, especially since she was also regularly featured in press reports about anarchism and

and the German Anarchists,” in *Radical Gotham: Anarchism in New York City from Schwab’s Saloon to Occupy Wall Street*, ed. Tom Goyens (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2017), 12–32.

26 Blaine McKinley, “‘The Quagmires of Necessity’: American Anarchists and Dilemmas of Vocation,” *American Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (1982): 503–504. See also Blaine McKinley, “Anarchist Jeremiads: American Anarchists and American History,” *The Journal of American Culture* 6, no. 2 (1983): 75–84.

27 Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 274; Rudolf Rocker, “Zum Geleit,” in Emma Goldman, *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution* (Berlin: Der Syndikalist, 1922), 3–4; Solomon, *Emma Goldman*, 4–8. In Chapter 1 of *Living My Life*, Goldman wrote that she intentionally met with Most, whose German paper *Die Freiheit* she had read and whose articles about the events in Chicago must have inspired her: “My mind was made up. I would go to New York, to Johann Most. He would help me prepare myself for my new task.”

28 “Goldman’s Cry Against Society,” *Pittsburgh Post*, November 27, 1896, in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, eds. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 250. Also see Kowal, “Anarcha-Feminism,” 274; Kenyon Zimmer, *Immigrants against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America* (Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press, 2015), 2–3.

29 Bill Lynskey, “‘I Shall Speak in Philadelphia’: Emma Goldman and the Free Speech League,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 133, no. 2 (2009): 174.

30 Rocker, “Zum Geleit,” 4. On Most’s influence and relationship with Goldman, see also Edward de Grazia, “The Haymarket Bomb,” *Law and Literature* 18, no. 3 (2006): 296; Shari Rabin, “The Advent of a Western Jewess: Rachel Frank and Jewish Female Celebrity in 1890s America,” *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women’s Studies & Gender Issues* 22 (2011): 121; William O. Reichert, “Toward a New Understanding of Anarchism,” *The Western Political Quarterly* 20, no. 4 (1967): 861.

the political menace it supposedly represented in the United States during the late nineteenth century.³¹ Goldman, however, did not only point her criticism towards the US government or US capitalism, although especially racism seem to have vanished from her considerations about American society.³² As an anarchist, Goldman criticized nationalism and American patriotism, which she considered a possible reason for violent conflicts in the future:

We Americans claim to be a peace-loving people. We hate bloodshed; we are opposed to violence. Yet we go into spasms of joy over the possibility of projecting dynamite bombs from flying machines upon helpless citizens. We are ready to hang, electrocute, or lynch anyone, who, from economic necessity, will risk his own life in the attempt upon that of some industrial magnate. Yet our hearts swell with pride at the thought that America is becoming the most powerful nation on earth, and that she will eventually plant her iron foot on the necks of all other nations.³³

In her criticism of the United States, Goldman also often used Europe as a form of antagonist counter-draft, even though she had left her European home looking for better opportunities. This created a strange relationship between her and the "new home" she could only openly criticize due to the freedom the anarchist enjoyed on the western side of the Atlantic.³⁴ Moreover, European patriotism and nationalism were actually no less dangerous than the forms of leadership that Goldman criticized in the United States.

When Berkman tried to assassinate the industrialist Henry Clay Frick (1849–1919), who had sanctioned the use of violence against workers during the Homestead Strike in Homestead, Pennsylvania in 1892, Goldman explained the anarchist act by referring to Berkman's "belief that if the capitalists used Winchester rifles

31 Wexler, *Emma Goldman*, xv. See also Candace Falk, ed., *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History*, 3 vols. (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008–2012) for a collection of Goldman's writings during her "American years."

32 Kathy E. Ferguson, *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011), 211–212. For a broader survey of anarchist positions towards nationalism, see Uri Gordon, "Anarchism and Nationalism," in *Brill's Companion to Anarchism and Philosophy*, ed. Nathan J. Jun (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 196–215.

33 Emma Goldman, Speech in San Francisco, April 26, 1908, accessed December 10, 2021, <https://awpc.cattcenter.iastate.edu/2017/03/09/what-is-patriotism-april-26-1908>. For a broader debate of patriotism, see Goldman's text "Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty," in *Emma Goldman, Anarchism and Other Essays*, 2nd ed. (New York: Mother Earth, 1911), accessed December 10, 2021, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-anarchism-and-other-essays#toc7>.

34 Ashbolt, "Love and Hate," 2.

and bayonets on workingmen they should be answered with dynamite.”³⁵ In her autobiography, she also blamed Frick for causing the violence because of his “dictum to the workers: he would rather see them dead than concede to their demands, and he threatened to import Pinkerton detectives. The brutal bluntness of the account, the inhumanity of Frick towards the evicted mother, inflamed my mind. Indignation swept my whole being.”³⁶ Regardless of her anger about Berkman’s imprisonment, Goldman herself would soon share his fate when she was sentenced to spend one year at Blackwell’s Island Penitentiary following a speech she gave at New York’s Union Square on August 21, 1893, where similar to the Panic of the same year, anarchists demanded more protection for unemployed workers.³⁷ This, in turn, led to an anti-Goldman campaign in the press that argued that she had demanded workers to act violently against their exploitation by US capitalists.³⁸ Now, the radical woman would finish her apprenticeship and become a fully accepted member of the country’s anarchist milieu:

I knew from what Most had related to me about Blackwell’s Island that the prison was old and damp, the cells small, without light or water. I was therefore prepared for what was awaiting me. But the moment the door was locked on me, I began to experience a feeling of suffocation. In the dark I groped for something to sit on and found a narrow iron cot. Sudden exhaustion overpowered me and I fell asleep.³⁹

Goldman left the prison as some kind of celebrity and around 2,800 people gathered in New York City to celebrate her release.⁴⁰ Goldman’s nationwide lectures

35 On Frick, see Kenneth Warren, *Triumphant Capitalism: Henry Clay Frick and the Industrial Transformation of America* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996); Quentin R. Skrabec, *Henry Clay Frick: The Life of the Perfect Capitalist* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2010); Paul Krause, *The Battle for Homestead, 1890–1892: Politics, Culture, and Steel* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992); “Goldman’s Cry Against Society,” in *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, eds. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana/Chicago, IL: Illinois University Press, 2008), 249. Berkman was later sentenced to 22 years in prison, but was already released in 1906. Alexander Berkman, *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist* (New York: Mother Earth, 1912). After his time in prison, Berkman would join forces with Goldman again in their anarchist struggle for a better society. See Alexander Berkman, “A Greeting,” *Mother Earth* 1, no. 4 (1906). http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev1n4.html.

36 Goldman, *Living My Life*.

37 Goldman describes her prison experience in *Living My Life*, see esp. chap. 12. The anarchist Philip Grosser, who spent time at Blackwell’s Island Penitentiary during the First World War, later referred to it as “Uncle Sam’s Devil’s Island.” Philip Grosser, *Uncle Sam’s Devil’s Island: Experiences of a Conscientious Objector in America during the World War* (Boston, MA: Excelsior Press, 1933).

38 Lynskey, “I Shall Speak in Philadelphia,” 175.

39 Goldman, *Living My Life*, chap. 12.

40 Lynskey, “I Shall Speak in Philadelphia,” 175; Rabin, “The Advent of a Western Jewess,” 122.

now attracted a lot of people, and she toured the country to spread anarchist ideas and to attack the US government. The topics she would talk about in the following years were quite diverse, ranging from anarchism to birth control and the sexual liberation of women.

When President William McKinley was assassinated by Leon Czolgosz, a Polish-American anarchist in 1901, Goldman was immediately declared an enemy of the state, because the assassin had stated that he knew the famous female anarchist and killed McKinley because he was an enemy of the “good working people.”⁴¹ This also intensified the US perception of anarchism as a threat and turned anarchists into “foreign enemies” of the state and its government: “While many Americans considered anarchism a foreign problem and the United States immune from the litany of anarchist assassinations of European leaders and monarchs in the 1890s, President McKinley’s assassination pulled the United States into existing international efforts and the global conversation about how to combat anarchist violence.”⁴² Goldman was one of the figureheads of the anarchist movement, whose members and well-known representatives had often turned against the United States due to their experience of immigration, their anarchist and anti-capitalist ideals that were challenged by American industrialized labor conditions, and the shattering of ambitious dreams related to a stereotypical image about their “new home.” Consequently, they radicalized on American soil but were considered a foreign menace by the authorities. Goldman’s initial love for her “chosen home” turned into critical energy, which she expressed as an anarchist activist over three decades. The struggle between her and the US state would, however, reach its climax during the First World War, ending in Goldman’s deportation to Soviet Russia, an experience that further stimulated her anti-Americanism.

Against Conscription and the US State

When the US government declared that they would enter the First World War in April 1917, “the country went mad with patriotism,” while the conflict between anarchism and the state intensified. When a “German spy hunt became a radical witch hunt,” many socialists and anarchists went to jail, thereby following pacifist

⁴¹ “Assassin Czolgosz Is Executed at Auburn,” *New York Times*, October 30, 1901. See also Scott Miller, *The President and the Assassin: McKinley, Terror, and Emire at the Dawn of the American Century* (New York: Random House, 2011).

⁴² Julia Rose Kraut, “Global Anti-Anarchism: The Origins of Ideological Deportation and the Suppression of Expression,” *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 19, no. 1 (2012): 171.

and left war critics in other national contexts since 1914.⁴³ Since anarchism in particular was perceived as an alien menace, men like the young J. Edgar Hoover were willing to solve this problem once and for all, and Goldman and Berkman were soon targets of a state-led anti-anarchist campaign.⁴⁴ They were not willing to betray global working-class internationalism and they demanded a revolution against the war which, turned them into natural targets.

Two years before war became an official burden for American society, Goldman and Berkman, together with Bill Shatov, who in 1917 returned to Soviet Russia to support the revolutionary process there, published a manifesto in May 1915 against the defensive demands of many European left radicals. Together with many other anarchists who signed the manifesto, they resisted the nationalist wave that had taken over the US and other European countries alike.⁴⁵ In fact, the First World War drove a wedge into the international workers' movement in general and the anarchist movement in particular. While Pjotr Kropotkin, the famous Russian anarchist, demanded support for the war effort from Allied powers, other anarchists, such as Errico Malatesta in Italy, opposed any participation in the First World War.⁴⁶ The anarchists "claimed that the war only served to benefit the rich, and they linked conscription to other means by which elites denied the autonomy of working people."⁴⁷ In this way, they hardly stood a chance against

43 Alix Shulman, *To the Barricades: The Anarchist Life of Emma Goldman* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1971), 188–189; For a broader perspective on anarchism during the war, see Matthew S. Adams and Ruth Kinna, eds. *Anarchism, 1914–18: Internationalism, Anti-Militarism and War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017).

44 Hoover gathered material related to the two anarchists between 1917 and 1919. See "FBI File on Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman," IISH, ARCH01724.

45 In the US, left radicals, e.g. those responsible for the *Fraye Arbeter Shtime*, a Yiddish weekly paper in New York City, later also supported the US war effort, although its editor Saul Yanovsky had initially signed the manifesto. On the latter's role within New York's anarchist circles, see Kenyon Zimmer, "Saul Yanovsky and Yiddish Anarchism on the Lower East Side," in *Radical Gotham: Anarchism in New York City from Schwab's Saloon to Occupy Wall Street*, ed. Tom Goyens (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2017), 33–53.

46 Michaël Confino, "Anarchisme et internationalisme. Autour du Manifeste des Seize Correspondance inédite de Pierre Kropotkine et de Marie Goldsmith, janvier-mars 1916," *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique* 22, no. 2–3 (1981): 231–249; Peter Ryley, "The Manifesto of the Sixteen: Kropotkin's Rejection of Anti-War Anarchism and His Critique of the Politics of Peace," in *Anarchism, 1914–18: Internationalism, Anti-Militarism and War*, eds. Ruth Kinna and Matthew S. Adams (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), 49–68; Carl Levy, "Malatesta and the War Interventionist Debate 1914–17: From the 'Red Week' to the Russian Revolutions," in *Anarchism, 1914–18: Internationalism, Anti-Militarism and War*, eds. Ruth Kinna and Matthew S. Adams (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), 69–92.

47 Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 56.

a public opinion that was in favor of nationalist tones during the war years. In the meantime, Goldman criticized the discussion about America's preparedness for the war and published "Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter" in her anarchist journal *Mother Earth*. She argued that "[t]he human mind seems to be conscious of but one thing, murderous speculation."⁴⁸ Our whole civilization, our entire culture is concentrated on the mad demand for the most perfected weapons of slaughter." Goldman appealed to workers, hoping that they would understand who really profited from this war, namely the "privileged class; the class which robs and exploits the masses, and controls their lives from the cradle to the grave." The working class would be exploited by a capitalist state and its imperialist ambitions, though not only in factories but also as cannon fodder on the European battlefields. She consequently emphasized the dangers of the preparedness debate and claimed that:

America grows fat on the manufacture of munitions and war loans to the Allies to help crush Prussians [and] the same cry [was] now being raised in America which, if carried into national action, would build up an American militarism far more terrible than German or Prussian militarism could ever be, and that because nowhere in the world has capitalism become so brazen in its greed and nowhere is the state so ready to kneel at the feet of capital.

At the same time, Goldman accused US President Woodrow Wilson, "the historian, [and] the college professor," of being an agent of capitalism and of only serving "the big interests, to add to those who are growing phenomenally rich by the manufacture of military supplies." According to the female anarchist, war could not be waged "with equals; you cannot have militarism with free born men; you must have slaves, automatons, machines, obedient disciplined creatures, who will move, act, shoot and kill at the command of their superiors." Once the United States joined the war, Goldman continued in her anti-imperialist and anti-militarist argument, that militarism would suppress individual freedoms and exploit the masses:

Militarism consumes the strongest and most productive elements of each nation. Militarism swallows the largest part of the national revenue. Almost nothing is spent on education, art, literature and science compared with the amount devoted to militarism in times of peace, while in times of war everything else is set at naught; all life stagnates, all effort is curtailed; the very sweat and blood of the masses are used to feed this insatiable monster – militarism.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Emma Goldman, "Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter," *Mother Earth* 10, no. 10 (1915), accessed April 30, 2024, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-preparedness-the-road-to-universal-slaughter>. The following quotes are taken from this article.

⁴⁹ Goldman, "Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter."

Goldman's early criticism of the war and the US government would eventually cause problems, especially since 1916 was "a particularly dangerous year to become [or to be] an anarchist."⁵⁰ However, the events of the following year turned a struggle for the future of the United States into open war between the anarchists and the state they had been criticizing for decades. The Russian Revolution in February 1917 stimulated fears of unrest, which intensified following the rise of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, who took power in October 1917 and claimed to be leading the way toward a communist society. The US decision to join the war, on the other hand, triggered further actions by Goldman and her fellow anarchists, who now not only criticized the war but also hoped that the events in Russia would spark a revolution by the American working class as well. In early May, together with Berkman, Eleanor Fitzgerald, and Leonard Abbott, Goldman organized the No-Conscription League, and its first meeting at the Harlem River Casino on 126th Street and 2nd Avenue, as reported by *The New York Times*, turned out to be "a wild anti-conscription demonstration, in the course of which the Government of the United States was denounced and referred to as a tool of the capitalist classes." Goldman "[u]rge[d] workers to follow Russia's lead" and demanded young men to resist conscription. In addition, she "predicted a nationwide strike to embarrass the Government and denounced the authorities in Washington as being on par with the old powers in Russia."⁵¹ The No-Conscription League, which soon "became the nerve center of the resistance to the draft," consequently not only challenged the position of the government but also linked the American decision to join the First World War with the Russian Revolution.⁵² These connections must have caused US Authorities to react nervously at that time, especially the fulfillment of "the anarchists' prophecies of wartime revolution; they were also elated to learn that Russian workers had established workplace and citywide soviets ... that shared the self-managing ethos of anarcho-syndicalism."⁵³

The No-Conscription League was formed as a reaction to the new Selective Service Act, although the latter, in combination with already-existent anti-conspiracy laws and additional new laws, such as the Espionage Act of 1917 and the Sedition Act of 1918, provided the authorities, first and foremost Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer and the young Bureau of Investigation agent J. Edgar Hoover, with the legal means to get rid of the anarchist menace once and for all.⁵⁴ Eventually, as

⁵⁰ Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 54.

