INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR LISA HOCHBERG-MILLER

TITLE AN ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL VIEWS OF EMMA GOLDMAN, THE ANARCHIST, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO HER RELATIONSHIP WITH JEWS AND JUDAISM AS REFLECTED IN HER WRITINGS

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [✓]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [✓]) Not necessary
) for Ph.D.
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓ yes ___ no

Mar 1 1991
Date

Lisa Hochberg-Miller
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed Date July 1991

Marilyn Krider
Signature of Library Staff Member

AN ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND CULTURAL VIEWS OF EMMA GOLDMAN, THE ANARCHIST, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO HER RELATIONSHIP WITH JEWS AND JUDAISM AS REFLECTED IN HER WRITINGS

Lisa C. Hochberg-Miller

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
1991

Referee: Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus

Dedicated to my mom, Shirley Goldberg Hochberg (August 8, 1926 - September 9, 1980), who never went to college, but whose love of education, knowledge, and books showed me the way. From you I learned to yearn for knowledge, to care about people, to love family, and to light Shabbat candles.

Dedicated to my dad, Marvin Stanley Hochberg (March 16, 1921 - April 9, 1980), who told me that I could be anything that I wanted to be; the only thing that would limit me would be my own abilities.

To Grandma Essie, who is my spiritual wellspring.

To Seth and Mara, whom I love.

To our families and friends for their encouragement and support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I was a high school student in 1976, my Temple youth group came to Cincinnati on pilgrimage. I remember sitting in the chapel after Shabbat morning services, while Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus spoke to us. I don't remember the exact content of his talk, but I do remember the very warm, strong, positive impression he made on me. Fifteen years later, it has been my honor to work with Dr. Marcus in the preparation of my rabbinic thesis, and to be his student. A professor who is always submerged in his own projects, whose time is always filled with so many acquaintances, Dr. Marcus always lets his students know that they are his top priority. Thank you for showing me how to encounter Jewish American history, and thank you for your constant friendship and advice.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND CULTURAL VIEWS OF EMMA GOLDMAN, THE ANARCHIST, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO HER RELATIONSHIP WITH JEWS AND JUDAISM AS REFLECTED IN HER WRITINGS

Table of Contents

Thesis Digest

Emma Goldman, (1869-1940) was born into a Jewish family in Tsarist Russia. Her reverence for revolution was born within her while in her native homeland, and it did not take long after her 1886 immigration to the United States to align herself with the more radical elements in society, particularly the anarchists. Although she rejected religious Judaism, her life was spent in a Jewish environment. She lived in the center of immigrant Jewry, the Lower East Side. Her lifetime intellectual soulmate, Alexander Berkman, was a Jew. Many of the people she surrounded herself with were Jews. From this Jewish environment emerged a revolutionary mind, a woman committed so deeply to issues of workers' rights, birth control, equality of women, free speech, military draft opposition and the like, as to be called in a 1908 article in the St. Louis Mirror "8,000 years ahead of her time."

Goldman was encouraged to a life as an activist by the Haymarket Affair of 1886. Workers had been striking in favor of the eight-hour workday. In Chicago, a number of strikers were beaten and killed by police. At a workers' protest rally, a bomb exploded, killing several bystanders and policemen. Eight innocent anarchists were executed as the perpetrators. Goldman was sparked with the desire to help the working masses change their lot in life. She spoke to them at meetings and rallies, engaging in long cross-country tours, and, in 1906, through the appearance of Mother Earth, a

magazine she published for a decade. Goldman spoke on the pressing issues of her day. For her outspokeness and unpopular views she was shunned, castigated, arrested, and persecuted. In 1917 she was sentenced to a two-year prison term for opposing the military draft. Upon her release, Goldman was deported under the Alien Exclusion Act, and sent to Russia.

Emma Goldman spent two years, from 1919-1921, in Soviet Russia. She had dreamed of helping the Revolution, of helping the country to reorganize and of helping the masses to a new freedom. What she found in post-Revolutionary Russia was a betrayal of the Revolution by the ruling Bolsheviki communists. They were the powerful; nothing had changed for the masses. Goldman and her companion Alexander Berkman spent two years traveling through Soviet Russia. When they had confirmed for themselves that the Revolution indeed was dead, they left Russia, and the dreams they had nurtured for many years.

Goldman's activities continued as she traveled through Europe, living in Berlin, St. Tropez, and Toronto, among other places. But she lived her life as an exile from the country that she loved-- the United States. She continued her writing and speaking, and even joined in the unsuccessful fight to liberate Spain from fascist forces. But it was only in her death that Emma Goldman was permitted to permanently reside in the United States again, buried next to the martyrs of the Haymarket Riot.

Emma Goldman was not a religious Jew, but she was proud to count herself among the Jewish people, to be of the Jewish race. It was in that world that Goldman lived, propagating her strong sense of the value of each human being-- and that individual's political, social, and economic rights. Her words and her ideology are hauntingly timeless, as she speaks not only to her own generation, but to those which have followed.

SECTION ONE: THE WORLD FROM WHICH GOLDMAN EMERGED

CHAPTER ONE: THE PHILOSOPHY AND BACKGROUND OF ANARCHISM

Emma Goldman spent her life as a political anarchist. Anarchism was not just the ideology she espoused; she strove to live her daily life in consonance with anarchist ideals. Anarchism was more than a pat ideology she adopted in her youth, a label she affixed to her garments. Throughout her life, and often daily, she wrestled with anarchism conceptually and practically, critically examining her own actions and beliefs against a purist's yardstick. With all her soul Goldman believed that anarchism could grant individualization and self-actualization to the individual, and this belief carried her through years of persecution by governments and individuals who did not share her vision. To understand Goldman, one must begin with an understanding of the vision which motivated her.

A society with no government, which functions harmoniously by the freely-arranged economic cooperation of individuals and groups-- this laissez-faire concept existed for centuries before the name "anarchism" was attached to it in the 19th Century. Economically, anarchist society would exist, not by subjugation to law, but by agreements contracted for the sake of production and consumption. Freed from the exploitation of private ownership or the automaton efficiency inflicted by capitalism's thirst for production, the worker could strive for the full development of his or

her intellectual, moral, and creative abilities. How this utopia was to come about and how it was to be run were widely interpreted by different schools of anarchist thought, yet on one point all anarchists could agree: compulsory forms of government must be opposed.

This economic and political theory found expression in William Godwin's An Inquiry Concerning Political Justice and its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness (1793), which stated that real justice could be found if laws and courts were abolished and decisions in times of conflict were rendered by reasonable men chosen for that purpose. Small, autonomous communities could function successfully. Modernity had been saddled with laws which were attributed to the "wisdom" of our ancestors; in reality the laws were a product of their jealousies, timidities, passions, and ambitions.[1] Without so titling it, Godwin was advocating anarchistic communism.

The true father of anarchy was Pierre Joseph Proudhon whose 1840 work, What is Property? concluded that "property was theft." Labor was the true possession to be prized, and this had been stolen from the worker. In this view he was aligned with Karl Marx and the socialists. But Proudhon went a step further; whereas state socialism and communism saw labor liberated under the guidance of the state, Proudhon's anarchy saw labor liberated only by its own power.

---

[1] "Anarchism," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1910-11.

Through the 1830's and 40's, communistic organizations attempted to emerge in Paris and London. Suppressed in Paris through the next two decades as a reaction to a French workers' uprising, it wasn't until 1864 that the International Working Men's Association was founded in London by a group of British and French socialists. With Karl Marx at the helm, the Association advocated state ownership of land. But in 1869, Michael Bakunin, a Russian anarchist, joined the Association. Their ideological differences were exacerbated by the Franco-German War, and racial tensions crept into the International Association. Bakunin was expelled in 1872 from the Association, taking the loyalties of the collectivist anarchists with him.

Bakunin added an element to anarchism that had not been present before: the total destruction of the existing society. A Russian officer-turned-revolutionary who had witnessed the cruelty of the Tsar toward the Poles and the serfs, Bakunin was determined that society could not be reconstructed. Revolution was the only recourse; evolution would accomplish nothing. In his founding the International Social Democratic Alliance he professed his belief in the abolition of religion, marriage, inheritance, and classes, to be replaced by the political, social, and economic equality of the individual, male and female. The land, the instruments of production, and all other capital, were only to be used by the workers within their agricultural and industrial communities. The only justified political action was that

aimed at the triumph of labor over capital. Patriotism and nationalism were to be repudiated.[2] Although it was one of his disciples who advocated terrorism and wholesale violence, Bakunin did put forth the view of propaganda by action. Bakunin was one of the two anarchists Emma Goldman counted as her "spiritual fathers", and her references to "attentat," acts of political violence, certainly are ideological outgrowths of Bakunin's philosophy.

More primary than Bakunin in Goldman's life was Peter Kropotkin. Not only was she heavily influenced by his anarchist theory, their status as contemporaries added an immense quality to her life, and her association with Kropotkin in 1920-21 while they were both in Soviet Russia was inspirational and gratifying for her. Born of a noble Russian family in 1842, Kropotkin rejected the advantaged life and served in Siberia. There he became convinced that anarchistic communism was the only significant way to help the Russian people. Kropotkin rejected the individualistic anarchism of Proudhon, and the predecessor to anarchistic communism, the collectivist anarchism of the International Working Mens' Association, but like Bakunin he saw that the state needed to be destroyed by popular revolution before anarchistic communism could take root. After a number of bouts with advocacy-imprisonment, he settled in England in the mid-1880's, where he flourished as a writer of anarchist

---

[2] "Anarchy, Anarchism," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 1917.

ideals.

Anarchism was found in America, too, advanced by the likes of Josiah Warren, who in 1827 had established an Equity Store in Cincinnati based on labor being exchanged for produce, an idea of Proudhon's. To Warren's credit is the first anarchist magazine in the world.[3] The post-Civil War-to-World War 1 period has been called the era of Classical American Anarchism, and Benjamin E. Tucker is cited as the foremost individualist anarchist.[4] But the anarchist theory of Emma Goldman is derived almost solely from the European intellectuals, with the exception of the writings of great American authors such as Thoreau and Whitman, in whose works Goldman found pro-anarchist sentiments. Although Goldman did not become acquainted with the works of Bakunin or Kropotkin until after her emigration to the United States, it was in her Russian teenhood that she experienced first-hand familiarity with the causes of labor and anti-Tsarism which they espoused.

---

[3] "Anarchism," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1949.

[4] "Anarchists," Dictionary of American History, 1976.

SECTION ONE: THE WORLD FROM WHICH GOLDMAN EMERGED

CHAPTER TWO: EARLY BACKGROUND AND CULTURAL INFLUENCES IN RUSSIA

Although Emma Goldman would count her birthday as November 11, 1887, the day of the execution of the Haymarket Riot victims, she was born June 27, 1869 to Abraham and Taube Goldman in the Russian province of Kovno, in what is now Lithuania. Unstable finances forced her family to move a number of times within the Jewish ghettos of the Pale, as her father struggled to make a living with different enterprises. For Goldman, the 16 years of experience prior to her emigration undoubtedly weighed heavily in her Jewish and political identity. During her childhood in the Baltic town of Popelan, in the Russian-German province of Kurland, Goldman's parents ran a government inn. The acts of anti-Semitism which dotted her Russian childhood were evident to her at an early age. She witnessed the constant harassment of her father by Christians for being a petty official and a Jew. Abraham, as the middleman, was scapegoated by both the peasants and the officials. He endured this frustration, only to be defeated in a re-election for his position because he was a Jew.[1] Emma saw more than just the injustices of anti-Semitism; she saw soldiers taken from poor families because the wealthy had bribed officials to overlook their sons; her mother, in fact, was recognized in the community as being

---

[1] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1970), p. xiii.

particularly eloquent in convincing officials not to draft Jewish boys.[2] She saw women and children beaten, and peasants whipped. She saw female servants "used" by regiment officers and men considered of "respectable standing." One biographical sketch, written by a lifelong friend, included Emma's recollection that the Goldman home was often refuge for these women who had been driven out of their work homes. Emma would take coins from her parents' drawer and give them to these unfortunate women.[3]

Emma hated her childhood, and her relationship with her parents was marked with fighting. As an adult she was able to see the socio-economic noose within which her parents lived, and the frustration of their lives. In her adult years she was able to understand and come to appreciate her parents. But as a child, Emma's experiences were as the butt of her father's anger at the world and frustration at being an unsuccessful provider. Emma's older sisters Lena and Helena were of a different father; the widowed Taube had married Abraham-- an arranged marriage-- and together they had Emma, Herman, and Yegor.[4] Abraham's violence made home life

---

[2] Candace Falk, Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990), p.11.

[3] Emma Goldman, Anarchism and Other Essays (New York: Kennikat Press, 1910), p. 10.

[4] The exact composition of Goldman's family, in particular her younger brothers, is rather confusing. A photograph of the family, taken in St.Petersburg in 1882, shows Abraham, Taube, Helena, Emma, Herman (born in 1873), and Morris (born in 1875). A son born in 1870 died in 1876-- his name is not recorded. In Living My Life, Goldman says her

stifling and terrifying. Taube, although "less violent," was never warm nor affectionate.[5] The affection came from Helena, a forged bond of love that lasted throughout their lives.

At the age of eight Emma was sent to live with her grandmother in Koenigsberg, in Eastern Prussia, to begin her education. Her father, informing Emma that he was sending 40 rubles monthly to cover her education at a Jewish elementary school and her board, threatened her that he should receive no bad reports on her behavior. Emma's grandmother owned a hairstyling parlor, run by her three daughters. These aunts, as well as an uncle, lived with the grandmother. Emma adjusted well to life and school until her grandmother left town "to ply the trade of smuggler."[6] Immediately her uncle pulled her out of school and turned her into a chore-girl. He was exploitive and abusive, a condition which continued until her maternal Aunt Yetta who lived nearby telegraphed Emma's father to come and get her. Her father, shocked by Emma's

---

parents emigrated from Russia to Rochester, with her brothers Herman and Yegor. (pg. 20). She mentions a brother Leibale born two years after Herman, when she is six: Leibale would be Morris (pg. 58). In Nowhere at Home, Goldman mentions a visit from her brother Moishe, who I assume is Morris. She seems to indicate that Moe is a doctor. In Living My Life Yegor pursues medicine. My guess is that Yegor, sometime after his immigration to the United States, pursues medicine and Americanizes his name to Morris. In Living My Life Goldman mentions only Yegor; in Nowhere at Home she mentions only Morris; it appears that Yegor/Leibale is Morris/Moishe. The photograph identifies a Morris at a time when he was still called Yegor.

[5] Emma Goldman, Living My Life (Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith, Inc., 1982), p. 11.

[6] Ibid., p. 66.

appearance-- her threadbare clothes and shoes, her worn physical condition-- hugged her and kissed her, an act which Goldman later recalled had not happened since she was four.[7] Upon the grandmother's return the abusive uncle and his wife were evicted from the apartment. Abraham Goldman had been sending 40 rubles regularly and in return the uncle had been sending positive progress reports regarding Emma's "education."

The Goldman family moved to Koenigsberg, where they stayed until Emma was thirteen. She spent four years at a Jewish elementary school, where German, French, and music were all part of her studies. Her interest in formal learning was nipped by her religious instructor who refused to give her the needed recommendation for entrance into the Gymnasium. Her "problem" was disciplinary; Emma hated the authoritarianism of the classroom. With the Goldman family rendered impoverished in Popelan, the rabbi of Koenigsberg, a distant relative, had agreed to allow Emma and Herman to continue schooling with the stipulation that he receive monthly behavioral reports. Needless to say, favorable monthly reports were all but impossible for Emma. Bad reports were always accompanied by severe beatings from her father. Punishment would include a whip and a stool, and often Emma would be forced to stand in the corner or walk back and forth with a glass of water in her hand, a beating the inevitable

---

[7] Ibid., p. 68.

outcome of a spilled drop.[8]

Emma's family, which as an adult she would always refer to as "her people," lived a Jewish life, but rarely spoke about religion. They would go to synagogue on Shabbat and holidays, and Emma would recall Sukkot as the only time of the year she liked her father, because he would drink a little wine and become warm and affectionate with his children.[9] But "theology" came from the German nurse and the Russian peasant servants who were a part of their Popelan life. It was from these gentiles that Emma heard about heaven and hell, sin and punishment, God and the devil. In later years Goldman was quick to reject the Jewish religion, but a Jewish identity was always a part of her life.

Some of the most formative events of Goldman's early life happened after the family moved from Koenigsberg to St. Petersburg, the Russian capital, in late 1881, when Emma was twelve. The "move" included being smuggled across the border, and although guards were bribed, the maneuver included forging through a frozen stream in mid-winter at night. The effect of this was a weakening of the spine and the damaging of internal organs, from which she suffered for many years. Emma began school in St. Petersburg, but within a few months it was imperative for her to find work. Abraham Goldman had moved to St. Petersburg to manage his cousin's dry goods

---

[8] Ibid., p. 60.

[9] Ibid., p. 59.

store, but by the time Emma had arrived with her mother and siblings, the business had failed. Taube's brothers advanced Abraham a 300-ruble loan, which he invested in a grocery store. But the project moved slowly, and Emma began knitting shawls at home. Eventually a cousin offered her work in a glove factory. Awake at 5 a.m. to be at the distant factory by 7 a.m., Emma was one of 600 workers. The dark, unventilated rooms were lit by oil lamp; there was no natural lighting that permeated the factory. Although the conditions were unattractive, Goldman later recalled that the workers were given adequate time for lunch, and two tea breaks during the day. Workers were not driven nor harrassed, and talking, even singing, was permitted. This she held in contrast to her later factory experiences in the United States, in which workers were pressured for output and communication between workers was forbidden.[10]

Aside from her first work experiences, St. Petersburg exposed Emma to new politics. In 1881, when the family was still living in Koenigsberg, Tsar Alexander II had been assassinated by a group of Nihilists. Among the group charged with his death was Emma's maternal uncle, Taube's brother Yegor. Taube went immediately to St. Petersburg and bribed an audience with the Governor-General of that city, whose son had been a college acquaintance of Yegor's. Convincing him of Yegor's youth and naiveté, Yegor was released and placed

---

[10] Ibid., p. 15.

under surveillance, with the promise that he denounce any affiliation with the Nihilists. To Emma, Taube had painted the Nihilists as ogres, singing the praises of the deceased Tsar as one who had been good to the Jews. He had given freedom to the Jews and stopped the pogroms. Furthermore he had been planning to set the peasants free when he was murdered.[11] In St. Petersburg, Emma saw a more two-sided picture than Taube had painted. Revolution was literally in the air, and Emma heard and saw the Nihilists and the Populists, and their ideas of libertarianism and egalitarianism. These were the Russian intellectuals struggling against the Autocracy; they were being executed for the Tsar's murder, and they were being exiled to Siberia.

Emma's response to the political turbulence was to read the forbidden political novels and similar works, most notably the Nihilist Chernishevsky's What is to be Done?, Turgeniev's Fathers and Sons, and Gontcharov's The Precipice. She was drawn to Chernishevsky's character of Vera Pavlovna, a political organizer and cooperative worker. Through her childhood, Emma's heroine had been the apocryphal figure Judith, who had saved the Jews from defeat at the hands of their Greek attackers. She had identified with Judith, and in her imagination saw herself lashing out at the injustices

---

[11] Ibid., p. 27.

perpetrated against the enemies of the Jewish people.[12] Now, Judith was replaced with Vera as her new heroine. More importantly, her heroines now came from real-life, as she followed the lives of Vera Zasulich, who had shot the police chief of St. Petersburg, and Sophia Perovskaya, who was martyred for conspiring against the Tsar. She wholeheartedly sided with all of those executed or exiled.

Emma's view of the world had grown larger than the Jewish ghettos in which she had lived. Although her family lived in the Jewish ghetto of St. Petersburg, her mind had begun to embrace the larger world, the larger injustices. Russia was not just persecuting the Jews; the Autocracy was oppressing all Russians. Her world focus made family life more unbearable than ever. When Abraham Goldman tried to marry Emma off at fifteen, she protested that her goal was to study and travel. In a rage he threw her French grammar book into the fireplace, crying, "Girls do not have to learn much! All a Jewish daughter needs to know is how to prepare gefilte fish, cut noodles fine, and give the man plenty of children."[13] Emma knew it was time to leave. With Helena, she plotted to go to America, to join their eldest sister Lena and her husband in Rochester, New York. In 1885, at the age of 16, Emma and Helena left, Emma having received 25 rubles

---

[12] "The Emma Goldman Exhibit," compiled by the Emma Goldman Papers Project, University of California, Berkeley. Above information taken from text of exhibit, as viewed in Akron, Ohio, June 23, 1990.

[13] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 12.

from her father. Their journey was as much an escape from their restrictive home life as it was a desire to start a new life in the United States.

SECTION ONE: THE WORLD FROM WHICH GOLDMAN EMERGED

CHAPTER THREE: MIGRATION, RADICALISM AND THE HAYMARKET AFFAIR

The flux of emotions that Emma Goldman experienced on her arrival in the United States must have been similar to that of the multitude of immigrants that were arriving. Standing on the deck of the boat, she, like the others, was enraptured by the sight of the Statue of Liberty, the symbol of hope, freedom, and asylum. The hopefulness and longing to find a generous America was starkly contrasted with what Goldman later described as appalling scenes at Castle Garden: the shouting and pushing of antagonistic guards; hysterical, angry, confused immigrants; the lack of accomodations for the pregnant, for the children.[1] The life they imagined they would find in Rochester was non-existent: Lena had worked hard, and now, with a child expected, her husband was the sole family support, earning $12 per week as a tinsmith. Determined not to be a burden, both Helena and Emma found employment, Emma at the Jewish-owned Garson and Mayer factory, sewing ulsters for ten and one-half hours a day, for $2.50 per week. Although the work room was bright, clean, and airy in contrast to her Russian factory experience, Emma found the work and the continuous grind more oppressive, as interaction between workers was prohibited, and little time was given for the personal needs of the worker, particularly

---

[1] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 11.

meals. After months of work, Emma decided to apply to Mr. Garson for a raise. Garson refused, on the grounds that he would have to give the rest of the girls raises.[2] Goldman, struck by the lavishness of Garson's office-- his cigar, the vase full of American beauty roses, quit. She soon found work at Rubinstein's factory, where her wages were $4 per week.

More than employment, she also found co-worker Jacob Kershner at Rubinstein's, who had emigrated from Odessa in 1881. Through a courtship, Emma found they shared mutual interests: reading, and dancing. He wanted to marry; she finally agreed to an engagement. When in the fall of 1886, Emma's parents and brothers immigrated to Rochester, (they had been impoverished from the bribe money Abraham had to pay to keep his grocery open), Jacob moved into the newly established family home, his rent money helping them to meet their expenses. In February 1887 Jacob and Emma were married by a rabbi. Immediately life changed. In addition to the discovery of Jacob's impotence, all former mutual interests melted away. Kershner would spend his income gambling in card games. By the end of 1887 she had insisted on a divorce. Kershner fought against it, but the rabbi who married them eventually granted Emma the divorce. She left Rochester, settling in New Haven, where she became acquainted with socialists and anarchists. This new life interested her greatly, but she could not financially succeed on her own.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 17.

She returned to Rochester, and was immediately prevailed upon by Kershner to remarry him, lest he commit suicide. With no high hopes, she remarried him. For three months she secretly took dressmaking lessons, knowing a skill would increase her ability to support herself. She and Kershner fought; he was unwilling to change, and she could not live with him. She left him. Her family rebuked her, and her parents closed their home to her. Only Helena, who had disliked Kershner from the beginning, stood by her. The Jewish community of Rochester ostracized her. Emma was pained at leaving Helena, and Lena's little daughter Stella, whom she adored. But life in Rochester and life with Kershner were unbearable.