⁵¹ "Anarchists Demand Strike to End War," *The New York Times*, May 19, 1917: 11.

⁵² Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 186.

⁵³ Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 59.

⁵⁴ For a detailed discussion of the work of the No-Conscription League and the legal issues it caused for Goldman, see Pribanic-Smith and Schroeder, *Emma Goldman's No-Conscription League*.

Richard Drinnon correctly remarked, “the war between Emma and the government [got] entangled in the larger war to save the world for democracy.” On the day the Espionage Act took effect, a US marshal and 12 policemen arrested Goldman, who had been prepared, changed into her purple dress, grabbed James Joyce’s *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916), and did not resist. She was, once more, willing to face prison time for her ideals. An extremely high bail of \$25,000 was set to free Goldman for the trial, and Harry Weinberger prepared the legal strategy for her and Berkman, although both anarchists decided to defend themselves in court.⁵⁵ The trial of Goldman and Berkman was, however, only the tip of the iceberg, because almost 1,500 people were put on trial nationwide in relation to the new laws, and around two-thirds were convicted.⁵⁶ Francis Caffey, a New York district attorney, emphasized that Goldman was a high-profile target for authorities when he said that “Emma Goldman is a woman of great ability and of personal magnetism, and her persuasive powers are such to make her an exceedingly dangerous woman.”⁵⁷ The trial, however, was not like the ones Goldman had faced in the past, and an article in *The New York Times* explained that “[t]he Federal authorities, backed by the full power of the New York Police Department, [were] determined to put an end to anarchy in New York.”⁵⁸

Although she was out on bail, the anarchist was reluctant to speak at another public meeting at Madison Square Garden on 23 June 1917: “The great anarchist meeting ... failed to materialize. Great was the disappointment of the men and women who follow the red flag, about 3,000 of whom ... stood about four hours waiting for Emma Goldman ... and other agitators, whose coming had been announced, but who left Madison Square off their schedule yesterday.” As the newspaper report about the event continues, this was unusual, but “for once the woman anarchist leader, who generally [kept] her speaking appointments, disappointed her perspiring and noisy cohorts.”⁵⁹ When the trial began, “[t]he courtroom was packed both at the morning and afternoon sessions” by “500 followers, each wear-

55 Weinberger’s documents that related to legal issues during the Red Scare that also involved the defense of Goldman can be found in the Harry Weinberger Papers (MS 553), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, Box 2, Folders 12–19.

56 Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 62. Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 93, mentions 4,000–10,000 arrests, but states that less than 600 cases led to actual trials between 1917 and 1921.

57 Candace Falk, ed. *Emma Goldman: A Guide to Her Life and Documentary Sources* (Alexandria, VA: Chadwyck-Healey, 1995), 15.

58 “Government to End All Anarchy Here,” *The New York Times*, June 17, 1917: 7.

59 “Leaders Disappoint Anarchist Hordes,” *The New York Times*, June 24, 1917: 8.

ing a red rose,” while Goldman “discarded her favorite purple robe and appeared in [a] plain black gown.”⁶⁰

It was not hard to prove that Berkman and Goldman opposed the war. A letter by the No-Conscription League from May 1917 already made clear what the two anarchists had tried to achieve by forming this anti-war organization. Goldman and Berkman were “sure that [the addressees] are interested in the anti-war agitation” and “we appeal to you for moral and financial support to enable us to carry on an effective campaign by means of meetings ... manifestos and, above all, through the channels of MOTHER EARTH and THE BLAST. We consider this campaign of the utmost importance at the present time, and we feel confident that you will not withhold from us your immediate generous support.”⁶¹ They had tried to organize protests against the new conscription law, and the authorities had not wasted time in collecting evidence to prove that the two radicals were violating it. At a mass meeting at Hunts Point Palace on 4 June 1917, Berkman had emphasized the value of freedom and the extent to which conscription violated it:

There is no greater boon in the world than liberty. There is nothing greater in the whole universe than freedom of conscience, freedom of opinion and freedom of action, in short liberty. But it is we who are fighting for liberty, and no one else, not those who oppose us. We have been fighting for liberty for many years, and even for the liberty of those who oppose us. ... Conscription in a free country means the cemetery of liberty, and if conscription is the cemetery then registration is the undertaker. (Great applause and cheers and boos, and something thrown at the speaker that looked like a lemon.) ... Those who want to register should certainly register; but those who know what liberty means, and I am sure there are thousands in this country, they will not register.⁶²

Goldman would later speak as well and provided a relatively negative evaluation of the United States that again reflected upon her shattered dream:

I actually believed that this was the promised land, the land that rests upon freedom, upon opportunity, upon happiness, upon recognition [sic!] of the importance and the value of the young generation. ... I have come to the conclusion that when the law for conscription was passed in the United States the Funeral March of 500,000 American youths is going to be celebrated tomorrow, on Registration Day.⁶³

60 “Reds Are Defiant, Can Get No Delay,” *The New York Times*, June 28, 1917: 5.

61 Alexander Berkman, No-Conscription League, Serial Letter No. 1, New York, May 25, 1917, Alexander Berkman Papers, Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Archives, New York University (henceforth ABP-TAM), Box 1, Folder 7.

62 Stenographer’s Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, Hunts Point Palace, New York, June 4, 1917, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 12, 17 and 19.

63 Stenographer’s Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, June 4, 1917, 24.

Furthermore, Goldman did not think about camouflaging her anti-conscription attitude: "I am here frankly and openly telling you that I will continue to work against Conscription."⁶⁴

According to her basic political beliefs, she resisted giving advice to the young men who thought about serving the US war effort, arguing that "the only reason that prevents me telling you men of conscriptable age not to register is because I am an Anarchist, and I do not believe in force morally or otherwise to induce you to do anything that is against your conscience."⁶⁵ She nevertheless described the realities of the war, a senseless slaughtering of young men, and prophetically pointed out that "for every idealist they [the governments] kill, thousands will rise and they will not cease to rise until the same thing happens in America that has happened in Russia."⁶⁶ Goldman consequently not only criticized conscription as such but also made an argument for a revolution on American soil, which she considered to be the only way to solve the exploitation of the working class, whose members were now supposed to die for their capitalist ideals in an imperialist war. She closed her speech with a remark that would highlight the end of American liberties as they were known and believed by workers:

My friends, we are grateful to the Government for having passed the Conscription Bill for it will teach the American people that American Liberty has been buried and is dead and is a corpse, and that only our voice is going to raise it up and revive it again, until the American people and all the people living in America will unite in one great mass and will throw out capitalism and Government by militarism.⁶⁷

Ten days later, on 14 June 1917, at another meeting organized by the No-Conscription League at Forward Hall in Pennsylvania, the two anarchists repeated these arguments, and Berkman, almost prophetically, added: "I personally do not believe that a workman or a man who stands for real liberty, an anarchist, can receive justice in any court of the United States. I don't believe it. I speak from personal experience. I have had enough of it and I know I will have more. I know there is no

⁶⁴ Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, June 4, 1917, 26. Goldman also addressed the present stenographers, who recorded what had been said on behalf of the authorities, directly: "We are told that you have stenographers here to take down what we say, this is not the first time we are having stenographers at our meeting. And I have always said things that everybody can hear, and what is more important I want the police and the soldiers to hear what I have to say. It will do them good." Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, 26.

⁶⁵ Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, June 4, 1917, 27.

⁶⁶ Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, June 4, 1917.

⁶⁷ Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, June 4, 1917, 30 and 32.

justice for a working man.”⁶⁸ A flyer for this meeting at Madison Square Garden clearly demanded protests against conscription to defend American liberty against an increasingly authoritarian government:

NOW is the time to protest: Later it will be too late. If hundreds of thousands of you raise your voice NOW, you will force the government to listen to you, and they will know that you have the courage of manhood and womanhood, and that you cannot be treated as the Czar used to treat his submissive subjects. The people of Russia, your own brothers and sisters, brought the mighty Czar off his high throne. Are you going to submit to Czarism in America?⁶⁹

The US authorities consequently had sufficient material to bring the two anarchists to trial, and it was clear that this one would be nothing more than a “farce.”⁷⁰

In his closing speech of July 1917, Berkman emphasized this to a jury in court and stated that “we stand here indicted for a charge never mentioned in the indictment itself. We stand here accused of being anarchists. A vain accusation! We are anarchists, and I for one am proud of being an anarchist, and I am sure I may say the same for my co-defendant Miss Goldman.”⁷¹ Nothing more, as Berkman continued, could have been proven by the trial. Besides the anarchist identity of the accused, nothing could lead to a sentence in this trial: “I believe it is absolutely demonstrated here that the District Attorney has no case. I believe that it is absolutely demonstrated here that he did not begin to prove a conspiracy. They did not prove any overt acts.”⁷² The two anarchists would consequently not bend their knees before the US state, which is why Berkman, obviously in agreement with Goldman, added:

I am not arguing to keep myself from going to prison. I am not afraid of prison. I am willing to suffer for my ideas in prison if necessary. Life is dear, but not so dear that I should be at liberty without self respect. I would rather be in prison with my ideals, with my convictions, true to myself than be outside with my soul damned in my own estimation. So I am not pleading to save ourselves from prison.⁷³

68 Stenographer’s Minutes of Alexander Berkman’s Speech in Forward Hall, New York, June 14, 1917, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 12: 13.

69 Flyer “Labor and War,” Demonstration Madison Square, Saturday, June 23, 1917, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 7.

70 Telegram by Carl Newlander to Leon Malmed, New York, July 3, 1917, LMP, Folder 22.

71 Alexander Berkman’s Closing Speech, U.S. v Goldman and Berkman, 1917, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 15, 4.

72 Alexander Berkman’s Closing Speech, U.S. v Goldman and Berkman, 1917, 56.

73 Alexander Berkman’s Closing Speech, U.S. v Goldman and Berkman, 1917, 57.

Goldman also wanted to emphasize that her actions were not directed against the American people and that she considered herself to be pro-American, although not in the sense of the increasing nationalism that somehow perverted patriotism of her time. Therefore, Goldman argued that there were immigrants like her who "love America with deeper passion and greater intensity than many natives whose patriotism manifests itself by pulling, kicking, and insulting those who do not rise when the national anthem is played..."⁷⁴

When attorney Harold A. Content replied to this speech on 9 July 1917, he emphasized the intellectual capacity of the two anarchists added that "unfortunately I am sadly lacking in that eloquence of words that had distinguished Miss Goldman's oration. I am paid to talk for a living, but I am sure that if Miss Goldman wanted to accept a position in the government service she could secure the finest kind of position by reason of her oratorical gifts."⁷⁵ Regardless of such praise, he concluded: "I say to you that from the evidence you have heard you are safe in saying that the No-Conscription League might just as well have been termed 'Goldman, Berkman & Company, dealers in all sorts and orders of disorder.'"⁷⁶ In addition, the prosecutor made clear that Goldman and Berkman "really are the No-Conscription League," and he eventually reminded the jury members that:

[t]he government is your government, in which you participate through your duly constituted representatives. And this case is of prime importance to that government. Will you by your verdict say that people like these can go forth again, defy our laws, desecrate the Stars and Stripes, make fun of the national anthem and do that with impunity? Urge people willfully to set themselves above the provisions of a definite law?⁷⁷

For Goldman herself, the accusations against her and Berkman as well as the trial "proves that the court is prejudiced because we are anarchists; because we were frank and because we stood by our opinions, and because we are going to stand by our opinions."⁷⁸ The verdict of the jury and the sentencing by Judge Julius Marshuetz Mayer eventually surprised no one:

It has undoubtedly been a source of regret to the gentlemen of the jury, as it has been to the court and possibly to those who have set in the courtroom for these many days, that the extraordinary ability displayed by the defendants has not been utilized in support of law and

⁷⁴ *Trial and Speech of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman in the United States District Court, in the City of New York, July 1917* (New York: Mother Earth, 1917), cited in Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 277.

⁷⁵ Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, U.S. v Goldman and Berkman, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 14, 2.

⁷⁶ Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, 9.

⁷⁷ Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, 60–61.

⁷⁸ Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, 87.

order. The magnetic power of one of the defendants [Goldman], if thus utilized, might have been of great service, in forms legitimately advocated, for the betterment of conditions as the world goes on. That power might have been of tremendous service, and more especially among the millions of humbler people who come to our country in an aspiration for liberty. ... [W]hen I impose this sentence I am imposing it on the one hand with regret that these abilities were not better used. I impose it on the other hand with profound conviction that I am speaking for organized law, for the kind of liberty that we know and we understand, who have been privileged to live in this country that we believe is a true democracy.⁷⁹

Both anarchists had to face the maximum sentence, i. e. two years in prison and a \$10,000 fine. However, the anti-anarchist action by the legal authorities was not yet over. Judge Meyer referred the case to "the commissioner of labor ... in order to determine in due course whether or not either or both of the defendants are subject to the provisions as to deportation provided in that act."⁸⁰ Goldman, facing prison time again, would ironically address the court again in the final moments: "I wish to thank the court for the marvelous fair trial we have received. I hope history will record the fairness. ... Thank you very much."⁸¹ The "true type of American anarchist" seemed now to be contained, although Goldman tried to hold onto hope when she wrote to her friend and fellow anarchist Leon Malmed on 7 August 1917: "Now is the time. You must not lose courage no matter what happens. As a matter of fact, Anarchism was never proven with greater force than at the present moment when all the institutions resting upon the State collapsed so utterly."⁸² However, just a month later, the hope for an American revolution that would prevent Goldman's prison sentence dematerialized, and she wrote in a letter to Malmed on 18 September 1917 that "our ideal which is now also bleeding and crushed by the judges that lie" seemed unable to activate the masses. Before finally entering a cell again, Goldman had nevertheless "decided to go on a short tour ... partly to enlighten the American public as to who the Boylsheviki [sic!] really are and what their example will mean to the world."⁸³

79 Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, 90, 93.

80 Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917.

81 Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, 95.

82 "Anarchists, in Russia and Elsewhere, Always Disorganized," *The New York Times*, July 15, 1917: 53.

83 Leon Malmed, born in Russia in 1881, emigrated to the US around 1895. He went to New York City and worked as a cigar maker before he opened a delicatessen with his wife in 1907, later working in the real estate business in the 1920s. He met Goldman in 1906 and supported the anarchist movement by arranging meetings or distributing publications. During a lecture tour in 1915, he was arrested for his distribution of birth control-related materials. He continued to support Goldman after her deportation, and died in 1956. Information provided in relation to Leon Malmed and Emma Goldman Papers, accessed December 10, 2021, <https://hollisarchives.lib.harvard.edu/repositories/8/resources/7287>; Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, August 7, 1917, LMP, Folder 22.

In February 1918, Goldman was taken into custody by the US marshal service and brought to Missouri State Penitentiary in Jefferson City, while Berkman was transferred to Atlanta, Georgia.⁸⁴ Her time in prison was not easy for the female anarchist.⁸⁵ To quote Vivian Gornick, “in the Missouri penitentiary for women, prisoners survived under conditions of permanent low-grade sadism. Routinely, and for the most arbitrary of reasons, they were deprived of food or exercise, went untreated when ill, were forced into illegal and demeaning labor, were beaten when deemed disobedient, and were thrown into solitary confinement at the drop of a retort.”⁸⁶ Goldman would also suffer further as she “spent many lonely months, starved o[f] intellectual and spiritual companionship. Added to that was considerable physical indisposition which made my life and the work very tiring indeed.”⁸⁷ However, some luxuries and moments of joy were nevertheless possible, as Malmed had sent her a care package that was shared by Goldman with her prison friends Kate Richards O’Hare and “Dynamite Girl,” Ella Antolini.⁸⁸

Although Goldman had thought and talked about the possibility of moving to Soviet Russia with Berkman to support the Russian Revolution, she did not really intend to leave her beloved America, even though she was sent to serve jail time again.⁸⁹ Fifteen days before her release from the penitentiary, she received her deportation papers.⁹⁰ While she and Berkman were still in prison, the state authorities ensured that new problems awaited them the moment they stepped through the prison door. *The New York Times* had already reported about this governmental *coup* on 19 September 1919: “When the terms of the two agitators expire late this month they will be rearrested, and, after an examination, it is expected that further warrants will be issued for their deportation. The immigration authorities are proceeding on the grounds that both are aliens, there being some question as to their citizenship.”⁹¹ While it seemed clear that Berkman did not stand a chance of staying in the United States, Goldman considered herself to be an American citizen and did not anticipate that she would be expelled as well.