Through 1886 and 1887 Emma found the daily news was a suitable distraction from the disappointment of her work life and her married life. She became mesmerized by the proceedings of the Haymarket Affair. In 1886, striking laborers throughout the country demanded the 8-hour workday. In Chicago, a meeting of McCormick Harvester Company strikers was disrupted by a police attack. Many were beaten, both men and women, and several were killed. A protest meeting was called for May 4, 1886, at Haymarket Square. The gathering was orderly; so said Chicago Mayor Carter Harrison, who attended. After the Mayor had left, a light rain began to fall, scattering many of the workers. The police ordered the rest of the group to disperse, to which the gathering replied that they were an orderly assembly. The police began to club those in the crowd, and as a riot ensued, a bomb exploded,

killing a number of policemen and wounding others. The speakers, as well as all prominent local anarchists, were arrested. Chicago began a virtual campaign of terror, led by the police, the press, and the major employers.

The arrest and trial of the eight Chicago anarchists filled Goldman's life, as she heard in their words ideas similar to the Russian Populists. The trial was condemned as a sham even as it was going on; the District Attorney had declared that "anarchy was on trial," and the judge had even denounced the prisoners from the bench.[3] Witnesses were terrorized and bribed. Five anarchists were condemned to death by hanging: Albert Parsons, August Spies, Adolph Fischer, George Engel, and Louis Lingg (the last of whom committed suicide in jail.) Life imprisonment was the sentence for Samuel Fielden and Michael Schwab. The eighth defendant, Neebe, was sentenced to 15 years in prison. To follow the case more closely, she had taken to attending meetings of a German socialist group in Rochester, having become disgusted with the obvious bias of the Rochester press. Through the German socialists, Goldman was exposed to Die Freiheit, the German anarchist paper edited by Johann Most. She became an avid reader, sending away for all the literature on anarchism she could obtain. On November 11, 1887, "Black Friday," Parsons, Spies, Engel, and Fischer were hanged. Months of absorption in the case for Emma culminated

---

[3] Ibid., p. 31.

in their deaths, what she saw as their martyrdom. As Goldman recalled:

> "The next morning I woke as from a long illness, but free from the numbness and depression of those harrowing weeks of waiting, ending with the final shock. I had a distinct sensation that something new and wonderful had been born in my soul. [I was filled with] A great ideal, a burning faith, a determination to dedicate myself to the memory of my martyred comrades, to make their cause my own, to make known to the world their beautiful lives and heroic deaths."[4]

Emma Goldman was becoming an anarchist. In Rochester and in New Haven, she had been lead by her perception of political events to seek out the socialists, the anarchists, the insights of the liberal press. For four years she continued the process she had begun in St. Petersburg: the process of reading, listening, of absorbing all she could about different ideological approaches to the injustices she saw about her. For personal reasons, for ideological reasons, she had to leave Rochester. In 1889, at the age of 20, Goldman set off for New York City, with her sewing machine and $5 in her purse.

---

[4] Ibid., p. 10.

SECTION TWO: 1887-1919: THE LIFE AND WORK OF AN AMERICAN ANARCHIST

CHAPTER FOUR: LIVING AN IDEOLOGY

It was on Emma Goldman's first day in New York City that she met Alexander Berkman, the comrade who would be her lifelong soul-mate. Upon her arrival she called on family, but she knew that they did not offer the life for which she was looking. She sought out Dr. A. Solotaroff, a young Jewish anarchist she had heard lecture in New Haven. Solotaroff knew of two Russian Jewish girls she could room with: Anna and Helen Minkin. They could be found at Sachs's Cafe on Suffolk Street, the hangout of the East Side Jewish radicals, socialists, and anarchists; the Yiddish poets and writers. Yiddish and Russian were in the air. It was at Sachs's that first day that Goldman met Berkman; she was attracted by his intensity, and unwavering commitment to fight injustice and exploitation. The friendship grew; a romance developed. But the emotional relationship was difficult for Goldman, for it was clear from Berkman, whom she called Sasha, that his love for her would always be subjected to his disciplined prioritization: the movement was his highest commitment. Within a short time Goldman, Berkman, Helen Minkin and Modest (Fedya) Stein, a Jewish artist, moved into a four-room apartment. Although Goldman never terms it a "commune," her

biographers do,[1] for Goldman states that they were committed to living as comrades, sharing all expenses and pooling their wages.[2] The relationship begun with Stein continued throughout their lives; not only did they live communally for a few years, with Goldman and Stein becoming lovers at one point, but the friendship forged in the early 1890's lasted into the 1930's although Stein was never the radical that his two comrades hoped he might be.

It was at the same time Goldman and Berkman were solidifying their relationship that they became close with Johann Most, the spellbinding lecturer and editor of the German anarchist Freiheit, the most noted anarchist of his day. Through his personal library Goldman grew in her political ideology; through his lectures she grew in her fervor. He became her idol, her mentor, as he filled her head with his dogmatic views on social order, the use of violence to achieve this order (he had written a pamphlet on how to construct a bomb), and the evils of capitalism. He also exposed Goldman to opera, theatre, fine food and drink. And it was Most who encouraged her to become an orator for the movement. It was in this move that Most "lost" his hold over Goldman. Six months after her arrival in New York, Goldman set out on her first lecture tour: to Rochester, Buffalo, and

---

[1] For example, Alix Kates Shulman, ed., Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman (New York: Vintage Books, 1972), p. 8.

[2] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 44.

Cleveland. The questions she received from her audience convinced her that she could not simply spout forth Most's ideology; she needed to think critically, and to be her own thinker. Most, against his own wishes, had set Goldman on the path of individual thinking. The relationship continued, but eventually Goldman found herself more ideologically comfortable with the London-published Autonomie and the American Autonomie followers, for this movement stressed more individual freedom and group independence. Her ideological move cooled Most's romantic affection for Goldman; he berates her for her love of Berkman, the "arrogant Russian Jew." I, too, am a Russian Jew, Goldman had to remind Most.[3]

Within a short time, Goldman and Berkman became active lecturers, speaking in German, Russian or Yiddish before immigrant anarchist groups. Their circle widely increased, as they met and spent time with Russian radicals such as Michael Cohn, M. Katz, Michael Zametkin, Louis Miller, Abraham Cahan, Yiddish poet David Edelstadt[4], Isaac Hourwich, and Joseph Barondess. It was Barondess who involved Goldman in her first labor activity: working with Annie Netter to organize the women for the Cloakmaker's Strike in 1889. Barondess had pulled together the Jewish anarchists and socialists to support the Yiddish unions. The strike succeeded through a compromise, (although Barondess was sentenced to jail), and

---

[3] Ibid., p. 73.

[4] Goldman, Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 21.

the experience for Goldman of organizing labor was a valuable part of her education. Her work for the next years included speaking to immigrant labor unions, and her push to involve the anarchist German, Russian, and Jewish organizations in the first International Worker's Day rally on May 1, 1891 gave her widespread visibility as she led the anarchists from the back of a wagon, waving a red flag.[5]

In May 1892 a political situation arose that allowed Goldman and Berkman to test the extent of their commitment to anarchy, and their commitment to each other. The setting was Homestead, Pennsylvania. The Carnegie Steel Company, owned by Andrew Carnegie, was being run by Henry Clay Frick, the chairman of the board. Frick hated labor; he privately owned non-unionized coke ovens. He was determined to disempower the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, who were insisting upon wage increases which would reflect the higher market prices. Frick refused to acknowledge the union; the workers were fired and those wishing employment would have to re-apply individually. Frick termed this a lockout. His actions were severe and non-negotiable to the extent that national sympathy was with the strikers; even the conservative press harangued him. The situation was reaching a boiling point: Frick was forcibly evacuating the striker's families-- the children, the infirm-- from their hovel homes. Goldman and Berkman were sickened as they read the news. They

---

[5] Ibid., p. 9.

planned to send a manifesto to the steel workers, for this was the time to begin uniting American workers to renounce capitalism and destroy the wage system; this was the time to move towards social revolution and anarchism. They believed that the Homestead strike was the polarizing event that would rouse the masses to action.[6] The revolution was about to begin. Before the manifesto could be sent, Frick took the next step. A barge full of strike-breakers and Pinkertons was brought up the Monongahela River in the middle of the night. The strikers gathered on the shores, determined to repel the strike-breakers. The Pinkertons opened fire, shooting indiscriminately at the shoreline. Twelve died, including a little boy, and hundreds were injured.[7] Goldman later wrote that:

> "...it was the psychological moment for an **Attentat** (a politically-inspired violent act of propaganda); the whole country was aroused, everybody was considering Frick the perpetrator of a cold-blooded murder. A blow aimed at Frick would re-echo in the poorest hovel, would call the attention of the whole world to the real cause behind the Homestead struggle. It would also strike terror in the enemy's ranks and make them realize that the proletariat of America had its avengers."[8]

Berkman set out to build a bomb, and Goldman and Stein immediately agreed to go with him to Homestead. He disagreed. His plan was to blow up Frick but not himself. It was only

---

[6] Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 9.

[7] Ibid., p. 9.

[8] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 87.

through his arrest and trial that they would be able to spread their message. Goldman was most necessary as an orator; her role was to interpret the Homestead events from an anarchist's view for the public to understand. Goldman reluctantly agreed that she would not accompany Berkman. When plans for the homemade bomb were unsuccessful, the comrades agreed that Berkman should buy a gun. The $20 to purchase the gun was raised in part through Goldman's solicitation of her sister Helena, although Helena never knew why Emma had requested the funds.

Later Berkman would write,"Human life is indeed sacred and inviolate, but the killing of a tyrant, an enemy of the People, is in no way to be considered the taking of a life."[9] Berkman did not take Frick's life on July 23, 1892; although he shot him three times and stabbed him in the leg with a dagger, Frick recovered quickly, in time to direct the National Guard to squelch the strikers once and for all.

The reaction to Berkman's act was not what the two anarchists had expected. What they had discounted was that they were in the United States, not Europe. In the United States, there was no precedent for such an act; the act was incomprehensible to the masses. His act confused the issues of the strike for the general population, reawakening the fears of anarchism that had been quieted after the 1886 Haymarket Affair. Berkman was seen as a lunatic, and even the

---

[9] Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 10.

strikers repudiated his act.[10] Closer to their own circle, his act was looked upon with mixed reaction. Johann Most, who had published the pamphlet on bomb-making and had long advocated political violence, chastised both Berkman and the attentat, stating that the proletariat was not ready for such an act of violence. He went so far as to claim that Berkman had no real intention of killing Frick; he even claimed that the gun was a toy. Goldman, full of fury at Most, appeared at one of his public lectures, seated in the front row. She demanded Most produce proof of his accusations against Berkman. When Most called her a "hysterical woman," she leapt forward, pulled forth a bullwhip from under her cape, and proceeded to horsewhip Most in front of the audience.[11]

The lack of support found in Most's anarchist circle-- which included many of the Jewish East Side anarchist groups-- was offset by the full support Goldman found in the **Autonomie** group and with their closest Jewish anarchist comrades. When Berkman was placed on Murderer's Row at the Western Pennsylvania Penitentiary, Joseph Barondess was among the first to offer help. Berkman's crime carried a maximum seven-year sentence. Without even being given notice of his trial date, Berkman was suddenly hauled into court, charged with six indictments (including an attempt on the life of Frick's assistant), and given a Russian interpreter who

---

[10] Ibid., p. 11.

[11] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 105.

interpreted incorrectly. Berkman, who had decided to be his own counsel, was given no chance to speak, and was found guilty after the District Attorney leaned into the juror's box and held a low conversation with the jurors. The jurors gave a guilty verdict without ever leaving the juror's box. Berkman was sentenced to an unbelievable 21-year prison term, with an additional year to be served in the workhouse for carrying a concealed weapon. Two groups came forward to work for the commutation of Berkman's sentence; the "American" radicals and the East Side Jewish radicals. Barondess, Zametkin, Miller, Hourwich, Solotaroff, Netter, Cohn, and Sergey Shevitch, editor of the German daily Volkszeitung, all spoke out on Berkman's behalf.[12] The legal system was not to be swayed. Commutation for Berkman did come, but years later. Berkman served 14 years in the Penitentiary, and was released May 18, 1906 at 35 years of age.