84 Serial letter, Emma Goldman, December 18, 1917, LMP, Folder 22; Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, September 18, 1917, LMP, Folder 22.

85 Stella Comyn to Leon Malmed, New York, February 5, 1918, LMP, Folder 22.

86 Richard Drinnon and Anna Maria Drinnon, eds., *Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman* (New York: Schocken Books, 1975), 4–8.

87 Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 102.

88 Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Jefferson City, MO, July 17, 1919, LMP, Folder 24, 1–2.

89 Sally M. Miller, *From Prairie to Prison: The Life of Social Activist Kate Richards O’Hare* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 167–169.

90 Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Chicago, November 29, 1919, LMP, Folder 25, 2.

91 Avrich and Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 292; Shulman, *To the Barricades*, 194.

The deportation charges, as far as Goldman considered them, represented nothing more than “a denial of the insistent claim on the part of the Government that in this country we have free speech and free press.” The anarchist instead requested that “if I am not charged with any specific offense or act, if – as I have reason to believe – this is purely an inquiry into my social and political opinions, then I protest still more vigorously against these proceedings, as utterly tyrannical and diametrically opposed to the fundamental guarantees of a true democracy.”⁹² On 1 November 1919, Goldman and Berkman declared in a letter to their friends and fellow-anarchists what they now had in mind:

We say it freely and frankly, with utmost conviction, that both of us are entering again upon the remaining sentences of our lives, with our spirits unbroken, entirely unrepentant – indeed, with a will unembittered by the acid of the prison test, but rather purified and made stronger, with our minds happily unimpaired by the terrible experience of the last two years, our hearts youthful with the joy of life, of work, of social effort.⁹³

They also pointed out that many anarchists were facing deportation, but Goldman and Berkman were not yet fully accepting such a fate:

Deportation of so-called aliens is fast becoming an established American institution, and if allowed to remain unchallenged by the liberal minded spirits of the country, this imperialistic system of stifling the voice of social protest will become rooted in American life. Deportation is but the first step that will inevitably lead to its ultimate, the complete suppression of popular discontent and free speech by the system of expelling even the native protestants and rebels.⁹⁴

Goldman might have been optimistic that only Berkman would have to leave the United States, but in the end, her marriage was not accepted as legally binding because it had not been documented and because her husband, Jacob Kerschner, had lied during his naturalization process, which made his and Goldman’s claims for citizenship legally unbinding.⁹⁵ The legal prosecutors at Ellis Island were not convinced by the presented arguments and declared that:

the Court views both of these defendants as enemies of the United States of America, and of its peace and comfort. The defendant Berkman has a criminal record that began with his at-

⁹² “Plan Deportation of Emma Goldman,” *New York Times*, September 19, 1919: 11.

⁹³ Statement by Emma Goldman at the Federal Hearing on Deportation, October 27, 1919, in EGP-IISH, No. 303.

⁹⁴ Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, Circular, New York, November 1, 1919, ABP-IISH, No. 119, 1.

⁹⁵ Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, Circular, New York, November 1, 1919, 1.

tempt to assassinate Mr. Frick. At the beginning of the war, both of these defendants sought to injure the United States by preventing the carrying out of the Selective Service Draft Law. They were convicted, and their conviction was sustained. They did everything they could to destroy the welfare, the stability and the integrity of this Government.⁹⁶

While the two anarchists had to await their deportation, they sent a letter to their friends on 9 December 1919: "This may be our last letter to you. The expected has happened: the Federal Government had ordered both of us deported. ... If Emma Goldman can be deprived of her citizenship and deported, every other citizen of foreign birth is in similar danger."⁹⁷ For Goldman, this was shocking, and she would suffer from the exile experiences that followed, once the deportees had been sent abroad on the USAT Buford, a "barely seaworthy relic of the Spanish-American War" and later known as the "Soviet Ark," which sailed out from New York for an initially unknown destination.⁹⁸

The night before their deportation, Goldman and Berkman finished their last official message to the American people, "Deportation: Its Meaning and Menace – Last Message to the People of America," highlighting that they now had to suffer for their resistance against the First World War:

The brave men and women that dared to speak in [sic!] behalf of peace and humanity, that had the surpassing integrity of remaining true to themselves and their ideals, w[ith] the courage of facing danger and death for conscience sake – these, the truest friends of Man, had to bear the cross of Golgotha ... as the lovers of humanity have done all through the centuries of human prayers.⁹⁹

Goldman's American experience ended by force, and the anarchist who wanted to change the United States by activating the revolutionary potential of the national working class was bitterly disappointed. Her life with Berkman in Soviet Russia

96 Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Chicago, November 29, 1919, LMP, Folder 25, 2. Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Chicago, November 29, 1919, LMP, Folder 25, 2; Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Stenographer's Minutes, December 8, 1919, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 3, 28 and 30.

97 Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Stenographer's Minutes, December 8, 1919, 68.

98 Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Serial Letter [New York], December 9, 1919, LMP, Folder 25, 1.

99 Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 105–106; Kowal, *Tongue of Fire*, ix; Avrich and Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 296–297; Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 74. On the journey of the USAT Buford, see Torrie Hester, *Deportation: The Origins of U.S. Policy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 121–124.

was surprisingly more challenging than expected.¹⁰⁰ The anarchists left their new home in late 1921, and Goldman in particular turned into a fierce anti-Bolshevik in the following years. At the same time, she continued to criticize the United States, railing against its inability to reach Goldman's postrevolutionary utopia, even more than those of Soviet Russia. Most likely, this behaviour was a result of Goldman's deportation experience, which had hurt her more than the recognition that the Russian Revolution had been undermined by Lenin and his followers. The last section of the present article shall, therefore, take a look at Goldman's anti-Americanism during the years she spent in exile.

Ambivalent Views from Abroad

Once Goldman had settled in Berlin, after having left Soviet Russia and a stay in Sweden, she sent a letter to Leon Malmed and described her situation on 9 August 1922 in some detail:

In fact I have not written to any one of my friends in the States for nearly three months. I cannot go into the causes which affected me mentally and spiritually. Primarily it is the utter hopelessness of the Russian situation. I suffered keenly under it while I was there, but always consoled myself with the thought that when I got out of Russia I would be able to do much to arouse the workers against the terrible things that were happening there. Since I came to Germany, I seem to have gotten into a state of lethargy. I could not get myself to work, or even to concentrate on any one given thought. You can well imagine that I was in despair. However, I believe I have myself in hand.¹⁰¹

In the following months, while she lived at Rüdeshheimer Straße 3 in Berlin, Goldman finished her first manuscripts about her Russian experiences, but she was treated quite badly by her American publisher. On 22 September 1922, in a letter to the Polish-born American anarchist and her US representative Michael A. Cohen, Goldman confirmed that she had finished 85,000 words of the manuscript, but she expected to deliver it at a later date: "I think it will be ready much later; I do want to give something good and to write about Russia which is living through Purgatory all over again."¹⁰² Her manuscript was published by Doubleday, Page & Co. in 1923, but only the first 12 chapters were published as *My Disillusionment in*

100 Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, *Deportation: Its Meaning and Menace – Last Message to the People of America*, Ellis Island, NY, December 1919, ABP-IISH, No. 126, 6.

101 Alexander Berkman to Michael A. Cohen, Stockholm, February 12, 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 2.

102 Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Berlin, August 9, 1922, LMP, Folder 28, 1.

Russia, though she had suggested *My Two Years in Russia* as the title. Goldman was furious about the "butchery of her work."¹⁰³ Doubleday, Page & Co. would later publish the second half of the work as *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (1924), but the damage had been done. Considering Goldman's anger about that accident, it is interesting that only two reviewers, a critic for the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* and a Buffalo librarian, realized that the first book had only partially been published.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, the book's release "brought down on [Goldman] a storm of left-wing abuse from which there would be no recovery."¹⁰⁵

Her writings also brought old friends up against the female anarchist. Among them was Goldman's former manager Ben Reitman, with whom she had some kind of toxic relationship between 1908 and 1916, especially acrimonious since Goldman was very jealous that Reitman had intimate liaisons with other women during these years. In 1925, Goldman's former lover wrote a letter to her about his impression of the anti-Bolshevik books that must have further embittered Goldman, who seemed unable to gain any support from the US left with regard to her criticism of the Soviet government.¹⁰⁶ Reitman wrote that:

Your first book on Russia left me sympathetic to Russia. I felt that Russia gave you a chance in the world, that they put themselves out to let you and Sasha work and be helpful but true to yourselves. YOU WERE AS YOU ALWAYS WERE HARD* CRITICAL* BITTER* SELFDETERMINED* UNWILLING TO FALL IN WITH NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY* (Now don't label this refusal to compromise). What I am trying to say [is] that you and Sasha wanted your way (and that is characteristic of the ANTI-Mind) and refused to work for God, for society, or humanity or what ever you may call it unless it was your way. ... You are always knocking, kicking, criticizing, seeing the worst side of everything, whining until you have your reader HATING* ... you have no idea of your whinfulness and bitterness and unjust critical attitude. Wake up and be happy. ... when I understood that the Bolsheviks had to deal with minds like your[s] I was not surprised at the Kronstadt bombardment and Prisons and all the terribel [sic!] things they did to the ANTIMINDS – yes you are a typical *antimind* you always oppose the thing that is ... How in the hell could the Bolsheviks live and thrive if they allowed you and minds like you[rs] to have power* ... Your and Sa[s]ha[s] books convince any thoughtful student that MINDS like your[s] will never permit the world to have anything that approaches Socialism or much less Anarchism. I think the Bolsheviks were kind to you and you were most unjust to them.¹⁰⁷

103 Emma Goldman to Michael A. Cohen, n.p., September 22, 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder; 2.

104 Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 118.

105 Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 245.

106 Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 118.

107 Goldman also tried and failed to persuade Bertrand Russel to make a statement against Bolshevik rule while she was living in England. See Emma Goldman to Bertrand Russell, London, February 9, 1925, Emma Goldman Papers, New York Public Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division,

Regardless of such letters, Goldman continued her fight against Lenin's legacy, although she received no support from the US left, which made her both sad and angry.

In the following years, when Goldman lived in England and then France, the anarchist continued to use most of her energy agitating against the corruption of the Russian Revolution by Lenin and the Bolsheviks, but she would also discuss the situation of anarchism and the working class in the United States from time to time during her lectures. Goldman's criticism of the American working class as well as US leftist intellectuals who still supported Lenin was based on several factors during these years. First of all, she was bitter that her position as a well-known and respected anarchist was fading, leading to a lack of trust in the revolutionary potential of the US working class. Secondly, she felt disrespected by the American left, whose representatives seemed to ignore her first-hand reports from Soviet Russia. Lastly, she was disappointed in the weak position of the anarchist movement in the United States, as it had declined in membership and influence, as in other countries, since the end of the First World War. In short, Goldman could observe the shattering of her dreams for her own role within the anarchist movement as well as the movement in the United States as a whole – a fact that must have harshened her views and her criticism alike.

In "America in Comparison," Goldman referred to her twelve years of exile as an experience that "enable[d] me to see both the good and the evil of America in much sharper outline than before."¹⁰⁸ Without any doubt, she still loved the US: "My faith in the good potentialities of the country has not been dimmed or less-

ZL386, Reel 1, 1. A copy of this letter can also be found in EGP-IISH, No. 144. Bertrand Russell to Emma Goldman, London, February 14, 1925, EGP-IISH, No. 144, 2–3; Bertrand Russell to Alexander Berkman, London, June 15, 1925, EGP-IISH, No. 144.

108 Ben Reitman to Emma Goldman, Chicago, IL, July 10, 1925, EGP-IISH, No. 132, 1–2. Emphasis in the original. Goldman also corresponded about Bolshevism with Roger Nash Baldwin, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, whom she considered not only a student of hers, but also a friend. On 30 December 1933 she wrote about him to Arthur Ross: "I can assure you that I never at any moment doubted the sincerity of Roger Baldwin, or his friendship for me. Don't forget he is a pupil of mine. And while not all pupils give cause for pride on the part of their tutors Rogers [sic!] stand during the war had already been sufficient to gladden my heart. The work he has been doing in the States since our deportation made him stand out among all those who had claimed me as their teacher. No, I had never doubted his sincerity. But I had too many occasions to doubt his judgement in a number of issues. Primarily, I found him most naive in his faith in people in authority. Being perfectly honest himself he takes everything as gospel truth what his friends in power tell him." Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, Toronto, December 30, 1933, Emma Goldman Papers, Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Archives, New York University (henceforth EGP-TAM), Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, Jan. 4, 1933 – Dec. 30, 1933, 1.

ened by my European vantage ground. On the contrary, it has been strengthened. But similarly has also grown my realisation of the evil things in America, and the need of speaking out frankly and fearlessly against them.”¹⁰⁹ According to her comparisons, which relate to the recently introduced concept of “migrant knowledge,” the US was too immature: “Everywhere I found the fundamental difference between them and America is mostly a difference of age. The difference between juvenility and maturity with all the peculiar traits and characteristics that go to make up the two stages of human and social development.”¹¹⁰ In addition, the immensity of capitalist exploitation, as it existed in the United States, was unmatched by any European state because “[t]he political rights established through age-long struggle have solidified into traditions which the plutocracy of Europe cannot so easily and brutally set aside for its convenience and benefit as [was] done in the United States.”¹¹¹ Even worse, however, was the fact that “in the United States, the political is considered a fool, and impractical dreamer, or – worse yet – a criminal.”¹¹² For Goldman, one thing was more than obvious: “That which is evil in America is due not only to its adolescent crudity and heartlessness, but also to the fact that as pioneer country it was and still is more concerned in material values than in the achievements of the spirit.”¹¹³ The United States had “no patience with the social pioneer,” but “as America can do nothing by halves, it outdoes Europe in its crude suppression, its draconic laws, and savage persecution, of everything that has its being outside of the purely material pursuits of his fellows.”¹¹⁴

Regardless of such statements, Goldman was still in love with her spiritual home, represented by friends and family there, and was very happy that she got one more chance to visit the US in 1934 for a lecture tour. Therefore, she had continued to hate the American state and its government, but she was still in love with the American people, or at least those she had met as members of the anarchist movement. What she did not fully understand before her visit in 1934, however, was that many of the anarchists she knew from before had already moved on, and the US anarchist movement of the 1930s was nothing in comparison with

109 Emma Goldman, “America in Comparison,” [1931], EGP-IISH, No. 189. An earlier version of the text, from 1924, is Emma Goldman, “Good and Evil Points in the Makeup of America,” [1924], EGP-IISH, no. 189; Goldman, “America in Comparison,” 1.

110 Goldman, “America in Comparison,” 2.

111 Simone Lässig and Swen Steinberg, “Knowledge on the Move: New Approaches toward a History of Migrant Knowledge,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 43, no. 3 (2017): 313–346; Goldman, “America in Comparison,” 2.

112 Goldman, “America in Comparison,” 3–4.

113 Goldman, “America in Comparison.”

114 Goldman, “America in Comparison,” 6.

the one of the late nineteenth century. Her visit in 1934 would not only give her an opportunity to see old friends again, but also to secure some income after her autobiography had failed to generate long-lasting financial security, a fact for which Goldman would blame Alfred A. Knopf and a lack of professional advertisements.¹¹⁵ What the formerly famous anarchist had not realized, and what she would learn during her lecture tour in 1934, was the decline of anarchism in the United States since the end of the First World War in general and the fading of her own stardom in particular.¹¹⁶ James B. Pond, who had prepared Goldman's tour at Pond Bureau, Inc., New York, came into conflict with Goldman over the collection of admission fees, but he would also confront the anarchist with the simple and harsh reality:

I repeat another thing, when this tour started out you, yourself, spoke of Madison Square Garden. There wasn't a single person connected with your family or friends, but [you] thought Mecca Temple was the proper place. You all had the same feeling that I and every other showman had that you were going to draw large audiences. Now, because you have had two successful meetings, out of an otherwise consistent run of failures, you inform me that the reason for the whole debacle was myself. There was a whole lot deeper reason than that. If any of the people who have been associated with you in the past had told me in advance what you were telling me now, we would have handled everything differently.¹¹⁷

Her renewed American "business" was thus rather unsuccessful, but Goldman was sad about leaving the US again. In a letter to Rudolf Rocker, a German anarchist, she confessed:

Yes, I admit it will be extremely painful. Much more so than 15 years ago to leave America. Then I turned my face to Russia, and my hopes went high, but now I know that I will never be able to do any kind of real work in Europe. It is only here that I can find myself, and I am sure you will not take it as braggadocio when I tell you that I never was in better trim, and never did better work. The greater the tragedy that I could reach so few people.¹¹⁸

115 Goldman, "America in Comparison."

116 Emma Goldman to Alfred A. Knopf, St. Tropez, August 5, 1933, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross et al., Jan. 22, 1930-Jun. 12, 1939, 1.

117 Carl Levy, "Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, ed. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 126–127.

118 James B. Pond to Emma Goldman, New York, March 30, 1934, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross et al., Jan. 22, 1930-Jun. 12, 1939, 1; James B. Pond to Emma Goldman, New York, March 30, 1934, 3.

Financially the tour was more or less a waste of time, as "old Emma [would] leave America as poor in cash as she has arrived."¹¹⁹ The American experience in 1934 also made Goldman doubt the possible success of the anarchist movement in the future. The US anarchists, she argued, "do not move a fly, let alone anything on the structure of American life. But it is Anarchism itself which burns like a red, white flame in my soul and it is for this reason that I would rather die in exile and poverty than I would detract one iota from its beauty and its logic."¹²⁰ Her relationship with US anarchists had also suffered from Goldman's deportation and her following years of exile, although the female anarchist seems to have failed to accept the larger picture of the story about the confusion and decline of European and American anarchism in the years following the Russian Revolution.¹²¹

Conclusion

Emma Goldman's relationship with the United States was ambivalent, to say the least. She hated the capitalist exploitation of the American working class, which made her radicalize and fall in love with anarchism, a relationship she would cherish during her whole life. What broke Goldman's heart was her deportation to Soviet Russia in late 1919. Although the anarchist had supported the Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviks because she had hoped for a revolution on American soil, Goldman would never have expected to be expelled from the country she had initially turned to in search of freedom and independence. For three decades, Goldman had fought for freedom and equality, especially for women, but she eventually became a victim of the seminal American red scare. Shipped away, Goldman realized how good the US had been compared to an increasingly totalitarian Russia, but she continued to attack the American situation in later lectures. These attacks were partly stimulated by her continuing views of a necessary class struggle to set free the potential of the American working class, but also motivated by her feelings of anger about her own treatment between 1917 and 1919. Although Goldman's feelings toward the United States can best be described as a *longue-durée* love-hate relationship, it must also be stressed that this relationship was also determined by global phenomena, i.e. the Russian Revolution and the American reaction after "Red October" as well as the general decline of the anarchist move-

¹¹⁹ Emma Goldman to Rudolph Rocker, Pittsburgh, PA, April 12, 1934, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Doris Zhook et al., Dec. 24, 1926 – Jul. 31, 1939.

¹²⁰ Emma Goldman to Rudolph Rocker, Pittsburgh, PA, April 12, 1934, 2.

¹²¹ Emma Goldman to Jeanne Levey, New York, April 23, 1934, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Doris Zhook et al., Dec. 24, 1926 – Jul. 31, 1939, 1.

ment after the end of the First World War. Considering the current situation of the United States, one could argue that Goldman would still love and hate the US today. She would probably hate that the country is still in the grip of capitalist forces while workers continued to suffer from exploitation. No matter which conclusions she would have drawn, Goldman, of course, would have found a way to protest against these American shortcomings, regardless of the consequences.

7 An Anarchist Has to Live off Something: Emma Goldman as a Capitalist Publicist

Emma Goldman was probably one of the most famous anarchists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.¹ Nevertheless, she also had to make an income, which often brought her into conflict with her anarchist comrades, who argued that she was living off, rather than for, the working class.² She was not ashamed of making money from lectures about Russian literature that were usually frequented by middle- and upper-class women because she needed to live.³ She also used the largest parts of such lecture-related income to finance her own publications, i.e. the journal *Mother Earth*,⁴ and the projects of her comrades like *The Blast*, another anarchist periodical published by Goldman's lifelong companion Alexander Berkman.⁵ Regardless of her attempts to live as independently as possible, Goldman was later forced to depend on her publication-related income, especially since she had to live as an exile after December 1919, when she was expelled

1 This article was first published in *Anarchist Studies* 30, no. 2 (2022): 8–30. I would like to thank the editors Ruth Kinna and Matthew S. Adams for the permission to include it in this book as well. The main biographical works about Goldman are Richard Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*, Phoenix edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982 [1961]); Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life* (New York: Pantheon, 1984); Kathy E. Ferguson, *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield 2011); Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT, 2011); Paul Avrich and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

2 Voltairine de Cleyre to Saul Yanovsky, 18 October 1910, Joseph Ishill Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University; Voltairine de Cleyre to Joseph Cohen, 26 October 1910, 1, Joseph Cohen Papers, Bund Archives of the Jewish Labor Movement, YIVO Archives, New York. Both cited in B. McKinley, “‘The Quagmires of Necessity’: American Anarchists and Dilemmas of Vocation,” *American Quarterly*, 34, no. 5 (1982): 519. On Voltairine de Cleyre, see Eugenia C. DeLamotte, *Gates of Freedom: Voltairine de Cleyre and the Revolution of the Mind* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2004). Goldman herself would later lecture about de Cleyre: Emma Goldman, ‘Voltairine de Cleyre’, n.d., Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (henceforth EGP-IISH), no. 271.

3 Emma Goldman, *The Social Significance of Modern Drama* (Boston, MA: Richard G. Badger, 1914). Goldman's lectures on Russian dramatists, such as Leo Tolstoy or Maxim Gorky, were quite successful. Kathy E. Ferguson, “Gender and Genre in Emma Goldman,” *Signs*, 36, no. 3 (2011): 738.

4 For a detailed discussion of Goldman's work on this journal see Rachel Hui-Chi Hsu, *Emma Goldman, ‘Mother Earth’, and the Anarchist Awakening* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2021).

5 McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 518.

led from the United States to Soviet Russia, from where she escaped in late 1921.⁶ The rest of her life was characterised by worries and an unsteady income that forced Goldman to look for the best possible rates of pay for her works, a necessity that brought her into conflict with the US publishing industry.⁷ During these struggles, she tried to find a compromise between her anarchist values and her real-life necessities, a dominant aspect of her life.⁸ This conflict shall be taken into closer consideration in the present article, which not only shows how the US publishing industry dealt with the anarchist's demands during the 1920s and 1930s but also how Goldman was torn between her ideals and harsh capitalist realities. The latter made her realise that an anarchist also had to live off something, although she still emphasised in a letter in 1934 that "it is Anarchism itself which burns like a red, white flame in my soul and it is for this reason that I would rather die in exile and poverty than I would detract one iota from its beauty and its logic."⁹ This article will therefore discuss Goldman's early publishing activities in the United States and will afterward take a closer look at her main publication projects, i.e. her works about the Russian Revolution and Bolshevism during the 1920s and her autobiography in the 1930s, to show what problems the anarchist had to face during her exile years.

Goldman and *Mother Earth*

Emma Goldman turned from a hopeful young immigrant to the United States, having left Czarist Russia to find a better life, into an anarchist as a consequence of

6 Goldman would become an almost fanatic anti-Bolshevist, and most of her writings and lectures after her stay in Soviet Russia emphasised the moral corruption of the Russian Revolution by Lenin and his followers. For Goldman's views related to the Russian Revolution, see her works *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution* (Berlin: Der Syndikalist, 1922), *My Disillusionment in Russia* (New York: Doubleday, 1923), accessed May 20, 2020, <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-disillusionment-in-russia>, and *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1924), accessed May 10, 2020, <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-further-disillusionment-in-russia>. Also see Emma Goldman, "What I Saw," EGP-IISH, No. 284.

7 On Goldman's years in exile, see Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).

8 For a broader overview of Emma Goldman's ideas about business related income see Ari Weinzwieg, *Going into Business with Emma Goldman* (Ann Arbor, MI: Zingerman's Press, 2019).

9 Emma Goldman to Jeanne Levey, New York, April 23, 1934, Emma Goldman Papers, Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Archives, New York University (henceforth EGP-TAM), Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Doris Zhook et al., 24 Dec. 1926–31 Jul. 1939, 1.

her experiences in the garment industry while she lived in Rochester, New York, with her half-sister Helena, and due to the so-called Haymarket Tragedy in 1887,¹⁰ which roused Goldman and stimulated her political awakening.¹¹ Like many other Jewish immigrants in the United States, she would turn toward the left, in particular anarchism, to use the liberties of her new home to activate the revolutionary potential of the working class. Her contact with the German anarchist milieu in New York City, and the German-American anarchist Johann Most in particular, stimulated Goldman's further political development, and she became a well-known agitator and lecturer who drew many people to her nationwide speaking events about anarchism, women's rights, and sexual liberation for the modern woman.¹² With her own journal called *Mother Earth*, the female anarchist eventually made the step toward becoming a professional political figure who would no longer separate her anarchist from her working identity.¹³

Just a year before she founded the new journal, Goldman had borrowed money to open a massage parlour, where rich customers could buy a facial or scalp massage. The business did quite well, and the anarchist eventually had to decide whether she wanted to be a successful capitalist and gain from selling pleasure and a good feeling to the rich or if anarchism meant more to her than just words. With the money she had earned, however, Goldman left a possible life as a successful businesswoman behind and was eventually able to move from her semi-professional life as a part-time anarchist and make a full dive into the life of a "political professional." She would later make a similar decision when she was offered the possibility to appear on a vaudeville stage, but the financial attraction of such a job engagement did not suffice to let her forget about her ideals. The manager of the stage "was not sure whether I was to come on before the high kicker or after the trained dogs. At any rate I could not have more than ten minutes. From behind the curtain I watched the pitiful efforts to amuse the public, the horrible contortions of the dancer, whose flabby body was laced into youthful appearance, the cracked voice of the singer, the cheap jokes of the funny man, and the

10 Paul Avrich, *The Haymarket Tragedy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984).

11 Emma Goldman, "An Anarchist Looks at Life," text of a speech by Emma Goldman, held at Foyle's twenty-ninth literary luncheon (London, UK), March 1, 1933, EGP-IISH, No. 191, 4–5.

12 Donna M. Kowal, *Tongue of Fire: Emma Goldman, Public Womanhood, and the Sex Question* (Albany, NY: SUNY University Press, 2016). On Goldman and her role as an early "anarcha-feminist", see Donna M. Kowal, "Anarcha-Feminism," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, C. Levy and M.S. Adams (eds), (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 265–279.

13 McKinley, "The Quagmires," 512, 516.

coarse hilarity of the crowd. Then I fled. I knew I could not stand up in such an atmosphere to plead my ideas, not for all the money in the world.”¹⁴

Goldman kept her dedication for a life as an anarchist. Her revolutionary mind could simply not accept being a capitalist herself; she wanted to be part of a larger social change for all people. Furthermore, anarchism and the economic aspects of business ownership did not go hand in hand. In general, business operations were considered possible by anarchists, as long as they were not for profit and as long as they were not based on or did not create any kind of hierarchies.¹⁵ Yet in Goldman’s case she would not have been free from the dynamics of the capitalist market and thereby the exploitative aspect of it. She consequently tried to run her own publication business that was supposed to support the anarchist movement in the United States.

The establishment of *Mother Earth*, therefore, ended her double life once and for all, and Goldman could now focus on publishing and a more intellectual kind of work. Alexander Berkman, who was released from prison after fourteen years of an originally twenty-two-year sentence for his assassination attempt on the industrialist Henry Clay Frick, in protest at the Homestead steel strike in 1892,¹⁶ joined Goldman as editor of the new journal, and so the two radicals teamed up once again to support and guide the US anarchist movement. Before the assassination attempt, Goldman and Berkman had worked together as “business partners,” when they had run an ice cream parlour, a business venture they gave up when the call for anti-capitalist resistance called them to action.¹⁷ Goldman at that time had decided to live for the anarchist cause rather than from a steady income as a business owner. After Berkman was released from prison, it was therefore almost natural that the two anarchists worked together again. However, Goldman also continued to lecture, and in contrast to other anarchists “regularly charged an admission in order to sustain not only *Mother Earth*, but also Goldman herself, her editor, Alexander Berkman, and, at least at times, her manager and lover, Ben

14 Emma Goldman, *Living My Life* (New York: Knopf, 1931), ch. 40, accessed December 17, 2018, <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-living-my-life>.

15 Peter Kropotkin, *Fields, Factories and Workshops* (London: Freedom Press, 1998 [1912]); Peter Kropotkin, *The Conquest of Bread* (Edmonton: AK Press, 2013 [1892]). For a more detailed discussion of anarchist positions towards business operations see Benjamin Franks, “Anarchism and Business Ethics: The Social Responsibility of the Anarchist is to Destroy Business,” *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization* 14, no. 4 (2014): 699–724. Goldman herself often seemed to be frustrated about the “everlasting talk about money and business.” Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 1.

16 Paul Krause, *The Battle for Homestead, 1890–1892: Politics, Culture, and Steel* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992).

17 Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 7.

Reitman.”¹⁸ This made her a target for critical remarks from other anarchists, who accused her of capitalist practices, and although Goldman never used large sums for her own needs, she must have been bothered by such accusations. In fact, as she later remarked in her autobiography *Living My Life* (1931), her lecture tours were essential to fund *Mother Earth* during the initial period after the journal had been launched: “My tours had become the main source of revenue for the magazine, for the publication of our literature and the other expenses involved.”¹⁹

The journal, as Goldman had envisioned it, would not only act as a platform for political ideas but was also supposed to provide cultural debates related to her own “celebration of freedom in the arts, politics, work, education, and sexual life [that] were very much a part of the pre-World War I modernist rebellion of bohemians, radicals, and artists.”²⁰ A special column, called “The Avant Garde,” often presented modernist ideas to a wider public, although Kathy E. Ferguson remarked that “for Goldman, as for others in her generation of radicals, modernism was not a primary source of her energies.”²¹ Regardless of her own taste for the classics of literature or modern drama, Goldman’s mind seemed open enough to allow broad discussions and presentations of new directions in art and literature to be presented in *Mother Earth*. Yet regardless of the journal’s cultural and political diversity, Goldman always needed to find ways to generate money for it, as its anarchist readers were predominantly poor workers who could not help to finance *Mother Earth* as permanent subscribers. The financing was often only possible because Goldman could fill her lectures on literature or drama with middle-class women whom she could charge more than her readers. As long as the revolution was nothing more than an idea, Goldman, like many other revolutionaries, had to rely on capitalist means in order to survive and to continue to spread ideas about revolution and the emancipation of the working class. This explains why she was sometimes more than eager to make the best possible income from her lecture tours.²² In this regard, Goldman was no different from other anarchists, who

have often been viewed as hopelessly impractical dreamers. While certainly idealistic, the anarchists also had a pragmatic streak that enabled them to deal with capitalistic society, however much they despised it. Indeed, Emma Goldman’s understanding of the promotional techniques required to market anarchism in a bourgeois society made her America’s most

18 McKinley, “The Quagmires.”

19 Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 33.

20 Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 743.