Throughout his sentence, Goldman felt guilty that Berkman was enduring a hellish prison experience, when both of them had schemed the attentat. If not in the legal view, in the public's view she was his accomplice; The World, a New York newspaper, accused her in a July 28 article of having masterminded the assassination.[13] While the news was still "hot," Goldman found it difficult to even secure lodging in New York; landlords would evict her from comrades'

---

[12] Ibid., p. 110.

[13] article as exhibited in the "Emma Goldman Exhibit," Emma Goldman Papers Project.

apartments, and there were nights that Goldman slept on park benches. In a strange way she took this hardship positively. Why should Sasha suffer and not her? Her correspondence with him over the years was his strongest link with the outside world, and her letters kept him sane in a prison system that was bent on physically and psychologically destroying his will.

In the 14 years of Berkman's imprisonment, an enormous number of acts of attentat were perpetrated internationally by anarchists. In 1893 Vaillant threw a bomb into the French Chamber of Deputies. Emile Henry, in 1894, caused a bomb to explode in a Paris Cafe. Shortly thereafter a bomb exploded in a theatre in Barcelona-- six men were executed for the crime. That same year French President Carnot was assassinated in Lyons by an Italian, Santo Caserio. The Prime Minister of Spain, Canovas del Castillo, was murdered by Angiolillo in 1897. In 1898 Empress Elizabeth of Austria was assassinated. An attempt was made on the life of the prince of Wales while visiting Belgium in 1900 by Sipido, but Sipido was later acquitted, his acquittal bringing strong international condemnation to Belgium. Italian King Humbert was assassinated in 1900, as was American President William McKinley on September 6, 1901. An unsuccessful attempt was made on the King and Queen of Spain on their wedding day in 1906. In each of these cases the public associated the crime with anarchism, and the decade clearly imprinted in most people's mind that anarchy was equivalent to violence. By

1894 the United States Congress had passed a bill to keep foreign anarchists out of the country, and to deport any foreign anarchists found in the United States.[14]

The "anarchy and violence" issue in the United States came to a crescendo unlike any since the Haymarket Affair with the assassination of President McKinley at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo. His attacker was Leon Czolgosz. Goldman had met the young man four months prior to the attack. She had been lecturing in Cleveland and Czolgosz, introducing himself as "Nieman," had attended the lecture on anarchism. He had asked her to recommend reading; he had been active with the socialists, but was now interested in anarchism. She complied. Sometime later, Czolgosz came to visit her in Chicago, but he arrived just as Goldman was leaving to vacation in Rochester with her family. She spoke briefly to him enroute to the train, and recommended he contact her local comrades. Within a short time her close comrade Abe Isaak, the Mennonite editor of the anarchist Free Society in Chicago, had printed a warning notice that the Cleveland anarchists thought Nieman was a spy; he asked too many questions. Goldman wrote to Isaak demanding proof. Isaak replied that there was none, but he had made himself untrustworthy by constantly talking about acts of violence. Goldman thought no more of the affair through the summer of 1901, as she spent relaxing months with Lena and Helena, and

---

[14] "Anarchism" Encyclopaedia Brittanica 1910-11.

their children Stella, Saxe, Harry and David, all of whom adored their "Tante" Emma.[15] She was taken completely by surprise the day she read the headline that Czolgosz had assassinated McKinley, and that Emma Goldman was being sought as having incited the assassin. It wasn't until she saw a photo of the assassin that she recognized him as being Nieman. A copy of one of her speeches was found in his coat pocket.[16]

Goldman was arrested in Chicago and underwent five days of harassment and abuse, as the police attempted to extort a confession from her. It wasn't until the Chief of Police decided she was innocent that conditions changed. She was held in jail but treated well by the Chief and the guards, who all admitted that, as Democrats, none were sorry about the fate of the Republican President, but only Goldman was willing to defend the assassin.[17] Goldman was freed after a month in jail, the Buffalo authorities failing to connect her with the crime in any way.

Goldman returned to Rochester to recuperate with her family. Her friends and family had been heavily attacked by the police and the community during her imprisonment. Her father had lost many of the customers at his furniture store,

---

[15] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 291.

[16] "Emma Goldman Exhibit," Emma Goldman Papers Project.

[17] Goldman, "The Assassination of McKinley," The American Mercury, September 1931, as reprinted in Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman p. 260.

and had been "excommunicated from the synagogue."[18] Nonetheless, they all staunchly defended Emma. She later wrote, "The imminent danger I had faced, which still threatened me, had served to establish a bond between my family and me stronger than we had ever felt before."[19]

Once McKinley died, it was apparent that Czolgosz would be sentenced to death. But Goldman was absorbed with finding justice, or at least some comfort, for the man. The anarchist community had not adopted Czolgosz as one of their own. They had not really known him, and his act was not seen as representative of their views. But Goldman saw within Czolgosz a sensitive soul. Although she was unable to communicate with him, she imagined that he had assassinated McKinley for the political stance that she held against McKinley: his constant siding with management against labor by sending troops to strike areas; his imperialism toward the Philippines, after he had promised to set it free during the Spanish-American War.[20] She wrote sympathetically about Czolgosz in the anarchist press, connecting him with others who had committed political crimes because they could not bear to see the misery and suffering of others. Czolgosz, she contended, was not so much to blame for his act as those world leaders who were responsible for the injustice and

---

[18] Ibid., p. 270.

[19] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 314.

[20] Ibid., p. 310.

inhumanity.[21] But she was a lone voice; she comments that even the Yiddish anarchist press, the Freie Arbeiter Stimme, under Shaul Yanovsky, was against Czolgosz, even though their office had been attacked by an anti-anarchist mob.[22]

Less than two months after his attentat, Czolgosz was put to death in the electric chair. He had been repeatedly beaten up in prison. The lawyers assigned to him began their court case by announcing how sorry they were to have to defend such a depraved criminal. On the day of his execution, the warden tried to manipulate Czolgosz to implicate Goldman. Under the black mask, Czolgosz replied, "It doesn't matter what Emma Goldman has said about me. She had nothing to do with my act. I did it alone. I did it for the American people."[23]

Berkman's act and Czolgosz's act were committed during a decade of international violence. Its prevalence gave Berkman and Goldman reason to evaluate the role of violence as a force for social change. The two were not always in agreement as to how they interpreted aspects of anarchy, and the role of the attentat was one of the aspects upon which their views diverged. Goldman addressed the role of violence in her essay "What I Believe", published in the New York World in 1908, and "The Psychology of Political Violence" published in 1910

---

[21] Ibid., p. 312.

[22] Ibid., p. 312.

[23] Ibid., p. 317.

in her book Anarchism and Other Essays.

Goldman felt it was her role to interpret the act of attentat to the masses, to help them come to see each act not as an act of violence but as a political act, a cry on behalf of the suffering, begging for relief. Although her feeling about attentat later changed, her feeling about the attentater remained constant. Regarding Czolgosz, she wrote passionately a decade after his death:

"A free Republic! How a myth will maintain itself....and yet within a little over thirty years a small band of parasites have successfully robbed the American people, and trampled upon the fundamental principles, laid down by the fathers of this country, guaranteeing to every man, woman, and child 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' For thirty years they have been increasing their wealth and power at the expense of the vast mass of workers, thereby enlarging the army of the unemployed, the hungry, homeless, and friendless portion of humanity, who are tramping this country from east to west, from north to south, in a vain search for work... For thirty years the sturdy sons of America have been sacrificed on the battlefield of industrial war, and the daughters outraged in corrupt factory surroundings...In vain did a lying press repudiate Leon Czolgosz as a foreigner. The boy was a product of our own free American soil, that lulled him to sleep with 'My country 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty.'... Who knows but that he too was willing to 'fight for his country and die for her liberty,' until it dawned upon him that those he belonged to have no country, because they have been robbed of all they have produced...Poor Leon Czolgosz, your crime consisted of too sensitive of a social consciousness."[24]

In each case of political violence, Goldman felt compelled to present "the other side of the picture." In 1894 Vaillant had exploded a bomb in the French Chamber of Deputies, and while some were wounded, none were killed. In

---

[24] Emma Goldman, "The Psychology of Political Violence," Anarchism and Other Essays, pp.94-96.

his trial, Vaillant gave a moving speech that his act was to shame the privileged class for allowing the starving and suffering of the lower class. The lower class could not be faulted for seeing the social inequities. They were "bent beneath the yoke of capital."[25] France's leading intellectuals had pleaded for the commutation of Vaillant's death sentence; President Carnot refused. When Carnot was murdered by Italian anarchist Santo Caserio, Vaillant's name was carved on the attentater's stiletto. Goldman excerpted Caserio's plea to the jury. He had seen children working and starving. He had seen people dying at 30 and 40 years of age from toil. Then he had seen the wealthy, and he could no longer believe in God.[26]

In a like manner, Goldman addresses the case of Canovas del Castillo, the Prime Minister of Spain. When a bomb exploded during a religious procession in 1896, 300 anarchists, socialists, and trade unionists were thrown into the Montjuich bastille. The prisoners were tortured at del Castillo's insistence: flesh was burned, tongues cut out, bones crushed. It was for this treatment that Angiolillo shot del Castillo.

It was imperative to Goldman that the masses know why Gaetano Bresci, an Italian immigrant who lived in New Jersey, had returned to Italy to assassinate King Humbert. The

---

[25] Ibid., p. 100.

[26] Ibid., p. 105.

Italian peasants were starving. Facing another famine, the wives of the peasants appealed to the King for help. They had gone to the palace, and silently held their starving babies up, for the King to see their emaciation. The soldiers lifted their guns and slaughtered the mothers and the babies. It was for this that Bresci shot King Humbert.[27]

In these cases and more, Goldman passionately wanted to illustrate that the world must see more than the murder of a political figurehead by an anarchist. The crimes were committed by sensitive, passionate men who could not endure to see suffering and misery. They had each committed their attentat with the intention of being caught, willingly sacrificing their own lives, to give meaning to the act. Berkman, of course, was in their league. Anarchists who commit crimes do so not because of anarchist theory, as if it is stated that to be an anarchist is to commit acts of violence, but rather because they see great economic inequality and political injustice. [28]

While her sympathies were unswervingly with the attentater, over the course of Goldman's life her view toward violence did change. She stated in "What I Believe", printed in the New York World in 1908, that she had never advocated violence. Yet, at the time of the Homestead Affair she did share Berkman's view that the "ends justified the

---

[27] Ibid., p. 110.

[28] Emma Goldman, "What I Believe," New York World 1908.

means;" this was the view she had cultivated since the assassination of Tsar Alexander II.[29] It was after Homestead that she changed her view, when she looked back at the horror of Berkman's constructing a bomb. They had been willing to experiment with explosives in a crowded tenement, endangering innocent lives for the sake of their Cause. It was at that point Goldman began to differentiate between individual acts of violence, which she saw as "deeds of misplaced protest,"[30] and collective revolutionary violence against the ruling class. She would no longer support the individual act. She wrote:

> "I do not believe that these acts can, or ever have been intended to, bring about the social reconstruction. That can only be done, first, by a broad and wide education as to man's place in society and his proper relation to his fellows; and second, through example... [and] lastly, [through] economic protest of the masses."[31]

The collective act, Goldman felt, was necessary against capitalism and the state. Violence was necessary to bring social and political change. Goldman maintained:

> "...great social changes have not and cannot take place without some clash. After all, revolutions are nothing else but the breaking point of accumulated evolutionary forces. Such a breaking point is inherent in nature and expresses itself through violent storms. Equally so are the forces inherent in life. Every change from the old to something new creates violent upheavals in our being. So too, such upheavals take place in the social and economic life of the

---

[29] Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Essays of Emma Goldman, p. 205.

[30] Ibid., p. 206.