21 Ferguson, “Gender and Genre,” 743–744.

22 Emma Goldman to Ben Reitman, 18 March [no year] and December 18, 1909, Ben Reitman Papers, Manuscript Collection of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle Library, cited in McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 518.

successful anarchist agitator. Yet Goldman was more successful than most anarchists, or most American dissidents generally, in unifying her work with her life and with her goals.²³

For the female anarchist, using all the possibilities she had to gain money was the only way to secure the independence of *Mother Earth*, which was supposed to “be a forum for anarchism of every school and variety.”²⁴ The journal eventually really did represent this variety and, in a way, represented a melting pot of political activists, bohemians, and intellectuals who shared their different opinions and ideas about anarchism.²⁵ In its twelve years of existence, *Mother Earth* was “an essential part of the [anarchist] action”²⁶ in the United States.

Those who were involved in publishing *Mother Earth*, like Berkman, also worked on other publication projects, like *The Blast* or *The Modern School*, yet Goldman was able to position *Mother Earth* as the anarchist mouthpiece, since it attracted a rather diverse readership, i. e. “anarchists, feminists, trade unionists, civil libertarians, and progressives of various alignments, not to mention persistent eavesdroppers from various state surveillance agencies.”²⁷ The journal’s design and scope imitated the French magazine *L’Humanité nouvelle*,²⁸ and Goldman kept it ‘anarchist’ in the sense that she allowed all kinds of voices in the anarchist movement to express their thoughts.²⁹ After six years of spending a lot of energy and money on the journal’s publication, Goldman and Berkman’s evaluation of its success was rather ambivalent:

Viewed from the dominant standpoint of success ... *Mother Earth* has failed. Our circulation is still far from the fifty-thousand mark; our subscribers, too, do not represent the multitudes. Nor is our financial rating such that we need feel any anxiety lest a Wall Street panic break our bank. Again, *Mother Earth* has lost in avoirdupois; it began as a heavyweight of sixty-four pages, but is now reduced to the lightweight class. But since when do Anarchists measure success by quantity? Are numbers, weight, or following the true criterion of success? Should not the latter consist, first of all, in adherence to the chosen purpose, no matter at what cost? In-

23 McKinley, “The Quagmires,” 522.

24 Peter Glassgold, “Introduction, The Life and Death of *Mother Earth*,” in *Anarchy! An Anthology of Emma Goldman’s Mother Earth*, ed. Peter Glassgold (Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint, 2012 [2001]), xvii.

25 Kathy E. Ferguson, “Assemblages of Anarchists: Political Aesthetics in *Mother Earth*,” *The Journal of Modern Periodical Studies* 4, no. 2 (2014): 172.

26 Glassgold, “Introduction,” xvii.

27 Ferguson, “Assemblages of Anarchists,” 174.

28 *L’Humanité nouvelle: revue internationale – sciences, lettres et arts*, published in France (1897–1903), was run by the French socialist-anarchist Augustin Hamon.

29 Craig Monk, “Emma Goldman, *Mother Earth*, and the Little Magazine Impulse in Modern America,” in “*The Only Efficient Instrument*”: *American Women Writers and the Periodical, 1837–1916*, eds. Aleta F. Cane and Susan Alves, (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2001), 113–125.

deed, the only success of any value has been the failure of men and women who struggled, suffered, and bled for an ideal, rather than give up, or be silenced. Mother EARTH is such a success. Without a party to back her, with little or no support from her own ranks, and consistently refusing to be gagged by a profitable advertising department, she has bravely weathered the strain of five years, stormy enough to have broken many a strong spirit. She has created an atmosphere for herself which few Anarchist publications in America have been able to equal. She has gathered around her a coterie of men and women who are among the best in the country, and, finally, she has acted as a leaven of thought in quarters least expected by those who are ready with advice, yet unable to help.³⁰

Obviously, the journal was far from being as financially successful as Goldman had intended it to be to secure her a stable living. On the other hand, the two leading anarchists involved in the journal's publication emphasised its ideal role as a platform for all kinds of anarchist thought, which could be expressed independently and without considering any party involved. Goldman and Berkman therefore continued to stress the things they considered to have been achieved by the journal's existence:

As to the original *raison d'être* of MOTHER EARTH, it was, first of all, to create a medium for the free expression of our ideas, a medium bold, defiant, and unafraid. That she has proved to the fullest, for neither friend nor foe has been able to gag her. Secondly, MOTHER EARTH was to serve as a gathering point, as it were, for those, who, struggling to free themselves from the absurdities of the Old, had not yet reached firm footing. Suspended between heaven and hell, they have found in MOTHER EARTH the anchor of life. Thirdly, to infuse new blood into Anarchism, which – in America – had then been running at low ebb for quite some time. All these purposes, it may be said impartially, the magazine has served faithfully and well.³¹

The further existence of Goldman's journal was, however, prevented by the First World War; when *Mother Earth* was "killed by the wartime postal censorship" in August 1917.³² Goldman transformed the journal into the *Mother Earth Bulletin*, which, however, ceased publication in April 1918 because the editors had been sentenced to two years in prison. Both were not only sent to jail but were later also expelled from the United States and sent to Soviet Russia. They consequently had to continue their publishing work in exile, although they remained relatively quiet between January 1920, when they arrived in the homeland of the utopian revolution, and December 1921, when they left it again, disillusioned and bitter but at the same time eager to spread the word about their experiences.

³⁰ Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, "Our Sixth Birthday," *Mother Earth* 6, no. 1 (1911), accessed April 30, 2024, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev6n1.html.

³¹ Goldman and Berkman, "Our Sixth Birthday."

³² Glassgold, "Introduction," xvii.

The Works of an Exiled Anti-Bolshevist

In a letter dated 10 October 1929 to Arthur L. Ross, a lawyer who had represented Goldman's interests in the United States since 1924, the anarchist described her experiences in Soviet Russia and made it clear of "the misery that has been mine since" she was deported from the US, a fact that made her feel quite uncomfortable.³³ Again, Goldman's dreams of and anticipations for a successful revolution and the change of human society to a better one had been destroyed. It is not necessary for the purpose of this article to describe her experiences there, especially since recent research has addressed them in some detail.³⁴ Suffice to say that Goldman was simply frustrated. She had doubted Lenin's moral dignity and the chances for the revolution, which had become more and more corrupted by the Bolsheviks. She reached this realisation earlier than Berkman, who was willing to believe in the future and success of the revolutionary process until the "portent"³⁵ of the Kronstadt Rebellion shattered his dreams in March 1921.³⁶ In December, after a year that saw more violence against Russian anarchists, the two left Soviet Russia and now faced the double dilemma that they first had to move through and to countries that were unlikely to grant them asylum – although they initially found shelter in Sweden – and secondly had to generate an income that would secure their living. Though far away from the United States, it nevertheless promised the best chances to make some money with texts about the anarchists experiences in the utopian land of the revolution.

In her writings, Goldman attempted to address the situation in Soviet Russia but was careful to separate the revolution and its ideals and the Bolsheviks and Lenin, who had betrayed them. In a letter to the Polish-born American anarchist Michael A. Cohen on 23 July 1921, she described her understanding of the situation as follows: "[I]t is not the R[ussian] Revolution which is to blame for the general debacle. It is the regime. But about that when we meet again, or when I am somewhere where I can again raise my voice. As I said before, we are trying desperately to get out. I do not know whether we will succeed. I only know it is beyond me to

33 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, October 10, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–23 Dec. 1929.

34 Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution: From Admiration to Frustration* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2020).

35 Helmut Bock, "Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921," in Helmut Bock et al., *Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921 – Kriegskommunismus und Alternativen* (Berlin: Pankower Vorträge, 2011), 5–20.

36 Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 235–236.

stay here another winter. I manage to go on only by sheer force of will.”³⁷ However, with her twenty-three months of eyewitness experience, Goldman did not only want to provide the world with first-hand information about the realities in Soviet Russia. She also intended to secure Berkman’s and her own financial life, as both were now “truly in exile, stateless in every sense of the word.”³⁸ The former, in a letter to the Yiddish anarchists Pauline and Solomon Linder, described himself as a “lonesome fellow, who is without place, country or name,”³⁹ and who, together with Goldman, now had to live in a world that could not offer the two anarchists a place and the necessary security to live an undisturbed life.

In February 1922, he sent his first article to Eleanor Fitzgerald in New York with the following instructions:

Enclosed herewith an article – a rather long one. It is a complete review and an outlook in re [sic] Russia. I have tried to do careful work. Every quotation is correct. Every fact verified. I do *not want this* for the Freie Arb[eiter] ST[imme]. I am very anxious to have this appear in *English* ... May be the Nation would take it, to be published in two instalments, perhaps. If you can induce the Editor *to read* it, I think he’d be interested. I do not want it to appear in any out and out capitalistic paper. As for the liberal press, use your own judgement, for I am very eager to have it appear in English. Of course, nothing must be changed. I permit no editorial corrections whatever on my work. But you know all that, dear – The Forward would probably take it, except the last part, especially the criticism of Marxism. I am afraid that if they take the whole, they might on the quiet change my Marxian attacks. I do not trust Cahan⁴⁰ or the others in *such* matters. At any rate, I want at least \$250.00 for this article, whoever takes it. But that, too, is left in your hands.⁴¹

Berkman also planned to publish a pamphlet about Soviet Russia soon afterward, maybe a shorter version of *The Russian Tragedy* (1922).⁴² In Sweden, however, the working situation for him and Goldman was not easy, as the two anarchists had to share one typewriter, which caused some trouble: “[A]s we live in different places it is a big handicap. Besides she is herself doing considerable writing now, so I can’t use the machine when I need it. It’s hell.”⁴³ In addition, money became a serious

37 Emma Goldman to Michael A. Cohen, Moscow, July 23, 1921, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 1.

38 Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 115.

39 Alexander Berkman to Polyá [i. e. Pauline] and Solo[mon Linder], n.p., August 9, [1923?], Solomon Linder Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 443, Box 4, Folder 63.

40 A reference to the socialist newspaper editor Abraham Cahan (1860–1951).

41 Alexander Berkman to Fitzie, Stockholm, February 10, 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 1. Emphasis in the original.

42 Alexander Berkman to Fitzie, Stockholm, February 10, 1922.

43 Alexander Berkman to Michael A. Cohen, Stockholm, February 12, 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 2.

issue, and Berkman was both anxious and angry: “[T]here is the money question, damn it. Of course the boys here, in Norway etc., will issue my pamphlets at their expense. They are, of course, too poor to pay me anything, and I don’t want them to do it, either. Nor could the German or English comrades pay. That will have to be done by the U.S. It is a very unpleasant thing for me to speak of this, but as you know I have no means of living. I believe I already told you that life is terribly dear here. Worse than in America.”⁴⁴ Their American friends collected some money and were able to send them a check for 360 Kroner that just arrived in time to save the two anarchists in their Swedish exile, but “living under this pressure it is somewhat hard to write articles on serious subjects. One needs a bit of quiet. This uncertainty and constant hounding get on one’s nerves, especially after those two harrowing years in Russia.”⁴⁵

Goldman acted pragmatically and, in contrast to Berkman, accepted the possibility to publish some of her articles about Soviet Russia in the *New York World*, which at least secured some income. Left radicals in the United States, however, would criticise her for publishing such negative views on the Russian Revolution, especially in a capitalist newspaper. Goldman’s point of view “alienated many former comrades,”⁴⁶ but the letters, later reprinted in a collected form as *The Crushing of the Russian Revolution* (1922), present an important early anti-Bolshevist interpretation of the moral corruption of the revolutionary process in Soviet Russia.⁴⁷ Goldman realised that her views were unpopular for many reasons: “I know I shall be misappropriated by the reactionaries, the enemies of the Russian Revolution, as well as excommunicated by its so-called friends, who persist in confusing the governing party of Russia with the Revolution.”⁴⁸ Goldman, who had been able to get a visa for Germany, lived in Berlin in 1922, where she worked on her first pamphlet, *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution* (1922),⁴⁹ which published thanks to the support of the German anarchist Rudolf Rocker.

44 Alexander Berkman to Michael A. Cohen, Stockholm, February 12, 1922, 2.

45 Alexander Berkman to Michael A. Cohen, Stockholm, March 14, 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 2.

46 Anthony Ashbolt, “Love and Hate in European Eyes: Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman on America,” *Australasian Journal of American Studies* 22, no. 1 (2003): 5.

47 Emma Goldman, *The Crushing of the Russian Revolution* (London: Freedom Press, 1922), University of Warwick Library Special Collections, JD 10.P6 PPC 1684.

48 Goldman, *The Crushing*, 3.

49 Emma Goldman, *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution* (Berlin: Der Syndikalist, 1922).

In 1922, Berkman, who had also been able to get to Germany and lived in Berlin as well, finished the first draft of a manuscript initially titled “The Russian Revolution: A Review and an Outlook,”⁵⁰ which was later published as *The Russian Tragedy: A Review and An Outlook* (1922). Berkman’s work was supposed to provide a critical reflection “[o]n the correct estimation of the Russian Revolution, the role played in it by the Bolsheviks and other political parties and movements, and the causes that have brought about the present situation” and on “what lessons we shall draw from the great historic event of 1917.”⁵¹ He therefore worked on the same topic and with the same agenda as Goldman, although they tried to sell their works independently from each other, which caused some trouble for their relationship, as they were competitors both needing to secure an income.⁵²

Goldman was still suffering from the events in Soviet Russia and needed some time to recover before she could begin writing, including letters to friends in the US, again. On 9 August 1921, she wrote to her friend Leon Malméd:

In fact I have not written to any one of my friends in the States for nearly three months. I cannot go into the causes which affected me mentally and spiritually. Primarily it is the utter hopelessness of the Russian situation. I suffered keenly under it while I was there, but always consoled myself with the thought that when I got out of Russia I would be able to do much to arouse the workers against the terrible things that were happening there. Since I came to Germany, I seem to have gotten into a state of lethargy. I could not get myself to work, or even to concentrate on any one given thought. You can well imagine that I was in despair. However, I believe I have myself in hand.⁵³

However, it did not take too long for Goldman to start writing again and reflecting on her experiences in Soviet Russia. She wanted to provide an intellectual reflection, not a classic scientific study, and argued that her work “will, of course, be of an entire different nature – not a history of the Russian revolution – I leave that to the historians who fifty years from now will interpret the great Russian event in a cold and detached manner.”⁵⁴ The anarchist wanted “[a]bove all ... to translate the heroic struggle, the hopes and the fate of the Russian people. I do not know how

50 Alexander Berkman, “The Russian Revolution: A Review and an Outlook,” Stockholm, 8 February 1922, Alexander Berkman Papers, International Institute of Social History (henceforth ABP-IISH), No. 182.

51 Berkman, “The Russian Revolution: A Review and an Outlook,” 1.

52 Alexander Berkman to Michael A. Cohen, Berlin, April 13, 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 4.

53 Emma Goldman to Leon Malméd, Berlin, August 9, 1922, Papers of Leon Malméd and Emma Goldman, MC 332, M-88, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, United States of America (henceforth LMP), Folder 28, 1.

54 Emma Goldman to Leon Malméd, Berlin, August 9, 1922, 1.

well I shall succeed, but I mean to try very hard.”⁵⁵ By the end of September 1922, she had written around 85,000 words, but she assumed that the process would take much longer than expected, as she reported to Cohen: “I think it will be ready much later; I do want to give something good and to write about Russia which is living through Purgatory all over again.”⁵⁶

The story of this manuscript would eventually become a disaster. Doubleday, Page & Co. had agreed to publish the work in 1923 but, without consultation, changed Goldman’s title, “My Two Years in Russia,” to *My Disillusionment in Russia*. As if that were not bad enough, Doubleday left out twelve chapters of Goldman’s manuscript because the literary agency, the McClure Syndicate, had sent an incomplete manuscript.⁵⁷ The missing parts were later published as *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (1924), but the damage had already been done, with the original manuscript split in two. Considering this situation, it might nevertheless have been worse for Goldman as almost nobody seemed to realise the incompleteness of her work. Only two reviewers, a critic who worked for the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* and a Buffalo-based librarian, remarked on the supposed lack of some chapters.⁵⁸ Besides these problems and the fact that Goldman’s work never reached a broader public, it “brought down on [Goldman] a storm of left-wing abuse from which there would be no recovery.”⁵⁹ It also drove some kind of wedge into her relationship with Berkman, although this was not related to her attacks against Bolshevism. Goldman had used a lot of her friend’s material, so Berkman’s own work was perceived as a copy rather than offering original knowledge. In October 1922, in one of his letters, he remarked that Goldman’s “forte is the platform, not the pen, as she herself knows very well ... As her book will be out first, what interest could my book ... have ... It is a tragic situation. Of course, my writing is different in style, and to some extent in point of view, but the meat I have given away. And yet I could not do otherwise.”⁶⁰

His book *The Bolshevik Myth* (1925) was considered superior to Goldman’s by his publisher, Horace B. Liveright, who believed that it could “sell a great many more copies both to radicals and conservatives than practically any other title we could hit upon,”⁶¹ even if not all external reviewers, whose opinions the pub-

55 Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Berlin, 9 August 1922, 2.