[31] Emma Goldman, "What I Believe," New York World 1908.

world."[32]

The collective violence she could tolerate was the violence, in revolution, of the masses against an oppressor. She was outspoken in distinguishing this type of collective violence from the violence of the state she observed in Lenin's Bolshevik regime in Russia, during 1920-21. In the preface to her book My Disillusionment in Russia, she wrote:

"The argument that destruction and terror are part of revolution I do not dispute. I know that in the past every great political and social change necessitated violence... I have never denied that violence is inevitable, nor do I gainsay it now. Yet it is one thing to employ violence in combat, as a means of defense. It is quite another thing to make a principle of terrorism, to institutionalize it, to assign it the most vital place in the social struggle. Such terrorism begets counter-terrorism and in turn itself becomes counter-revolutionary."[33]

Goldman, as an unceasing critic of Bolshevik Russia, condemned the Bolsheviki for institutionalizing violence as a necessary part of statism, a violence that she claimed far exceeded that necessary for the actual 1917 Revolution, and a violence that easily overshadowed that of Tsarism. With a sociological eye she proclaimed:

"There is no greater fallacy than the belief that aims and purposes are one thing, while methods and tactics are another... All human experience teaches that methods and means cannot be separated from the ultimate aim... to divest one's methods of ethical concepts means to sink into the

---

[32] Goldman, "EG to Havelock Ellis, November 8, 1925, Bristol," in Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman ed. Richard and Anna Maria Drinnon (New York: Schocken Books 1975) p. 69.

[33] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p.xlviii-xlix.

depths of utter demoralization."[34]

At the heart of her criticism of the Bolsheviki was that the violence was a waste. Nothing in theory had changed, just in name. The Bolsheviki had not, by revolution, brought about a change in the governing of Russia, they had just exchanged one type of dictatorship for another. [35]

The place and use of violence was an issue that Goldman and Berkman debated through a series of letters they exchanged in 1928. Berkman was working on his autobiography, and this served as the impetus for the debate, as they recalled Homestead, Czolgosz, and Russia. Berkman wrote to Goldman that he differentiated between political acts of violence, as was Czolgosz's attack on McKinley, and economic acts of violence, such as his act against Frick and Carnegie Steel. Economic acts could be understood in the United States, but not political acts. Goldman responded vociferously that she found his attitude absurd. Both of their acts were useless, except as demonstrations of sensitized souls. Berkman disagreed, citing that, although he now repudiated acts of terrorism, there were times that they could be useful; for example, the acts of Russian revolutionists alerted the world to the despotism of the Tsars. Goldman response was that Berkman's belittling Czolgosz's act was as offensive to her as Johann Most's

---

[34] Ibid., p. 260.

[35] Ibid., p. 259.

repudiating Berkman's attentat. She comments that Berkman had remained steeped in the old revolutionary traditions, far after she had abandoned them. In Russia, he was still willing to believe that "the ends justified the means" long after she had discarded that tenet in the light of the Bolshevik violence they were witnessing. He had finally come to agree with Goldman, but insisted that she had reached that conclusion because of over-emotionality and womanishness, while he had been methodic, exploring convincing proofs.[36] This recrimination was an aspect of their relationship; Berkman, the one committed to the ideals of the theory, and Goldman, the one who weighed the ideals evenly with how she saw them played out in the human drama. Berkman would often accuse her of softness, of being an armchair anarchist and not a real revolutionist. This was deeply painful to Goldman, who wrestled with the belief that her intuition and her emotions were weaknesses in her character.

The last decade of the 19th Century was indeed scarred with political violence, and although this was a major motif of the decade for Goldman, the decade was also one of great growth for her. Much of her growth occurred during the year Goldman spent in prison, which will be discussed below. If she wasn't becoming a recognizable leader of the radical faction by the events at Homestead, the events which put her

---

[36] Goldman, Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman pp. 93-98.

in jail certainly catapulted her into the inner circle of radical leaders. The industrial crisis of 1893 had left thousands unemployed, facing the misery of starvation and eviction with no promise for a brighter future. Goldman was in the thick of the relief work, working in shelters, soup-kitchens, and organizing meetings. A mass demonstration was held at Union Square, under Goldman's guidance. In front of thousands of angry, bitter, unemployed workers, Goldman concluded the program with these impromptu words:

> "Do you not see the stupidity of asking relief from Albany with immense wealth within a stone's throw from here? Fifth Avenue is laid in gold, every mansion is a citadel of money and power. Yet there you stand, a giant, starved and fettered, shorn of his strength. Cardinal Manning long ago proclaimed that 'necessity knows no law' and that 'the starving man has a right to a share of his neighbor's bread'... Your neighbors, they have not only stolen your bread, but they are sapping your blood. They will go on robbing you, your children, and your children's children unless you wake up, unless you become daring enough to demand your rights. Well then, demonstrate before the palaces of the rich; demand work. If they do not give you work, demand bread. If they deny you both, take bread. It is your sacred right!"[37]

Goldman was arrested the next day, in Philadelphia. After a delay, she was extradited to New York. Chief of Police Byrnes had sent a Detective Jacobs to escort Goldman. On the train returning to New York, Jacobs revealed to Goldman that he too was a "yehude" and that he hated to see her go to jail. She could go free, and even earn some money, if she would agree to report to Byrnes regularly on the activities of the East Side radicals. Byrnes was furious at

---

[37] Goldman, Living My Life, pp. 122-123.

her refusal. At Goldman's trial, the State produced Detective Jacobs who read from notes purported to be a verbatim account of Goldman's speech. He quoted her as advocating revolution, violence, and bloodshed. Twelve witnesses testified that Goldman had said none of that. A handwriting expert testified that Jacobs notes were too regular and even to have been written from the platform where he claimed to have been standing; the platform was overcrowded, and people were swaying. Goldman was grilled by the District Attorney on her anarchist views, but not about the contents of her Union Square speech. Based upon a falsified account of her speech printed in the New York World, Goldman was convicted of inciting to riot, even though no riot occurred after her speech. She was sentenced to one year in the Blackwell's Island Penitentiary.[38]

Goldman's opinions about prisons developed during her year on Blackwell's Island. What she saw were woman who were not criminal nor violent, simply social outcasts. They were impoverished, and because of impoverishment they had resorted to the streets for prostitution or to steal, or to act out their anguish in some manner frowned upon by the law. She became beloved among the women inmates for refusing to be placed in charge of the sewing room; she would not be a

---

[38] Goldman ran into Jacobs a number of years later, when she, as a nurse, was caring for the madam of a brothel. Jacobs was the madam's lover, and the man who carried bribe money from the madam to the police. Later, regarding another case, Goldman reports that Jacobs spent a year in jail for perjury.

"slave-master." Her own rheumatism put her in the sick ward, and there she was trained to be a nurse by the prison doctor, a position she retained for the rest of her sentence. At 24 years old, Goldman hated being away from her world of social involvement, and particularly from Ed Brady, an Austrian anarchist with whom she had been intimately involved. But in prison she had time to cultivate her mind; she read English and American literature, exposing herself to the writings of Twain, Emerson, Thoreau, and Whitman.

When Goldman wrote about the brutality and uselessness of prisons, as she did in "Prisons: A Social Crime and Failure" in 1910, she called upon her experience in Blackwell's Island and Berkman's 14-year term in the Western Pennsylvania Penitentiary, buttressing these experiences with her anarchistic, theoretical objection to the institution. In her essay, Goldman strove to expose the prison system as "big business;" indeed she cites that the United States was spending more than a billion dollars annually to maintain the prison system, a figure almost equal to the combined value of wheat and coal for the United States for a year.[39] Yet, murder had increased more than fourfold in the previous two decades. What better indication that the institution was a failure? To understand why prisons were a failure, Goldman presented a survey on the nature of crime, methods of coping with crime, and the effects of these methods.

---

39 Goldman,"Prisons: A Social Crime and Failure," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 118.

There were four types of crime, Goldman claimed, based upon The Criminal by Havelock Ellis: the political crime, the crime of passion, the crime by the mentally unfit, and the occasional crime.[40] Ninety percent of crimes were in this last category: the crime resulting from socioeconomic inequities. Goldman did not deny that psychological and physiological factors played a role for the criminal, she simply pointed out that societal conditions provided a rich soil for the could-be criminal.

Primitive man avenged wrongdoings. In a society, man had turned that authority over to the state. The law had proclaimed that punishment was atonement for one's crime. Yet the punishment meted out by the prison system did not deter criminals.

> "There is not a single penal institution or reformatory in the United States where men are not tortured 'to be made good,' by means of the blackjack, the club, the straightjacket, the water-cure, the 'humming bird' (an electrical contrivance run along the human body), the solitary, the bullring and starvation diet."[41]

When released, prisoners were greeted by hunger and inhumanity. They face little choice but to repeat their crimes. Goldman insisted that efforts had to be made to restore to the prisoner the possibility of human existence. Society had to stop torturing the social offender, which meant the brutality of the police and the prison guards had to be stopped. Goldman suggested that the answer was labor.

---

[40] Ibid., p. 119.

[41] Ibid., p. 125.

Prisoners should be taught meaningful labor, and earn money for the performance of that labor, money that would be set aside and given to them upon their release from prison.

This was an impossibility as long as the government was an exploiter of prison labor. Twenty-nine states sub-contracted convict labor to private individuals; the federal government and 17 states had stopped this practice because they knew it led to the overwork and abuse of the prisoners, as well as to graft. Goldman went on to cite companies and prisons that exploited the prisoner, having them perform tasks that were not viable occupations for them in the "outside" world, such as making brooms, an occupation done by the blind.

The effect of the prison method was negative. The prison system gave no incentive for a prisoner to change, to make good. A prison sentence was set; hard work did not bring liberty any closer, and there was no chance for a convict to learn a supporting skill. In short, society had to get away from the mentality of there being a "prisoner" and a "jailer," punitive measures had to be dropped, and the guise of "social protection" thrown away. Those who were unfortunate in society had to be directed to meaningful work that would support them, to be shown a way that they could succeed in society. This would ensure that the cycle of repeat offenders would be broken. The entire prison system, in the society which she envisioned, would be eliminated.

Goldman's views on prisons, which culminated in the

writing of her essay, undoubtedly had their seeds in her prison experience. Although her crime was not social but political, her advice regarding meaningful work followed her own experience. Upon her release from Blackwell's Island in 1894, she began to work as a nurse at Beth Israel Hospital. A year later she went to Vienna to study nursing and midwivery at the **Allgemeine Krankenhaus**. Her political life resumed immediately, and while abroad she met noted anarchists Peter Kropotkin, Louise Michel of the Paris commune, and Enrico Malatesta. By the end of the century she had returned to Europe as a delegate at a clandestine anarchist conference in Paris, as well as a representative at a Neo-Malthusian congress, where she became acquainted with the latest medical and political thought on birth limitation and contraception. Her nursing trade served her well; after the McKinley assassination, Emma Goldman was seen almost as a public enemy. After struggling for months to find housing and work, Goldman finally took the name Miss E.G. Smith, and it was under this name that she lived a quiet, non-public life from 1901-1906, supporting herself as a nursing companion to sick women. It was the middle of the first decade of the twentieth century before Goldman felt the mania of the McKinley affair had passed, and she could resume her previous life, name, and activities.

SECTION TWO: 1887-1919: THE LIFE AND WORK OF AN AMERICAN ANARCHIST

CHAPTER FIVE: ESPOUSING AN IDEOLOGY

In the early years of the twentieth century, Emma Goldman's focus turned to the events of Russia, her homeland. Russian uprisings in 1902 had brought the East Side socialists, anarchists, and trade unionists together to help the students, workers, and peasants who were being attacked and killed by the Cossacks of the Tsarist regime. Goldman was moved to leave her reclusive life and she took to publicizing the cause of revolutionary Russia. She applauded the "splendid efforts of the radical Yiddish press" [1]but lamented that it was limited to the East Side. The Tsar had ample positive publicity through the Russian Church, the Consulate, and the New York Herald. In 1903, two members of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, Rosenbaum and Nikolaev, came to New York. They formed a section of the party on the East Side, and although their ideology did not mesh with Goldman's vision of a non-governmental society, she joined their cause. Influential in her life was the American visit of Catherine Breshkovskaya, the "grandmother of the Russian Revolution." Babushka, as she was called, had spent years in prison and in exile. Speaking engagements were arranged for her; the non-Jewish, non-Russian "American" population was curious to hear the tales of the woman. Goldman served as her translator, although in many conservative circles Goldman was still

---

[1] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 359.

introduced as Mrs. E.G. Smith. Among Breshkovskaya's supporters was Lillian D. Wald, of the Nurses' Settlement, who succeeded in winning much support for the Russian cause through the receptions she hosted.[2] The January 1905 massacre of thousands of Russians at the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg-- Russians, who, following Father Gapon had arrived to appeal to the Tsar for relief-- was instrumental in bringing a larger audience to hear Breshkovskaya. Goldman, and her niece Stella Cominsky, became absorbed in Breshkovskaya's schedule, accompanying her everywhere in New York, and forging a warm friendship with the Russian heroine.

In 1905, a Russian theatre-dance troupe came to the United States, that of Pavel Nikolayevitch Orlenoff and Alla Nazimova. When the group found themselves without funds, Goldman brought them to Hunter Island, in Pelham Bay near New York, where Stella had arranged a permit to pitch a tent for the summer. Goldman, Stella, and the entire troupe spent the summer in tents on the island. Goldman agreed to manage the troupe. They had come to perform Tchirikov's **The Chosen People**, to publicize the pogroms which were sweeping Russia. Goldman worked with Abraham Cahan, the editor of the socialist daily Forward and Shaul Yanovsky, the editor of the anarchist Freie Arbeiter Shtimme, both of whom encouraged the efforts of the theatre group. In October 1905 a revolution erupted in Russia, a response to the Winter Palace massacre.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 362.

East Side support for the revolution was high, and Orlenoff's performances were packed. But almost as quickly as it started the revolt was crushed, and, filled with anguish as reports of new pogroms against the Jews grew, Goldman saw the Russian and the Jewish East Side population turn away from anything Russian. As thanks for her hard managerial work and her commitment, Orlenoff presented a special theatrical performance, the proceeds of which were to go to Goldman to be used to fulfill her dream of beginning a magazine. The $250 raised did indeed allow Goldman to move into the next stage of her political career.

Editing an anarchist magazine was an idea that had been born to Goldman through her association with Max Baginsky, the editor of the German anarchist Arbeiter Zeitung in Chicago. Baginsky and Goldman had met in 1893, and their friendship was lasting. Together they had developed the notion of a magazine that would give expression to Goldman's social ideas, as well as serving as a forum for various art forms: poetry, drama, art, and the like. The magazine would be open to all who had material for its pages; there would be no censorship. In March of 1906, the first issue of Mother Earth was published. It was 64 pages long. Until it folded, when Goldman was imprisoned for two years in 1917, Mother Earth was published regularly for more than a decade. While Goldman kept up an active speaking and touring schedule, others, such as Berkman, might run the New York office, but Goldman constantly supplied articles and essays.

Mother Earth was more than a magazine to Goldman, it was her child, and she often referred to it as thus. The name revealed much about Goldman. As a young woman, she had made a decision not to have corrective surgery performed, which would have enabled her to bear children. She had made the decision that one could not be committed to a child and an ideal simultaneously. As much as she loved children, and often wrote essays on the education of the child, she would foreswear not to bear any of her own. Her relationship with others revealed the profound psychological effect of this choice on her. She put herself often in a maternal role in her relationships, and in her writings about the men she was romantically involved with she would often refer to them as "my boy." Ben Reitman, her lover for a decade, of whom more will be written later, called Goldman by the pet name "Mommy." Acquaintances would later write of Goldman's maternal instinct. Through the years of communal living, when as many as ten people might be sharing her quarters, Goldman still did the cooking and cleaning, in addition to her demanding writing and work schedule. As Mother Earth came to fruition, she would refer to it as her expectant child, and throughout its publication she would call it "her child." Psychological implications aside, the magazine was as offspring to Goldman. She exerted enormous time and energy into developing and nurturing the publication, scheduling frequent lecture trips cross-country to raise funds for its continued existence. Goldman poured her hopes and dreams, her

visions for the world, into the essays she produced for the magazine. In time she began the Mother Earth Publishing Association, publishing in pamphlet form those of her speeches and essays which had met with success and were in great demand. It was the Mother Earth Publishing Association that published Alexander Berkman's Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist, relating his experience of 14 years in the penitentiary.

Through Mother Earth Goldman knew her ideas would be printed exactly as she meant, and not subject to the censorship, editing, and deliberate misrepresentation that she found typical in the general press. Over the decade of its existence, Mother Earth spoke out about the current issues of the day: conscription, birth control, women's rights, and the like. But it was also the vehicle for Goldman to espouse her ideology in general. Goldman wrote about anarchy; her critiques of socialism; the syndicalist movement in Europe, seen as the economic expression of anarchy; her critiques of religion and puritanism; in short, she revealed her visions for what an ideal society could and might be.

As an anarchist, religion played no part within her scheme for an ideal society, and she spoke out harshly against religion and its evils. While her criticisms of religion usually fell under the title of "Christianity," it is important to note that she did not support any religion, including Judaism. She did not write any essays criticizing Judaism in particular, although her feelings are apparent

from individual letters written to friends, and from her general critique of religion. What Goldman did separate was her recognition of Judaism as a religion from her recognition of Jewish peoplehood. She never hid or denied her Jewish roots. Throughout her American career she always lectured to Jewish groups, in Yiddish, and her correspondence with Berkman through their later life was dotted with Yiddish words and phrases. She recognized the special persecution of the Jews in Russia, and at times would even verbally defend the Jews. Of her "Jewish connection" more will be said later, but in exploring Goldman's feelings toward religion, it is necessary to know she had no tie to religious Judaism. In fact, both she and Berkman were known for having planned Yom Kippur galas and picnics.[3]

Goldman's critique of religion was in part theological, but mostly sociological. The heart of her critique rested on the way religion had stifled society and social development. Goldman spelled out her feelings toward Christianity in particular in a Mother Earth article which appeared in the April 1913 issue. In "The Failure of Christianity" she states:

> "Much as I am opposed to every religion, much as I think them an imposition upon, and crime against, reason and progress, I yet feel that no other religion has done so much harm or has helped so much in the enslavement of man as the

---

[3] Falk, Love, Anarchy and Emma Goldman, p. 137.

religion of Christ."[4]

Quite simply, Christianity was full of dead social and moral values, said Goldman, ideas long past their social usefulness that continued to be instilled as great and irrefutable. Christianity had helped society degenerate to its present state, perpetuating a slave society, and teaching a submission that protected society against rebellion "better than the club or gun." The teachings of Jesus were submission, inertia, and the denial of life, and these, the ethical and social Christ, as she called them, were more offensive to her than the theological teachings. The doctrine of afterlife and reward and punishment encouraged the poor and suffering to remain placid, rather than demand justice. Indeed, by focusing on an afterlife, Christianity had remained indifferent to the horrors existing in this life. She attacks Jesus:

> "...the moment he began his work, he proved that he had no interest in the earth, in the pressing immediate needs of the poor and disinherited of his time. What he preached was a sentimental mysticism, obscure and confused ideas lacking originality and vigor... When the Jews, according to the gospels...turned him over to the cross, they may have been bitterly disappointed in him who promised them so much and gave them so little. He promised them joy and bliss in another world, while the people were starving, suffering, and enduring before his very eyes." [5]

Jesus' "Sermon on the Mount" particularly angered

---

[4] Goldman, "The Failure of Christianity," Mother Earth April 1913, as reprinted in Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 193.

[5] Ibid., pp. 189-190.

Goldman, and she labeled it a eulogy on submission to fate.

"The idea conveyed in the Sermon on the Mount is the greatest indictment against the teachings of Christ, because it sees in the poverty of mind and body a virtue, and because it seeks to maintain this virtue by reward and punishment. Every intelligent being realizes that our worse curse is the poverty of the spirit; that it is productive of all evil and misery...nothing good can come of the poor in spirit, surely never liberty, justice, or equality."[6]

To say "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven," or "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," or "The poor ye have always with you," was to encourage slavery and inertia on the part of the suffering. This encouragement of meekness, as well as Jesus' claim that he "had not come to destroy the law" had been the carte blanche that governments, leaders, capitalism, and the like had needed to gain power and suppress the masses. Rome had never been concerned about Jesus, says Goldman. "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's;" Jesus conceded to the powers of his time. Rome must have laughed at the man who talked of repentance and patience. What threat was he to them?

From Goldman's perspective she can only read the life of Jesus through the spectacles of social consciousness. She compares Jesus to other martyrs.

"Thousands have gone to their death with greater fortitude, with more courage, with deeper faith in their ideas than the Nazarene. Nor did they expect eternal gratitude from their fellow-men because of what they endured for them. Compared with Socrates and Bruno, with the great martyrs of Russia, with the Chicago anarchists, Francisco Ferrer, and unnumbered others, Christ cuts a poor figure indeed... They stood their ground and faced their executioners with unflinching determination, and though they,

---

[6] Ibid., pp. 190-191.

too, died for the people, they asked nothing in return for their great sacrifice."[7]

Jesus' death, Goldman contends, imposed a burden upon humanity, paralyzing the human soul with its weight.

A sidelight to Christianity was the attitude of Puritanism that had developed, and which Goldman saw rampant in American society. She abhorred the:

> "...Calvinistic idea that life is a curse imposed on man by the wrath of God. In order to redeem himself man must do constant penance, must repudiate every natural and healthy impulse, and turn his back on joy and beauty."[8]

Imported from Britain, Puritanism had made Americans believe that the flesh was evil, perverting the significance and purpose of the human body. Forced to suppress one's deepest feelings, man was robbed of self-expression through sexuality, art, literature and drama. Temperance Unions, Sabbath Unions, Purity Leagues and the Prohibition Party had become all-powerful in America, suppressing natural, healthy, creative expression. In Europe, comments Goldman, Sundays were a day of festivities, a day of rejoicing for the masses who had but one day free from labor. They attended concerts, theatre, museums, gardens; it was a day that the masses could taste what life might really be like in a more equitable society. These avenues were closed to the American worker because of Puritanism. The rich, she adds, have their homes

---

[7] Ibid., p. 194.

[8] Goldman, "The Hypocrisy of Puritanism," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 174.

and clubs at which to drink and celebrate. But the masses are doomed to the monotony of Puritan Sundays.

But Puritanism's greatest evil was its sexual suppression and how this played itself out in society. The victim was the woman. Society demanded that an unmarried woman be pure. Feeling the natural curiosities about sex, a woman could either go against social dicta, with the accompanying guilt and mental agony, or marry. In most cases, marriages took place, not for love or true feeling, but for sexual motives. Now that sex was "socially sanctioned," the woman found herself constantly pregnant, weakened by this never-ending cycle. Birth control was forbidden, for society had deemed it criminal. Desperate women sought abortions; some 17 of every 100 pregnancies were aborted.[9] Women's physical lives were endangered, leaving at risk the lives of the existing children at home in need of a mother. Furthermore, the women carried the burden of shame of not achieving the false moral standards Puritanism had inflicted upon society.

Society, concluded Goldman, was better with atheism. Where a primitive society may have needed a God idea, born out of fear and ignorance, contemporary society had learned to understand natural phenomena. Science could correlate human and social events. Whereas theism was the theory of

---

[9] Ibid., p. 178.

speculation, atheism was the science of demonstration.[10] Her rejection of theism, consistent with Goldman's entire approach to religion, stemmed mostly from it clouding man with a focus on the next life, instead of working to improve this life. The humanly-invented God concept had done nothing to better the world. The Gods of the major world religions-- Confucius, Buddha, Yahveh, Jesus-- were non-responsive to the poverty and starvation in the world. These Gods of mercy and justice had done nothing to avert the increasing injustice in the world. For Goldman, they must be rejected. Her concerns of justice, morality, and truth were a part of this world. "God's" concerns were of the next world. By rejecting God, Goldman could affirm the power and will of man.

Understandably, Goldman's view that "organized religion oppressed the human soul and kept the human mind in bondage"[11] was not popular within religious circles. In spite of comments such as the Church is the "foe of human development and free thought and as such has no place in the life of a truly free people,"[12] from time to time, courageous religious leaders would invite her to their pulpit. At the San Francisco Exposition in 1915 Goldman was invited to

---

[10] Goldman, "The Philosophy of Atheism," Mother Earth February 1916, as reprinted in Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 197.

[11] Goldman, "What I Believe" New York World 1908. Reissued by Mother Earth Publishing Association, and reprinted in Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches of Emma Goldman, p. 43.