56 Emma Goldman to Michael A. Cohen, n.p., 22 September 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 2.

57 Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 245.

58 Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 245.

59 Gornick, *Emma Goldman*, 118.

60 Cited in Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 244.

61 Horace B. Liveright to Eleanor Fitzgerald, New York, December 15, 1924, ABP-IISH, No. 169.

lisher had sought, considered *The Bolshevik Myth* to be so intriguing.⁶² By June 1925, the sales numbers had proved that Berkman's work did not appeal to the masses. Liveright's report was more than sobering: "This has, unquestionably, been the worst book season that I have ever experienced. Novels that would ordinarily sell 10,000 copies have sold 3,000 or 4,000. Books of a more serious nature have failed even worse, so I can't say that I am disappointed yet when I report to you that *The Bolshevik Myth* has sold about 625 copies to June 1st."⁶³ The numbers only reached 999 sales copies in 1926, and Liveright emphasised that "it would take us so long to get rid of even 250 copies that it certainly wouldn't warrant our reprinting."⁶⁴ Goldman's and Berkman's works about their Russian experiences did not sell well, especially since they were trying to reach a movement, i.e. the anarchist one in the United States, that had lost most of its momentum, like many other anarchist movements around the globe.⁶⁵ The exiles were consequently back at the point where they had started when trying to make a living off their writings, yet in a situation where the anarchist community had lost many of its members and thereby the financial capacity to make Goldman's or Berkman's works bestsellers – and thus interesting for publishers – who would not otherwise grant them favourable publishing conditions. Casual work – Berkman, for example, acted as a translator – would hardly secure the costs for their daily life, which is why Goldman later hoped that her autobiography would secure her financial situation for the years to come, or at least grant her the chance for a peaceful and less troublesome period until the end of her life.

Struggling for an Income: The Story Behind Goldman's Autobiography

Regardless of her financial problems – alongside low sales numbers for her books, her lecture tours had turned out to be financially rather less successful than anticipated – in 1929 Goldman was able to buy a house for her and Berkman in Saint-Tropez because some of the anarchists' richer friends had paid a first instal-

⁶² Memorandum by Manuel Komroff to Horace B. Liveright, New York, December 12, 1924, ABP-IISH, No. 169.

⁶³ Horace B. Liveright to Alexander Berkman, New York, June 17, 1925, ABP-IISH, No. 169.

⁶⁴ John S. Clapp to Eleanor Fitzgerald, New York, March 19, 1926, ABP-IISH, No. 169. In the first six months of 1926, only twelve copies were sold in the US and Canada. Royalty Statement for Alexander Berkman, Boni & Liveright, June 30, 1926, ABP-IISH, No. 169.

⁶⁵ Carl Levy, "Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 126–127.

ment of 30,000 Francs, leaving 50,000 Francs in debts that were supposed to be paid in the following years. Goldman had hoped to pay off these debts with the income from her autobiography, *Living My Life* (1931), that she was then working on.⁶⁶ Settled in her new home in southern France, the anarchists celebrated Goldman's birthday and, according to her, it "was certainly the most perfect birthday I have had since I became a conscious human being ... After our tea, we had a grand banquet ... We had ordered our dinner, and believe me, it was the grandest feed I have had in years – perfectly prepared and exquisitely served. Then we danced and danced and danced."⁶⁷ Regardless of the fun, the next day seems to have been quite terrible and interrupted Goldman's work on her autobiography: "[I]t seems nothing will kill E[mma] G[oldman] except death, and if she can help it she is going to tell the Old Gentleman to wait at least until her book is completed."⁶⁸ This book was supposed to serve her in multiple ways. On the one hand, her autobiographical work gave Goldman a chance to look back critically upon her five decades of life – although she was rarely really critical about herself – and, on the other, the book seemed genuinely important to her in financial terms, as she really hoped to gain some income that would end her financial sorrows and relieve the pressure of thinking about how to make a living all the time.

She feared, however, that her autobiography would be too extensive to sell to a US publisher, as she shared with Arthur Ross in July 1929: "I quite agree with you that two volumes of a work, unless it is a novel, are a dangerous undertaking. I am going to insist with the publisher who will bring out my book to make it one large volume."⁶⁹ Even more troublesome was the royalty question, as Goldman wanted to receive 15 per cent a demand that could hardly be backed by the sales numbers of her former works. Alfred A. Knopf in New York offered her an advance of \$4,000 – the average hourly wage for a bindery woman working in the print and publishing sector in New York City at that time was 67 Cents⁷⁰ – and a royalty of 10 per

66 Emma Goldman to Doris Zhook, St Tropez, July 3, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Doris Zhook et al., 24 Dec. 1926–31 Jul. 1939, 2. She commented on her purchase as follows: "It is a comfort to know that in my old age I will have a roof over my head and a definitive place to which I can return and where I can keep my books which are the only valuable things I have."

67 Emma Goldman to Doris Zhook, St Tropez, July 3, 1929, 3.

68 Emma Goldman to Doris Zhook, St Tropez, July 3, 1929, 3.

69 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, July 18, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–23 Dec. 1929, 1.

70 "Union Scales of Wages and Hours of Labor," *Bulletin of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics* 540, May 15, 1930: 175. For the historical value development of the Franc at that time see Kenneth A. Oye, "The Sterling-Dollar-Franc Triangle: Monetary Diplomacy 1929–1937," *World Politics* 38, no. 1 (1985): 174.

cent on the first 5,000 copies. If more copies were sold, she would receive the demanded 15 per cent. Goldman consequently also considered other possibilities for her book: "I realise that Knopf from a point of quality as a publisher is perhaps preferable than Simon & Schuster, but on the other hand, the latter are the most skilful advertisers and recklessly enterprising. More than any other publisher ... Schuster ... would get my book over in a large way. That is my reason for begging off from Knopf until I hear from the others."⁷¹ Goldman's considerations emphasise that the anarchist knew both how capitalism works and that this may have been her last shot to secure a financial income for her remaining years. Liveright was obviously out of the question, as they had mishandled Goldman's last publication project. In addition, she found a letter from Liveright rude: "A man who can write in the tone that Horace L. did is not an agreeable person to deal with. I therefore want to get out of having anything to do with him unless there should be some hitch with Knopf."⁷² Her demands and expectations of Knopf were nevertheless similarly rude. Goldman was eager that her book should be published in only one volume, that it would cost less than \$5, and that Knopf would use all his means to advertise it properly.⁷³ From the start, the anarchist acted like a publishing professional whose goal was clear: maximum profit. It is therefore not surprising that she also hoped to keep the copyright of her work for the European market, where she had offers from German and Danish publishers, and Goldman also intended to sell the rights for the book to a British publisher. Knopf, who supposedly had to pay a relatively large share to Goldman, would only hold the rights for the US and Canadian markets.⁷⁴

Ross had supposedly pointed out that such demands were too much for Knopf to accept, and Goldman seemed to understand the problem, although she wanted to keep the book as cheap as possible, hoping that this would help to reach a wider audience and to sell more copies:

You are quite right that I cannot insist on whether my book is to appear in one or two volumes, and the same applies to the selling price of the book. My only reason for mentioning these points is that a one volume autobiography is likely to sell better, and a \$5.00 edition, though prohibitive for a great many people, would nevertheless not be so exclusive as \$750. After all, we need not deceive ourselves. The people most interested in the story of

⁷¹ Goldman to Ross, St Tropez, July 18, 1929, 2.

⁷² Goldman to Ross, St Tropez, July 18, 1929, 2.

⁷³ Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, August 8, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–23 Dec. 1929.

⁷⁴ Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, August 24, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–23 Dec. 1929, 1–2.

my life will be intelligent advanced workers and professional people and they are the very ones who cannot afford such a high price.⁷⁵

The negotiations were fierce, but Goldman had no other choice and emphasised this in another letter to Ross, when she confessed that “my book is my first and last chance in life to get enough material results to secure myself for whatever few years there are left me to live. It is for this reason that I am very eager to make the best possible arrangements with Knopf in regard to the returns that are likely to accrue from the publication of my autobiography.”⁷⁶

Goldman was also worried that 300,000–350,000 words would not suffice to describe her life in much detail, but in the meantime, she at least seemed to have reached an agreement with Knopf she could accept: “I am writing him today ... simply to tell him I am satisfied with his assurance of a large advertising campaign, as well as with the general tone he has maintained so far. In fact I must say I am delighted to find in Knopf a man of such fine tact and large spirit.”⁷⁷ In the end, Knopf offered Goldman a \$7,000 advance but requested the global rights for the work in exchange. The anarchist eventually accepted and could now focus on actually finishing the manuscript.⁷⁸ The writing process, however, turned out to burden Goldman in the following weeks and months: “Human nature, though, is a contrary thing: now that everything is settled, I may find it more difficult to keep going, and heavens only knows it has never been anything else but difficult since I began writing the story of my mad life. The thought that I am pledged to a definite

75 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, August 24, 1929, 2.

76 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, August 24, 1929, 2.

77 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, September 10, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–23 Dec. 1929, 4. Goldman wrote to Ross again on 15 September 1929 to say that Knopf would get the translation rights but that Ross should make sure to secure her rights as well, especially with regard to the much-needed advance payments: “[I]n whatever country he [Knopf] gives permission for the publication of my book he should ask for advance on royalties. I know that the \$2,000 I am to get soon and the \$2,000 when the manuscript is completed look like a very large amount of money. It is, of course. But I have many debts and I am dying to get a rest away somewheres [sic!] from writing. Inasmuch as there will be no returns from royalties on the book until the \$4,000 are deducted, I will need more money to keep me in comparative comfort and peace of mind. For this reason I am very anxious to get advance sums wherever I possibly can.” Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, September 15, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–23 Dec. 1929, 1.

78 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, September 24, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925 – Dec. 23, 1929, 1.

[sic] date has already started to haunt me.”⁷⁹ Regardless of these problems, the first payment of \$3,325 that reached her from Knopf made the financial pressure Goldman suffered from disappear, at least for the moment, and she was happy and thankful that Ross had been so helpful in the previous few weeks to get the contract with Knopf signed.⁸⁰ The only thing that bothered her was that she, the famous American anarchist, was supposed to pay taxes on her royalties from Knopf in the US to the same government that had expelled her in 1919:

I think it is a rotten shame that I should have to sustain the U.S. Government. Instead of giving me an indemnity for depriving me of citizenship, raiding our office and robbing us of everything we had built up in the way of literature etc., I am now compelled to pay a tax on the royalties of my book. This serves to prove my contention that governments are cut-throats, even worse than ordinary hold up men.⁸¹

That Goldman had at the same time acted according to the capitalist publishing system was also something she had obviously realised, as she felt “entirely indebted to some American publishers I have dealt with for the lessons they gave me about the necessity of becoming ‘a hard-boiled business woman’” who was “on the way of becoming a ‘bloated capitalist’.”⁸²

She could at least use some of the money to pay some debts, and the next \$650 payment for the house was secured as well. Some of the first payment also went to Ross, who had lent Goldman money earlier. Thus, as soon as she was paid, the money was gone and the sorrows returned. The anarchist made it clear that “unless I get any returns from serial sales or articles, I will have to hang on to the second advance for a long time because it is not likely ... [that I will] get another sou from royalties until Knopf has taken out his advance.”⁸³ However, the situation got even worse once the anticipated sales numbers were not reached, and Goldman blamed Knopf for this financial catastrophe: “*Living My Life* was botched in America owing to the mad price.”⁸⁴ Foreign publishers, especially in Britain, seemed un-

79 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, October 6, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–23 Dec. 1929, 1.

80 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, October 13, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–Dec. 23, 1929, 1.

81 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, October 13, 1929, 2.

82 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, October 13, 1929, 2–3.

83 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, Paris, November 4, 1929, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 18 Jul. 1925–23 Dec. 1929, 2.

84 Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, London, March 12, 1933, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 4 Jan. 1933–30 Dec. 1933, 1.

interested in buying the rights to publish the book there as well,⁸⁵ and Goldman eventually complained about the situation in a personal letter to Knopf:

It sounds as if you are holding me responsible for your losses on my book. Yet it was I who pleaded with you to make *LIVING MY LIFE* accessible to a larger public. In trying so hard to induce you to reduce your price, I was moved more by my concern in your returns than in mine. Surely that should have been proof enough that I did not want you to suffer any financial loss. I feel therefore that you are most unjust in throwing the blame for the unfortunate failure on my shoulders. After all, I did not sit on your doorstep and plead for your acceptance of *LIVING MY LIFE*. ... You know yourself that your loss is not due to [any] lack of quality of my work; that it was the crisis and your insistence on a prohibitive price. Why not admit that you had erred in the matter? None of us is always right, dear Mr. Knopf. No, not even you.⁸⁶

Goldman also tried to clarify the issue in a letter to Arthur Ross: “I finally had to give the man [Knopf] a piece of my mind. The stubborn mule has only himself to blame that he is still out so much on *Living My Life*. He keeps hinting that I am at fault after I had tried so desperately to make him see how absurd and downright criminal it had been to put the work out at \$7.50. Now, I [do not] give [a] damn whether he will have a cheap edition or not. I [have] had enough heart ache over the matter. I really can’t worry any more.”⁸⁷

As the hoped-for financial success never materialised, Goldman continued to struggle in the following years to make money from articles and lecture tours, which also rarely seemed to secure a financial surplus.⁸⁸ Her ‘last shot’ at the global book market had failed, and this emphasised the decline of interest in the life and achievements of the transnational anarchist, even if Goldman had tried to act in line with the rules of the capitalist publishing business of the United States.

Conclusion

In the early 1930s, Goldman had to pragmatically accept that she represented a political ideal that had not been realised, and she consequently had to act according to that system to survive as an individual. Of course, one could consider her de-

⁸⁵ Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, Jersey, May 1, 1933, 3.

⁸⁶ Emma Goldman to Alfred A. Knopf, St Tropez, August 5, 1933, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross et al., 22 Jan. 1930–12 Jun. 1939, 1.

⁸⁷ Emma Goldman to Arthur Ross, St Tropez, August 15, 1933, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross, 4 Jan. 1933–30 Dec. 1933, 1.

⁸⁸ James B. Pond to Emma Goldman, New York, March 30, 1934, EGP-TAM, Box 1, Emma Goldman Correspondence to Arthur Ross et al., 22 Jan. 1930–12 Jun. 1939.

mands greedy and as not following the ideals she preached as an anarchist, but she had little choice: an anarchist has to live off something. While her works on the Russian Revolution and Soviet Russia had caused aggressive reactions from the American left, her autobiography, which was supposed to secure her future and once more emphasise her role as an important figure of the anarchist movement, flopped. She blamed the publisher for this failure, not accepting the realities of an anarchist movement that was declining in importance. It must have angered her that, after all the years she had invested in the struggle for a better society and a freer world, she still had to struggle to secure her own living. She consequently acted like a pragmatist when she dealt with her US publishers and negotiated the terms for her autobiography, which the anarchist eventually sold like a capitalist. Critics always accused Goldman of having lived off, instead of for, the anarchist movement, but such critical voices forgot that she had to live abroad, far away from family and friends, without any support, and the only thing she could sell was her own story and her knowledge about anarchism and the world in general, and the Russian Revolution in particular.