[12] Ibid.

deliver a speech on atheism at the Congress of Religious Philosophies. She was followed by a rabbi who remarked, "in spite of all Miss Goldman has said about religion, she's the most religious person I know." [13]

The abolition of religion was only one aspect of Goldman's vision for the future. She knew, in speaking of anarchy, that she was constantly fighting the image painted in the American mind of people committed to violence and destruction. She sought to explain the true meaning and application of anarchism, its economic theory called syndicalism, and her views on property and government.

Goldman's descriptions of anarchism were often sweeping and broad-- not specific and technical-- as were her criticisms of capitalism. Anarchism, as she defined it, was:

> "...the philosophy of a new social order based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence, and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary."[14]

Goldman's appraisal of society was this: man and society had been placed at odds, rather than in harmony. Religion, property, and government had shackled man. Anarchism would group men together to create real social wealth, guaranteeing to each individual free access to the earth and full enjoyment of the necessities of life.[15] With no more

---

[13] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 561.

[14] Goldman, "Anarchism: What It Really Stands For," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 56.

[15] Ibid., p. 68.

specifics for how this could be accomplished, Goldman focused rather on why this needed to be accomplished. Although she conceded that institutional property may have had a purpose, the existence of private property had condemned those who had to labor for its productivity. Workers become non-entities who must sell their labor and have their judgment subordinated to the master, she explained in her article "What I Believe,"[16] and this was degrading. The cost in human lives was staggering; she reported that in the previous year 50,000 workers were killed and 100,000 wounded in the United States from production.[17] In addition to the loss of lives, there was the loss of individuality, initiative, originality. Real wealth was in things of beauty and utility, in making man's surroundings inspiring. Industrialization, production, and capitalism had all made for a mechanical existence. "Man can't live by only producing gray, hideous things, reflecting a dull, hideous existence," she insisted.[18] It was government which found value in industrialization and capitalism, and people had been indoctrinated with the false belief that government flowed from natural laws, maintained order, curbed crime, and prevented the lazy man from fleecing others. What men needed to realize was that natural laws would prevail

---

[16] Goldman, "What I Believe" New York World, 1908 as reprinted in Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 36.

[17] Goldman, "Anarchism: What It Really Stands For," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 60.

[18] Ibid., p. 61.

without government and that order was accomplished, not by the submission of men but through creating a "solidarity of interest," which couldn't exist in a class society. As for crime, the state was the biggest criminal in its abuse of the workers. Crime would end when economic injustice ended; 90% of crimes were economically motivated, Goldman asserted.[19] Capitalism created lazy men who would live off the work of others; societal reorganization would eliminate this class.

In her advocacy of anarchism and her critique of capitalism, Goldman was quick to explain why socialism was not the answer. Whereas at one time socialism was anti-authoritarian, anti-capitalist, and anti-religious, the modern socialist politicians wanted to become part of the power structure implicit in American government. Socialism had been fashioned to fight two evils: the wage system, and private property. The socialists, Goldman claimed, had sold out to modern society, by endorsing the state, the protagonist of private property. American socialists were favoring the state, which by definition was not just nor democratic, but which stood for supremacy, submission, and organized exploitation.[20] Socialism in America was no answer.

For all of the "isms" that Goldman spent her life

---

[19] Goldman, "What I Believe," Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Essays by Emma Goldman p. 38.

[20] Goldman, "Socialism: Caught in the Political Trap," incomplete typescript, probably 1913, never published, reprinted in Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches of Emma Goldman, pp.79-80.

writing and speaking about-- anarchism, capitalism, socialism, militarism, bolshevism-- it is clear that her stand on each was motivated by what to her was the most important "ism:" individualism. Anarchism strove to guarantee individual rights; capitalism and militarism strove to suppress individual rights. Her commitment only clarified and strengthened over time. In "The Individual, Society, and the State," a pamphlet she wrote late in her life, and which was published posthumously in 1940, Goldman spoke about the political world of the 1930's, the decline of democracy and parliamentarism and the rise of fascism and Nazism. Goldman fought vigorously against dictatorship. She spoke out against Franco, Mussolini, Hitler-- but she refused to embrace a faulty democracy as the solution. The state and society were abstractions conceived by man. They were names, not organic realities, nothing more than terms to designate the "legislative and administrative machinery" whereby the people's business could be transacted. The individual, stressed Goldman, was the true reality in life. The state had no conscience nor moral mission. It was, like the idea of a God, a creation of man.[21] Her convictions were strong, empowering mankind. Man had the power to create the society he wanted, it was not the state that held the power, rendering man helpless. Man had to recognize this and take

---

[21] Goldman, "The Individual, Society, and the State," published as a pamphlet by the Free Society Forum, Chicago, 1940, reprinted in Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 90.

the reins. What Goldman added to this assessment was that only anarchism claimed that society existed for man, and not vice versa.[22]

Given her commitment to the individual, and the rights of the individual in society, it is no surprise that the individual's right to free speech was one of the biggest banners Goldman waved for more than a decade in the United States. It was for speaking out against conscription that Goldman and Berkman were arrested in 1917 and deported in 1919. Suppression of the individual's voice enraged Goldman; certainly it had prompted her to found Mother Earth. But the free speech fight for Goldman began not in securing her own right to speak, but in securing the right for British anarchist John Turner. Congress had passed an Anti-Anarchist Law in March 1903, prohibiting the entrance of any person opposed to government into the United States. Goldman organized a Free Speech League of influential and well-respected Americans-- as opposed to immigrants-- citizens who recognized that the law impeding free speech was contradictory to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. While the Supreme Court eventually upheld the Anti-Anarchist Law, forcing Turner to return to England without conducting his speaking tour, something far greater was born. Goldman had spoken around the country about freedom of speech. Police departments had hounded her mercilessly; a

---

[22] Ibid., p. 100.

criminal anarchist law was used to suppress her speeches and cancel her meetings. In New York the police had created an "anarchist squad" to close down meetings. The extremes to which suppression of speech were carried prompted mainstream newspapers and conservatives to speak out on behalf of Goldman. In some cases, such as in Chicago, when a meeting was cancelled, the local newspaper would allow Goldman to write a column, which they printed unedited.[23] Her passionate plea for individual's rights as guaranteed under the Constitution inspired others. She created numerous Free Speech Leagues across the country, wherever she lectured. In 1908 Roger Baldwin heard Goldman speak in St. Louis. Baldwin went on to found the American Civil Liberties Union, and he and Goldman developed a longstanding acquaintanceship.[24]

Goldman arrived in Chicago in the winter of 1908 for a lecture series. The rising unemployment had put the masses on the streets, begging for relief. Goldman arrived two days after an attempt had been made on the life of the Chief of Police. A young Russian immigrant, Lazarus Overbuch, had gone to call on the Chief. In Russia, he had witnessed the Kishinev massacres. During the march of the unemployed in Chicago he witnessed police brutalities-- beatings and clubbings. Overbuch was killed by the Chief's son as soon as he entered the house. The Chief claimed that, after handing

---

[23] In this case, the Chicago Inter-Ocean. Goldman, Living My Life, p. 416.

[24] Falk, Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman, p. 9.

the son a letter, Overbuch shot his son, who then wrestled the gun away and used it to kill Overbuch. Although it was proven that the son had not been shot at all, and that Overbuch was killed by a gun of a different calibre than the gun he carried,[25] the police cracked down on the anarchists. Goldman could not find a hall that would rent to her Chicago comrades. An offer came from a Dr. Ben L. Reitman, who used a vacant hall for meetings with the unemployed and hobos. A meeting was arranged, but on the afternoon of the scheduled speech, the building and fire departments inspected and declared that the building could not hold more than nine occupants safely. The room had been arranged for two hundred. The meeting was cancelled. Reitman arranged a concert and social, planned at the Workmen's Hall. Goldman was not on the bill, but was clandestinely brought into the hall. After the music, Reitman announced that a friend would speak. When Goldman appeared on stage the police mobbed her, pulling her off, threatening to start a riot in the crowded hall. Goldman shouted to the crowd to remain calm, not to play into the hands of the police but to leave quietly. Public opinion sided with Goldman, the general press claiming that it was she, not the police, who had averted a calamity, and condemning the police for suppressing Goldman's right to speak. In her autobiography Goldman remembered that of all the prominent citizens who spoke out on her behalf,

---

[25] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 415.

"...the most gratifying result was the stand of Rabbi Hirsch in regard to the action of the police at our social. The next Sunday his sermon was devoted to an objective exposition on anarchism. Among other things he pointed out the stupidity of the authorities in attempting by violent methods to stamp out an ideal that had as its spokesmen some of the noblest spirits in the world."[26]

A Free Speech League was formed in Chicago.

The intimate relationship that developed between Goldman and Reitman in early 1908 would continue for the next ten years; indeed it would plague both of them for the rest of their lives. It was a relationship of deep passion, but also of infidelity on Reitman's part, separations, reconciliations, acceptance, and frustration. Reitman joined Goldman as her manager, proving himself quite capable in this field. Her audiences grew as he created a wider appeal, her speaking tours stretching for months cross-country, and the sale of her pamphlets increasing substantially. It was Reitman's idea to publish Anarchism and Other Essays in 1910. Emotionally, Goldman fell into an abyss in regard to Reitman. She wrestled with the almost drug-like hold he had upon her sexually, and the depths of sexual passions which they shared. When she came to discover his constant infidelity, she could not send him away, choosing to live with the constant torment of their rocky relationship, and the torment of knowing that she, who advocated emotional independence, was so emotionally tied to a man. They became enmeshed-- she was his "mommy" and he was her "hobo" as they corresponded

---

[26] Ibid., p. 419.

through their separations. Reitman was obsessively connected to his mother in Chicago. For stretches of time he would live with Goldman in New York or accompany her on tour, and then he would leave her to be with his mother. As a personality, he was an enigma. He had been a hobo through Asia, Europe, and the United States, always battling wanderlust. His hobo days brought him close to the unemployed and the marginal in society, and he had propagandized on their behalf. In 1904 he had earned a medical degree in Chicago, choosing sometimes to practice, and at other times to abandon medical work.

Although he was deeply committed to Goldman, and managed her career as an anarchist, Reitman was never accepted in anarchist circles as a serious anarchist. Indeed, Goldman's friends did not like Reitman and he was kept on the "outside" of intimate gatherings, and this plagued both Goldman and Reitman. Berkman and Reitman did not get along, although they each could acknowledge the other's place in Goldman's life. More than a dozen years after Goldman's relationship with Reitman had ended, she and Berkman corresponded about it, showing a rare openness to discuss their intimate lives with each other. In May 1929 Goldman wrote Berkman from her cottage in St. Tropez. In a refrain that hadn't changed in twenty years, she defended Reitman's being in the movement, attacking Berkman for making such an accusation in light of the many female lovers he had been with who had done nothing for the movement. Ben had made it possible for Goldman to do her best work; he had kept Mother Earth solvent many a time,

and had made their publishing association profitable. It had been extremely painful for her to know that Berkman, her intellectual soulmate and dearest lifelong companion, had so strongly disliked Reitman; at one point Berkman had written to verify Reitman's medical credentials. Goldman concedes that her fault was that she was not blind to Reitman's shortcomings. She had seen all of his faults, but this then required of her a deeper love.

> "I not only knew but loathed his sensational ways, his bombast, his braggadocio, and his promiscuity, which lacked the least sense of selection. But over and above that there was something large, primitive, unpremeditated, and simple about Ben which had terrific charm."[27]

Throughout the decade in which Goldman fought for free speech, she was involved in numerous battles. The most difficult of these was the Free Speech fight between the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.) and the Vigilantes in San Diego in 1912. San Diego had encouraged the tradition of having outdoor meetings, and the anarchist, socialist, and I.W.W. groups, as well as some religious sects, had regularly met in the city's parks. The city passed an ordinance to do away with the old tradition. The political activists initiated a free speech fight, and 84 activists were arrested. A virtual civil war began. The Vigilantes, calling themselves "patriots", had taken to beating and clubbing, even killing those who demanded their civil rights. The

---

[27] Drinnon, Richard and Anna Maria, Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman (New York: Schocken Books 1975), p. 149.