Works Cited

Archival Sources

Federal Archives of Germany, Berlin

Kurt Eisner Papers

Immigration History Research Center Archives, University of Minnesota

Michael L. Zlatovski Papers

International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam

Alexander Berkman Papers

Emma Goldman Papers

New York Public Library, New York

Emma Goldman Papers

Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Papers of Leon Malmed and Emma Goldman

Special Collections Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Joseph A. Labadie Collection

*Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, New York University, New York City, NY,
United States of America*

Alexander Berkman Papers

Emma Goldman Papers

Yale University Library, Manuscripts and Archives, New Haven, CT

Harry Weinberger Papers

YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York City, NY

Michael A. Cohen Papers

Solomon Linder Papers

Newspapers

Bergens tidene

Berliner Börsen-Zeitung

Daily Capital Journal

Freedom

Freiheit: Berliner Organ der Unabhängigen Sozialdemokratie Deutschlands

Hannoverscher Kurier

Morning Journal and Courier
Pittsburg Dispatch
New-York Tribune
The Camden Chronicle
The Chanute Times
The Day Book
The Evening World (New York City)
The Honolulu Republican
The New York Times
The Portland Daily Press
The San Francisco Call
Trondheims Folkeblad

Published Sources and Secondary Works

- Abidor, Mitchell ed. *Death to Bourgeois Society: The Propagandists of the Deed*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2015.
- Adamczak, Bini. *Beziehungsweise Revolution: 1917, 1968 und kommende*. Berlin, Germany: Suhrkamp, 2017.
- Adamczak, Bini. *Der schönste Tag im Leben des Alexander Berkman: Vom womöglichen Gelingen der Russischen Revolution*. Münster: Edition Assemblage 2017.
- Adams, Matthew S. and Ruth Kinna, eds. *Anarchism, 1914–18: Internationalism, Anti-Militarism and War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Ashbolt, Anthony. "Love and Hate in European Eyes: Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman on America." *Australasian Journal of American Studies* 22, no. 1 (2003): 1–14.
- Avrich, Paul. *Kronstadt 1921*. New York: Norton 1974 [1970].
- Avrich, Paul and Karen. *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Avrich, Paul. *The Anarchists in the Russian Revolution*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1973.
- Avrich, Paul. *The Haymarket Tragedy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- "A Woman Anarchist." In *Emma Goldman. A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, edited by Candace Falk et al., 243–246. Urbana/Chicago, IL: Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Bantman, Constance. "Internationalism without an International? Cross-Channel Anarchist Networks, 1880–1914." *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 84, no. 4 (2006): 961–981.
- Bantman, Constance and Bert Altena. "Introduction: Problematizing Scales of Analysis in Network-Based Social Movements." In *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies*, eds. Constance Bantman and Bert Altena, 3–22. London/New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Bantman, Constance. "The Dangerous Liaisons of Belle Epoque Anarchists: Internationalism, Transnationalism, and Nationalism in the French Anarchist Movement (1880–1914)." In *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies*, eds. Constance Bantman and Bert Altena, 174–192. London/New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Behrends, Jan C., Nikolaus Katzer, and Thomas Lindenberger, eds. *100 Jahre Roter Oktober: Zur Weltgeschichte der Russischen Revolution*. Berlin: Ch. Links 2017.

- Berger, Stefan and Angel Smith, eds. *Nationalism, Labour and Ethnicity 1870–1939*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Berkman, Alexander. “A Greeting.” *Mother Earth* 1, no. 4 (1906). Accessed October 17, 2019. http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev1n4.html.
- Berkman, Alexander. *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist*. New York: Mother Earth, 1912.
- Berkman, Alexander. *The Bolshevik Myth*. New York: Boni and Liveright 1925.
- Berkman, Alexander. *The Kronstadt Rebellion*. Berlin: Der Syndikalist, 1922. Accessed May 20, 2020. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/alexander-berkman-the-kronstadt-rebellion#toc8>.
- Berkman, Alexander. *The Russian Tragedy: A Review and An Outlook*. Berlin: Syndikalist 1922.
- Bock, Helmut. “Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921.” In Helmut Bock et al., *Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921 – Kriegskommunismus und Alternativen* (Berlin: Pankower Vorträge, 2011), 5–20.
- Bois, Marcel and Frank Jacob, eds. *Zeiten des Aufbruchs (1916–1921): Globale Proteste, Streiks und Revolutionen gegen den Ersten Weltkrieg und seine Auswirkungen*. Berlin: Metropol 2020.
- Brossat, Alain and Sylvia Klingberg. *Revolutionary Yiddishland: A History of Jewish Radicalism*. Translated by David Fernbach. London/New York: Verso, 2016.
- Confino, Michaël. “Anarchisme et internationalisme. Autour du Manifeste des Seize Correspondance inédite de Pierre Kropotkine et de Marie Goldsmith, janvier-mars 1916.” *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique* 22, no. 2–3 (1981): 231–249.
- Cornell, Andrew. *Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the Twentieth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press 2016.
- Daniels, Robert V. “The Kronstadt Revolt of 1921: A Study in the Dynamics of Revolution.” *The American Slavic and East European Review* vol. 10, 4 (1951): 241–254.
- DeLamotte, Eugenia C. *Gates of Freedom: Voltairine de Cleyre and the Revolution of the Mind*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Drinnon, Richard and Anna Maria, eds. *Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman*. New York: Schocker, 1975.
- Drinnon, Richard. *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*. Phoenix edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982 [1961].
- Falk, Candace, ed. *Emma Goldman: A Guide to Her Life and Documentary Sources*. Alexandria, VA: Chadwyck-Healey, 1995.
- Falk, Candace et al., eds. *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008.
- Falk, Candace. *Love, Anarchy and Emma Goldman*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990 [1984].
- Ferguson, Kathy E. “Assemblages of Anarchists: Political Aesthetics in *Mother Earth*,” *The Journal of Modern Periodical Studies* 4, no. 2 (2014): 171–194.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. “Discourses of Danger: Locating Emma Goldman.” *Political Theory* 36, no. 5 (2008): 735–761.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. “Gender and Genre in Emma Goldman.” *Signs* 36, no. 3 (2011): 733–757.
- Fine, Sidney. “Anarchism and the Assassination of McKinley.” *The American Historical Review* 60, no. 4 (1955): 777–799.
- Foucault, Michel. *Fearless Speech*, ed. Joseph Pearson. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001.
- Franks, Benjamin, Nathan Jun and Leonard Williams, eds. *Anarchism: A Conceptual Approach*. New York/London: Routledge, 2018.

- Franks, Benjamin. "Anarchism and Business Ethics: The Social Responsibility of the Anarchist is to Destroy Business." *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization* 14, no. 4 (2014): 699–724.
- Glassgold, Peter. "Introduction, The Life and Death of Mother Earth." In *Anarchy! An Anthology of Emma Goldman's Mother Earth*, ed. Peter Glassgold, xvii–xxxviii. Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint, 2012 [2001].
- Goldberg, Harold J. "Goldman and Berkman View the Bolshevik Regime." *The Slavonic and East European Review* vol. 53, 131 (1975): 272–76.
- G.[oldman], E.[mma]. "Alexander Berkman." *Mother Earth* 1, no. 3 (1906): 22–24. Accessed October 17, 2019. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/27262/27262-h/27262-h.htm#Page_22.
- Goldman, Emma. *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution*. Berlin, Germany: Der Syndikalist, 1922.
- Goldman, Emma. *Living My Life*. New York: Knopf, 1931. Accessed December 17, 2018. <https://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-living-my-life>.
- Goldman, Emma. "Marriage." In *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, edited by Candace Falk et al., 269–273. Urbana/Chicago, IL: Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Goldman, Emma. *Marriage and Love*. New York: Mother Earth, 1911.
- Goldman, Emma. *My Disillusionment in Russia*. New York: Doubleday 1923.
- Goldman, Emma. *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1924). Accessed April 30, 2024. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-further-disillusionment-in-russia>.
- Goldman, Emma and Alexander Berkman. "Our Sixth Birthday." *Mother Earth* 6, no. 1, (1911), accessed April 30, 2024, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev6n1.html.
- Goldman, Emma. "Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty." In *Emma Goldman, Anarchism and Other Essays*, 2nd ed. (New York: Mother Earth, 1911), accessed December 10, 2021, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-anarchism-and-other-essays#toc7>.
- Goldman, Emma. "Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter." *Mother Earth* 10, no. 10 (1915). Accessed April 30, 2024. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-preparedness-the-road-to-universal-slaughter>.
- Goldman, Emma. *The Crushing of the Russian Revolution*. London: Freedom Press 1922.
- Goldman, Emma. "The New Woman." In *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, edited by Candace Falk et al., 322–323. Urbana/Chicago, IL: Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Goldman, Emma. "The Russian Revolution." *Mother Earth Bulletin* 1, no. 3 (1917). Accessed April 30, 2024. http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/ME/mebulv1n3.html.
- Goldman, Emma. "The Social Aspects of Birth Control." *Mother Earth* 11, no. 2 (1916): 468–475.
- Goldman, Emma. *The Social Significance of Modern Drama*. Boston, MA: Richard G. Badger, 1914.
- Goldman, Emma. "The Tragedy of Women's Emancipation." *Mother Earth* 1, no. 1 (1906): 9–17. Accessed October 17, 2019. http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev1n1.html#tra.
- Goldman, Emma. "The Truth About the Bolsheviks," New York 1918. Accessed October 30, 2017. http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/truthaboutbol.html.
- Goldman, Emma. *The White Slave Traffic*. New York: Mother Earth, 1909.

- Goldman, Emma and Alexander Berkman. "Our Sixth Birthday." *Mother Earth* 6, no. 1 (1911). Accessed February 26, 2020. http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/goldman/ME/mev6n1.html.
- Goldman, Emma. "Walt Whitman. 1916." In *The Emma Goldman Papers: A Microfilm Edition*, edited by Candace Falk with Ronald J. Zboray et al., reel 54. Alexandria, VA: Chadwyck-Healey, 1990.
- Goldman, Emma. "What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?" In *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, edited by Candace Falk et al., 289–292. Urbana/Chicago, IL: Illinois University Press, 2008.
- "Goldman's Cry Against Society." In *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, edited by Candace Falk et al., 249. Urbana/Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008.
- Gordon, Uri. "Anarchism and Nationalism." In *Brill's Companion to Anarchism and Philosophy*, ed. Nathan J. Jun, 196–215. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Gornick, Vivian. *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Gornick, Vivian. *The Romance of American Communism*. London: Verso, 2020.
- Goyens, Tom. *Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880–1914*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press 2007.
- Goyens, Tom. "Johann Most and the German Anarchists." In *Radical Gotham: Anarchism in New York City from Schwab's Saloon to Occupy Wall Street*, edited by Tom Goyens. Urbana: Illinois University Press 2017, 12–32.
- Grosser, Philip. *Uncle Sam's Devil's Island: Experiences of a Conscientious Objector in America during the World War*. Boston, MA: Excelsior Press, 1933.
- Haaland, Bonnie. *Emma Goldman: Sexuality and the Impurity of the State*. Montréal et al.: Black Rose Books, 1993.
- Hedeler, Wladislaw, ed. *Die russische Linke zwischen März und November 1917*. Berlin: Dietz 2017.
- Hemmings, Clare. "In the Mood for Revolution: Emma Goldman's Passion." *New Literary History* 43, no. 3 (2012): 527–545.
- Hemmings, Clare. "Sexual Freedom and the Promise of Revolution Emma Goldman's Passion." *Feminist Review* 106 (2014): 43–59.
- Herzer, Manfred. *Magnus Hirschfeld und seine Zeit*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017.
- Hester, Torrie. *Deportation: The Origins of U.S. Policy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.
- Hollander, Paul. *Political Pilgrims: Western Intellectuals in Search of the Good Society*, 11th edition. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2009).
- Hsu, Rachel Hui-Chi. *Emma Goldman, 'Mother Earth', and the Anarchist Awakening*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2021.
- Ishill, Joseph. *Emma Goldman: A Challenging Rebel*. Berkeley Heights, N.J.: Oriole Press, 1957.
- Jacob, Frank. *1917 – Die korruptierte Revolution*. Darmstadt: Büchner Verlag 2020.
- Jacob, Frank. "An Anarchist Has to Live off Something: Emma Goldman as a Capitalist Publicist." *Anarchist Studies* 30, no. 2 (2022): 8–30.
- Jacob, Frank. "An Anarchist Revolution? Emma Goldman as an Intellectual Revolutionary." *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 15, no. 2 (2021): 29–48.
- Jacob, Frank. "Anarchism and the Perversion of the Russian Revolution: The Accounts of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman." *Diacronie* 33, no. 1 (2018): <https://doi.org/10.4000/diacronie.7405>.

- Jacob, Frank. "Anarchismus, Ehe und Sex: Emma Goldman (1869–1940) als Anarcha-Feministin." In *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die "Frauenfrage" aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob., 202–221. Berlin: Metropol, 2020.
- Jacob, Frank. "Anarchistische Imperialismuskritik und staatliche Repression: Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman und die Kritik an der politischen Ökonomie des Ersten Weltkrieges in den USA, 1917–1919." *PROKLA* 201 (2020): 681–695.
- Jacob, Frank. "Der Anarchismus und die Russische Revolution: Emma Goldman und Alexander Berkman im Kampf gegen den Bolschewismus." *Ne znam: Zeitschrift für Anarchismusforschung* 7 (2018): 3–66.
- Jacob, Frank and Riccardo Altieri, eds. *Die Wahrnehmung der Russischen Revolutionen 1917: Zwischen utopischen Träumen und erschütterter Ablehnung*. Berlin: Metropol, 2019.
- Jacob, Frank. *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution: From Admiration to Frustration*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2020.
- Jacob, Frank. *Emma Goldman: Ein Leben für die Freiheit*. Leipzig: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2021.
- Jacob, Frank. *Emma Goldman: Identitäten einer Anarchistin*. Leipzig: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2022.
- Jacob, Frank. "Emma Goldmans Blick auf Bolschewismus, Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus: Eine anarchistische Perspektive auf den Totalitarismus der 1920er- und 1930er-Jahre." *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 68, no. 10 (2020): 833–847.
- Jacob, Frank. "From Aspiration to Frustration: Emma Goldman's Perception of the Russian Revolution." *American Communist History* 17, no. 2 (2018): 185–199.
- Jacob, Frank and Jowan A. Mohammed, eds. *Gender and Protest: On the Historical and Contemporary Interrelation of Two Social Phenomena*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2023.
- Jacob, Frank and Riccardo Altieri, eds. *Krieg und Frieden im Spiegel des Sozialismus 1914–1918*. Berlin, Germany: Metropol, 2018.
- Jacob, Frank. "Marriage as Exploitation: Emma Goldman and the Anarchist Concept of Female Liberation." In *Marriage Discourses: Historical and Literary Perspectives on Gender Inequality and Patriarchal Exploitation*, eds. Jowan A. Mohammed and Frank Jacob, 133–158. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2021.
- Jacob, Frank. "Radical Trinity: Anarchist, Jew, or New Yorker?" In *Jewish Radicalisms: Historical Perspectives on a Phenomenon of Global Modernity*, edited by Frank Jacob and Sebastian Kunze, 153–180. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019.
- Jacob, Frank. "Revolution, Emigration, and Anger: Angry Exile Groups in the Aftermath of the French and Russian Revolutions." In *Understanding Angry Groups: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Their Motivations and Effects on Society*, edited by Susan C. Cloninger and Steven A. Leibo. Santa Barbara: Praeger 2017, 169–188.
- Jacob, Frank. "The Russian Revolution, the American Red Scare, and the Forced Exile of Transnational Anarchists: Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman and their Soviet Experience." *Yearbook of Transnational History* 4 (2021): 113–134.
- Jacob, Frank and Mario Keßler. "Transatlantic Radicalism: A Short Introduction." In *Transatlantic Radicalism: Socialist and Anarchist Exchanges in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, eds. Frank Jacob and Mario Keßler, 1–20. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2021.
- Jacob, Frank. "Transatlantic Workers' Solidarity: The Kuzbas Autonomous Industrial Colony (1920–1926)." In *Transatlantic Radicalism: Socialist and Anarchist Exchanges in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, edited by Frank Jacob and Mario Keßler. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2021, 151–169.

- Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. New York: B. W. Huebsch 1916.
- Kanstroom, Daniel. *Deportation Nation: Outsiders in American History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press 2010.
- Kellermann, Philippe, ed. *Anarchismus und Russische Revolution*. Berlin: Dietz 2017.
- Kennedy, David M. *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*, 25th anniversary edition. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press 2004.
- Kensinger, Loretta. "Radical Lessons: Thoughts on Emma Goldman, Chaos, Grief, and Political Violence Post-9/11/01." *Feminist Teacher* 20, no. 1 (2009): 50–70.
- Kossok, Manfred. "Requiem auf die schöne Revolution." In Manfred Kossok, *Sozialismus an der Peripherie: Späte Schriften*, edited by Jörn Schütrumpf. Berlin: Dietz 2016, 23–28.
- Kowal, Donna M. "Anarcha-Feminism." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 265–279. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Kowal, Donna M. *Tongue of Fire: Emma Goldman, Public Womanhood, and the Sex Question*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2016.
- Krause, Paul. *The Battle for Homestead, 1890–1892: Politics, Culture, and Steel*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992.
- Kraut, Julia Rose. "Global Anti-Anarchism: The Origins of Ideological Deportation and the Suppression of Expression." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 19, no. 1 (2012): 169–193.
- Kropotkin, Peter. *Fields, Factories and Workshops*. London: Freedom Press, 1998 [1912].
- Kropotkin, Peter. *The Conquest of Bread*. Edmonton: AK Press, 2013 [1892].
- Lässig, Simone and Swen Steinberg. "Knowledge on the Move: New Approaches toward a History of Migrant Knowledge." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 43, no. 3 (2017): 313–346.
- Levy, Carl. "Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 125–148. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Levy, Carl. "Malatesta and the War Interventionist Debate 1914–17: From the 'Red Week' to the Russian Revolutions." In *Anarchism, 1914–18: Internationalism, Anti-Militarism and War*, eds. Ruth Kinna and Matthew S. Adams, 69–92. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Longley, David A. "Some Historiographical Problems of Bolshevik Party History: The Kronstadt Bolsheviks in March 1917." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, Neue Folge* vol. 22, 4 (1974): 494–514.
- Lynskey, Bill. "'I Shall Speak in Philadelphia': Emma Goldman and the Free Speech League." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 133, no. 2 (2009): 167–202.
- Marso, Lori Jo. "A Feminist Search for Love: Emma Goldman on the Politics of Marriage, Love, Sexuality and the Feminine." *Feminist Theory* 4, no. 3 (2003): 305–320.
- Marx, Karl. "Die Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich 1848 bis 1850," in *Marx-Engels-Werke*, vol. 7. Berlin: Dietz 1960, 9–107.
- Maximoff, Gregory Petrovich. *The Guillotine at Work: The Leninist Counter-revolution*. Sanday: Cienfuegos Press 1979.
- Maybee, Julie E. "Hegel's Dialectics." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2019 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta, available online: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/hegel-dialectics/> (accessed April 1, 2020).
- McKinley, Blaine. "Anarchist Jeremiads: American Anarchists and American History." *The Journal of American Culture* 6, no. 2 (1983): 75–84.
- McKinley, Blaine. "The Quagmires of Necessity: American Anarchists and Dilemmas of Vocation." *American Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (1982): 503–523.

- Messer-Kruse, Timothy. *The Trial of the Haymarket Anarchists: Terrorism and Justice in Gilded Age*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2011.
- Michels, Tony. *A Fire in Their Hearts: Yiddish Socialists in New York*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Mickenberg, Julia L. *American Girls in Red Russia: Chasing the Soviet Dream*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017.
- Miller, Sally M. *From Prairie to Prison: The Life of Social Activist Kate Richards O'Hare*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1993.
- Miller, Scott. *The President and the Assassin*. New York: Random House, 2011.
- Mohammed, Jowan A. and Frank Jacob, eds. *Marriage Discourses: Historical and Literary Perspectives on Gender Inequality and Patriarchic Exploitation*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.
- Mohammed, Jowan A. "Mary Hunter Austin und die Forderungen nach einer Veränderung der Geschlechterrollen in den USA, 1914–1918." In *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die "Frauenfrage" aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob, 222–239. Berlin: Metropol, 2020.
- Monk, Craig. "Emma Goldman, *Mother Earth*, and the Little Magazine Impulse in Modern America." In *"The Only Efficient Instrument": American Women Writers and the Periodical, 1837–1916*, eds. Aleta F. Cane and Susan Alves. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2001, 113–125.
- Moritz, Theresa and Albert. *The World's Most Dangerous Woman*. Vancouver: Subway Books, 2001.
- Murray, Robert K. *Red Scare: A Study in National Hysteria, 1919–1920*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1955.
- Neumann, Jehuda. "A Note on the Winter of the Kronstadt Sailors' Uprising in 1921." *Soviet Studies* vol. 44, 1 (1992): 153–54.
- Nicholas, Lucy. "Gender and Sexuality." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, eds. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 603–621. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Nimni, Ephraim. *Marxism and Nationalism: Theoretical Origins of a Political Crisis*. London: Pluto Press, 1991.
- Nippel, Wilfried. "Diktatur des Proletariats: Versuch einer Historisierung." *Zyklus* vol. 5 (2019): 71–130.
- Oye, Kenneth A. "The Sterling-Dollar-Franc Triangle: Monetary Diplomacy 1929–1937." *World Politics* 38, no. 1 (1985): 173–199.
- Piep, Karsten H. *Embattled Home Fronts: Domestic Politics and the American Novel of World War I*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi 2009.
- Pope-Obeda, Emily. "National Expulsions in a Transnational World: The Global Dimensions of American Deportation Practice, 1920–1935." In *Deportation in the Americas: Histories of Exclusion and Resistance*, edited by Kenyon Zimmer and Cristina Salinas. College Station: Texas A&M University Press 2018, 18–49.
- Porter, David, ed. *Vision on Fire: Emma Goldman on the Spanish Revolution*. New Paltz, NY: Commonground Press, 1983.
- Presley, Sharon and Crispin Sartwell. *Exquisite Rebel: The Essays of Voltairine De Cleyre—Anarchist, Feminist, Genius*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005.
- Pribanic-Smith, Erika J. and Jared Schroeder. *Emma Goldman's No-Conscription League and the First Amendment*. New York: Routledge, 2019.
- Quinn Olmstead, Justin, ed. *Reconsidering Peace and Patriotism During the First World War*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan 2017.

- Rabin, Shari. "The Advent of a Western Jewess": Rachel Frank and Jewish Female Celebrity in 1890s America." In "Gender and Jewish Identity," special issue, *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women's Studies & Gender Issues* 22 (2011): 111–135.
- Reich, Wilhem. *Die Funktion des Orgasmus: Zur Psychopathologie und zur Soziologie des Geschlechtslebens*. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1927.
- Reich, Wilhelm. *Die sexuelle Revolution: Zur charakterlichen Selbststeuerung des Menschen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1966.
- Reichert, William O. "Toward a New Understanding of Anarchism." *The Western Political Quarterly* 20, no. 4 (1967): 856–865.
- Rich, Andrea and Arthur L. Smith. *Rhetoric of Revolution*. Durham, NC: Moore, 1979.
- Rocker, Rudolf. "Zum Geleit." In Emma Goldman, *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution*. Berlin: Der Syndikalist, 1922, 3–8.
- Rofel, Lisa. "Queer Positions, Queering Asian Studies." *Positions* 20, no. 1 (2012): 183–193.
- Rose, Sonya O. "Gender and Labor History: The Nineteenth-Century Legacy." *International Review of Social History* 38, 1 (1993): 145–162.
- Ryley, Peter. "The Manifesto of the Sixteen: Kropotkin's Rejection of Anti-War Anarchism and His Critique of the Politics of Peace." In *Anarchism, 1914–18: Internationalism, Anti-Militarism and War*, eds. Ruth Kinna and Matthew S. Adams, 49–68. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Schlögel, Karl, ed. *Der große Exodus: Die russische Emigration und ihre Zentren 1917–1941*. Munich: C.H. Beck 1994.
- Schöler, Uli and Thilo Scholle, eds. *Weltkrieg – Spaltung – Revolution. Sozialdemokratie 1916–1922*. Bonn, Germany: Dietz, 2018.
- Shatz, Marshall S. "Review:Wexler, Emma Goldman in Exile." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 83, nos. 3–4 (1993): 458–460.
- Sheehan, Sean. *Anarchism*. London: Reaktion, 2003.
- Shulman, Alix Kates. "Introduction." In *Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings and Speeches by Emma Goldman*. New York: Vintage Books, 1972.
- Shulman, Alix. *To the Barricades: The Anarchist Life of Emma Goldman*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1971.
- Skrabec, Quentin R. *Henry Clay Frick: The Life of the Perfect Capitalist*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2010.
- Solomon, Martha. *Emma Goldman*. Boston, MA: Twayne Publishers, 1987.
- Streichhahn, Vincent. "Zur 'Frauenfrage' und Sozialdemokratie im deutschen Kaiserreich: Zwischen Antifeminismus und Emanzipation." In *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die "Frauenfrage" aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob, 48–77. Berlin: Metropol, 2020.
- Warren, Kenneth. *Triumphant Capitalism: Henry Clay Frick and the Industrial Transformation of America*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996.
- Weinzwieg, Ari. *Going into Business with Emma Goldman*. Ann Arbor, MI: Zingerman's Press, 2019.
- Weiss, Penny A. and Loretta Kensinger, eds. *Feminist Interpretations of Emma Goldman*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007.
- Wexler, Alice. *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life*. New York: Pantheon, 1984.
- Wexler, Alice. *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1989.
- Zelensky, Natalie K. *Performing Tsarist Russia in New York: Music, Émigrés, and the American Imagination*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press 2019.

Zimmer, Kenyon. *Immigrants against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America*. Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press, 2015.

Zimmer, Kenyon. "The Voyage of the *Buford*: Political Deportations and the Making and Unmaking of America's First Red Scare." In *Deportation in the Americas: Histories of Exclusion and Resistance*, edited by Kenyon Zimmer and Cristina Salinas. College Station: Texas A&M University Press 2018, 132 – 163.

Index

- abortion 5, 7
anarcha-feminism (also anarcha-feminist) 5f.,
35, 37–40, 56,
anarcho-sexism 4
Atlantic 9, 82
- Baldwin, Roger N. 14, 16, 99
Berkman, Alexander 1–25, 30–33, 75f., 79,
81–83, 85, 87–92, 94–97, 99, 104, 107,
109–116
Berlin 1–7, 12–15, 18f., 21f., 28, 32, 77f., 81,
97, 105, 111, 113–115
Bernstein, Ethel 10
Bolshevik 3–5, 8–11, 13f., 16f., 98
British Committee for the Defense of Political
Prisoners in Russian Prisons 15
- Camden Chronicle* (Tennessee) 33
Carnegie Steel Company 31
Cheka 13–16
Chicago 1, 3f., 6–9, 13, 16, 19, 23, 26, 32, 75,
80f., 83, 94, 96, 99, 104, 108
Cohen, Michael A. 6, 14, 97f., 104, 111–115
Content, Harold A. 7–9, 77, 92f.
Czarist Russia 4, 6, 8, 76, 79, 105
Czolgosz, Leon 22, 32f., 84
- Dmitrov 12
Doubleday, Page & Co. 15, 97f., 115
Doubleday, Page & Co. 12f., 15, 77, 105
- Eastern Europe 6
Ellis Island 9f., 95, 97
emancipation 4f., 7, 11–17, 21–25, 27f., 108
Engels, Friedrich 1
England 15, 98f.
Espionage Act 5f., 87f.
Europe 5–8, 14, 80, 82, 100f.
exile 1–5, 8–18, 21, 25, 76, 78, 94, 96f., 99,
102, 104f., 110, 112f., 116
- Fascism 2, 16
February Revolution (Russia) 1, 4, 10, 12f.
- Finland 11
Firebrand 13, 26
First World War (also World War I) 2, 4, 7f.,
17, 76, 78f., 83–85, 87, 96, 99, 101, 103, 110
Fitzgerald, Eleanor 10, 14, 77, 87, 112, 115f.
Flynn, Gurley 11
Forward Hall 6, 90f.
Foucault, Michel 10f., 24
Freiheit 1, 20f., 81
Frick, Henry Clay 4, 9, 22, 30f., 33, 82f., 96,
107
- Germany 3, 6f., 14–16, 22, 32f., 97, 113f.
Gorki, Maxim 11f.
- Haymarket Tragedy 4, 6, 8, 80, 106
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 1
Hirschfeld, Magnus 18, 28
Homestead Steel Strike 31, 107
Honolulu Republican 32
Hoover, J. Edgar 2, 21, 85, 87
Hunts Point Palace 6, 8, 89
- Immigration Act 8
Italy 6, 85
- Jewish immigrants 4, 6f., 79, 106
Joyce, James 7, 88
- Kershner, Jacob 9, 80, 95
Knopf, Alfred A. 3, 19, 29, 79, 101, 107, 117–
121
Kossok, Manfred 1
Kronstadt Rebellion 12–14, 111
Kropotkin, Pjotr 12, 85, 107
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich 1–5, 8, 10f., 13–17, 77,
87, 97, 99, 105, 111
Lipkin, Dora 10
Lower East Side 5f., 81, 85
Luxemburg, Rosa 11
- Madison Square Garden 88, 91, 101

- Malméd, Leon 11, 14, 77, 91, 93f., 96f., 114f.
 Marx, Karl 1
 Mayer, Julius M. 9, 92
 McClure Syndicate 115
 McKinley, William 3, 5f., 8–10, 22, 32f., 81,
 84, 104, 106, 108f.
 Moscow 16, 112
 Most, Johann 1–10, 13, 15f., 19, 21, 25, 28,
 30–32, 75, 80–83, 86, 94, 97–99, 104–
 106, 108f., 116–118, 121
Mother Earth 3f., 6–11, 13, 19f., 23f., 31, 75,
 78, 80, 82f., 86, 92, 104–110
 Museum of the Russian Revolution 12
My Disillusionment in Russia 12f., 15, 77, 98,
 105, 115
My Further Disillusionment in Russia 15, 17, 77,
 98, 105, 115

 National Socialism 2, 16
 New York 1–9, 12–16, 19–22, 25, 29–33,
 75–85, 88f., 91–96, 98f., 101f., 104–107,
 112, 115–117, 121
New York Times 7–9, 11f., 76f., 84, 87–89,
 93–95
New York Tribune 31
New York World 14, 113
 No-Conscription League 2–5, 8, 17, 76, 78, 87,
 89f., 92

 Odessa 80

 Palmer, Alexander Mitchell 5, 87
 Palmer Raids 3, 6
 patriarchy 2f., 12, 33

 Pinkerton Boys 31
Pittsburgh Post 9, 31, 81
 Pond Bureau, Inc. 101
 Pond, James B. 101, 121
Portland Daily Press 32
 proto-feminist 4f., 20

 Reitman, Ben 4, 15f., 98f., 108
 Rocker, Rudolf 81, 101f., 113
 Ross, Arthur L. 12, 99, 101, 111, 117–121
 Russell, Bertrand 14–16, 98f.
 Russian Revolution 1–5, 9–17, 21, 76–78, 85,
 87, 94, 97, 99, 102, 105, 111, 113f., 122

San Francisco Call 21, 32
 Selective Service Act 8, 87
 sexual liberation 1, 4, 18, 21f., 29, 33, 84, 106
 Shatov, Bill 10, 85
 Stalin, Joseph 17
St. Louis Post-Dispatch Sunday Magazine 1, 19
 suffragist movement 25
 Sweden 13f., 97, 111f.

The Russian Tragedy: A Review and An Outlook
 13, 114

 US garment industry 21, 79f.

 Weinberger, Harry 9, 88
 Whitman, Walt 18
 Wilson, Woodrow 8, 17, 86

 Yiddishland 6, 79