I.W.W. was reinforced by hundreds of sympathizers who came to San Diego to help the I.W.W. carry on their campaign. But the Vigilantes meant business. They raided and destroyed the I.W.W. headquarters, arresting the men found there. "Arresting" was no problem; many of the San Diego police were Vigilantes. Goldman gives this account of what then transpired:

> "They were taken to Sorrento to a spot where a flagpole had been erected. There the I.W.W.'s were forced to kneel, kiss the flag, and sing the national anthem. As an incentive to quicker action, one of the Vigilantes would slap them on the back, which was the signal for a general beating. After these proceedings the men were loaded into automobiles and sent to San Onofre, near the county line, placed in a cattle-pen with armed guards over them, and kept without food or drink for eighteen hours. The following morning they were taken out in groups of five and compelled to run the gauntlet. As they passed between the double line of Vigilantes, they were belabored with clubs and blackjacks. Then the flag-kissing episode was repeated, after which they were told to "hike" up the track and never come back. They reached Los Angeles after a tramp of several days, sore, hungry, penniless, and in deplorable physical condition."[28]

Goldman and Reitman, in Los Angeles touring, arranged food and clothing for the I.W.W. men and then set out for San Diego, where she had lectured during each previous West Coast trip. The city was in a panic when they arrived, and through the chaos, the two found their hotel, although the manager warned them regarding their safety. Within a short while Goldman was informed that the city authorities had come to call upon her. She and Reitman went to meet them, finding themselves in a room with seven men. When the Chief of Police and the Mayor arrived, Goldman was escorted from the room to

---

[28] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 494.

meet with them. Reitman was informed that this was a private meeting, that he would stay with the band of men. The city officials asked Goldman to leave San Diego, insisting that they could not protect her within their city. Already an angry mob was outside her hotel. Goldman retorted that it was their job to disband the mob. They were committed to disbanding the anarchists who congregated; why not the Vigilantes? The officials insisted they could not, and Goldman responded that she would take care of herself. When her meeting was over, she went to find Reitman. He was nowhere to be found. Frantic, she searched the hotel, but all parties seemed to have no information regarding his whereabouts. After midnight, she was informed that Reitman had been taken out by the Vigilantes, but no harm had come to him. He was on a train toward Los Angeles. Goldman was informed that there was no way her meetings in San Diego would be able to proceed. She packed her bags and took a 3 a.m. train to Los Angeles. Reitman was not there; she realized that she had been duped into leaving San Diego. The next morning, Goldman received a call that she should meet the train from San Diego, and that Reitman's friends should be there with a stretcher. Reitman was indeed on the train, and the account of the abuse he received from the Vigilantes was the same and worse than that of his compatriots the week before. He recalled that, taken from the hotel by the seven men, they were joined by others who took him twenty miles out of town.

"They began kicking and beating me. They took turns at pulling my long hair and they stuck their fingers in my eyes and nose. 'We could tear your guts out', they said, 'but we promised the Chief of Police not to kill you. We are responsible men, property-owners, and the police are on our side.' When we reached the county line, the auto stopped at a deserted spot. The men formed a ring and told me to undress. They tore my clothes off. They knocked me down, and when I lay naked on the ground, they kicked and beat me until I was almost insensible. With a lighted cigar they burned the letters I.W.W. on my buttocks; then they poured a can of tar over my head and in the absence of feathers, rubbed sage-brush on my body. One of them attempted to push a cane up my rectum. Another twisted my testicles. They forced me to kiss the flag and sing **The Star Spangled Banner**. When they tired of the fun, they gave me my underwear for fear we should meet any women. They also gave me back my vest, in order that I might carry my money, railroad ticket, and watch... They ordered me to make a speech, and then they commanded me to run the gauntlet."[29]

The reports made by Reitman and other victims of the Vigilantes turned public opinion toward the free speech advocates. The California Governor appointed a special investigator, who substantiated every claim made against the Vigilantes. Yet, the lines had been drawn, and it was difficult to diffuse the issue. The "patriots" saw the liberal elements exercising free speech and felt that they were using the privilege to spread subversion. As "patriots" they had to protect their way of life from this subversive threat. In many cases the media helped the spread of such mania. Goldman encountered it again in Seattle, but she would not allow her meetings to be cancelled.

The Free Speech fight was going on in cities like Missoula, Spokane, and Fresno. Hundreds of free speech advocates were being arrested. Goldman took it upon herself

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 500-501.

to speak out on their behalf.In a 1908 article she attacked countries such as the United States, Russia, Spain, Italy, and France, where free speech had become a political issue. She pointed to countries where free speech was granted- England, Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark- noting that there had been no "evil consequences" for these countries. Free speech was a farce when it had to be legislated by constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, and the Postmaster General, Goldman claimed. What was more hypocritical, she contended, was that the right for or against free speech was enforced in the United States by the police, and the Postmaster General, neither of which were elected officials.[30] Goldman's gripe with the Postmaster General was specific: certain issues of Mother Earth had been prohibited from the U.S. mails because they contained articles on birth control. And her attack upon the police was at times even poetic:

> "O Liberty! Poor, outraged, degraded Liberty. Fallen indeed art thou from thy once lofty height, when every petty policeman can soil thy pure form with his foul hands and trample in the mire of Chicago's streets thy beauteous lineaments."[31]

With the freedom of speech campaign, Goldman was in a position in which she often found herself- that of being a minority voice regarding a major issue. The United States

---

[30] Goldman, "What I Believe," Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches of Emma Goldman, p. 42.

[31] Goldman excerpted from article published in Lucifer the Lightbearer, Chicago anarchist paper, displayed at "Emma Goldman Exhibit," Emma Goldman Papers Project.

had entered a period of repression of freedom of speech after the McKinley assassination. This repression led to the Espionage and Sedition Acts of 1917, and culminated in the suppression of those who spoke against United States involvement in World War I. At times Goldman admitted how hard it was to be a lone voice-- to advocate birth control in a sexist society, to be anti-Bolshevik in a Communist-loving era, to preach against military draft in a trigger-happy country. Her inner fortitude kept her strong, never allowing her to back down from a conflict, never allowing her to remain silent in the face of what she perceived to be an injustice. She addressed the issue by criticizing the persuasive power of the majority in the United States in an essay that appeared in her 1910 work Anarchism and Other Essays. Americans, she contended, although they liked to throw around the phrase "rugged individualism," were terrified to be individual in their thought or action. "Public opinion" was the stranglehold which kept most people in line with the majority opinion. This was no country of individuals, but a mass of cowards. The majority had never stood for justice or equality.[32]Goldman felt she had been reminded of this day after day in her life. The lesson of being alone against the crowd she had learned in the aftermath of the Homestead Affair and again after the McKinley assassination. She had no choice but to raise her

---

[32] Goldman, "Minorities Versus Majorities," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 84.

voice for the issues that called to her-- free speech, women's rights, anti-militarism-- whether or not they went against the tide of majority opinion, or the government's stance. Whereas one newspaper editor claimed that the only thing wrong with Goldman was that she was 8,000 years ahead of her age,[33] she may only have been fifty years too early. Goldman's writings inspired many activists of the 1960's who were battling the same general issues she had: free speech, women's rights, and war.

---

[33] William Marion Reedy, editor of the Reedy's Mirror as quoted in Candace Falk, Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman, p. 10.

SECTION TWO: 1887-1919: THE LIFE AND WORK OF AN AMERICAN ANARCHIST

CHAPTER SIX: THE FIGHT FOR WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Goldman biographer Alix Kates Shulman states, that of all of Goldman's diverse interests, the oppression of women was always one of her most central concerns,[1] and indeed the biographer is correct. Goldman looked at the place of women in her time, and saw many issues to be addressed. This was Goldman at her best; never one to see just one issue, it was her ultimate strength that she placed every issue within a universal framework. Over the course of her career Goldman wrote and lectured about women, advocating birth control, encouraging unrestricted love, attacking the suffrage movement, lambasting the institution of marriage, and condemning society for its abuse of women in the workplace, and its hypocrisy toward prostitution. Her position, as usual, was from a sociological perspective. Women were being exploited for economic and political ends, and these individual issues had to be exposed for the part they played in this larger picture. Goldman set about the task.

Goldman awoke to the "Woman Question" through a series of experiences in her life. Her 1893 stay at the Blackwell Island Prison put her in contact with other women inmates. She found that these women were prostitutes or lower-class women, whose crimes were not pathological, but rather were

---

[1] Shulman, p. 14.

acts erupting from the poverty and abuse in their lives. They were not criminal; they were victims of society. She met women who, in the face of starvation, had turned to prostitution and were now being punished. She spoke to women who had been constantly impregnated and beaten by cruel husbands, who had risen up and struck back, preferring a life in prison than a life of familial abuse. In the prison, Goldman learned nursing, and upon her release she spent a year in Vienna formally studying to be a nurse and midwife. She practiced mainly on the Lower East Side, particularly assisting Jewish families. Goldman recalls helping a woman in labor who lived in a two room tenement apartment. The couple had three children already, and no gas; water had to be heated over a kerosense lamp. The family had no clean linen with which Goldman could deliver the baby. The father brought her the only available cloth: the Shabbat tablecloth, from right off the table.[2] She wrote:

"Still more impressed was I by the fierce, blind struggle of the women of the poor against frequent pregnancies. Most of them lived in constant dread of conception; the great mass of the married women submitted helplessly, and when they found themselves pregnant, their alarm and worry would result in the determination to get rid of their expected offspring. It was incredible what fantastic methods despair could invent: jumping off tables, rolling on the floor, massaging the stomach, drinking nauseating concoctions, and using blunt instruments. These and similar methods were being tried, generally with great injury. It was harrowing, but it was understandable. Having a large brood of children, often many more than the weekly wage of the father could provide for, each additional child was a curse, "a curse of God" as orthodox Jewish women and Irish Catholics repeatedly told me. The men were generally more resigned, but

---

[2] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 184.

the women cried out against Heaven for inflicting such cruelty upon them. During their labor pains some women would hurl anathema on God and man, especially their husbands. 'Take him away,' one of my patients cried, 'don't let the brute come near me- I'll kill him!' The tortured creature already had had eight children, four of whom had died in infancy. The remaining were sickly and undernourished, like most of the ill-born, ill-kept, and unwanted children who trailed at my feet when I was helping another poor creature into the world."[3]

In 1900 Goldman attended the Neo-Malthusian Congress in Paris.[4] Because the goal of the Congress was to limit offspring, the Neo-Malthusians were considered illegal in France. The group convened secretly. Goldman met the 20th century thinkers in family limitation, and was supplied with literature and contraceptives to bring back to the United States. By the turn of the century, Goldman's experiences had shown her a reality to which she felt a need to respond. She saw the plight of women caught in the hopeless cycle of continual pregnancies. She knew how particularly tragic this was in the case of the lower class. Furthermore, she knew that contraceptives could be used, but that many countries, the United States included, considered them illegal and immoral. And she knew that desperate women would resort to life-threatening abortions and self-mutilation. But it was not Goldman's style to respond solely to the issue of birth

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 185-186.

[4] Thomas R. Malthus theorized that the population tends to increase at a faster rate than its means of subsistence and that unless it is checked by moral restraint or by disease, famine, war, or other disaster, widespread poverty and degradation inevitably result (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary).

control. The right to control one's reproduction was only one aspect of women's independence. Women were being suppressed by the state in its denial of economic and political equality, and by the church in its imposition of a false and hypocritical morality. Goldman addressed the particulars of state suppression and church suppression in a multitude of essays, which will be explored in this chapter.

Following the Neo-Malthusian Congress, Goldman began to speak about the need for birth control and the merits of family limitation, but she did not speak about the specifics of contraception, a topic which she was sure would land her in jail, in defiance of the 1873 Comstock Law. She was not willing to risk prison because she did not want to curtail her work in other fields for the sake of the contraception issue. It was Goldman who brought Margaret Sanger into the birth control campaign, the woman who grew into the most well-recognized national figure in this fight. Sanger, in fact, began her work out of Goldman's New York office. The two enjoyed a good relationship for a while but eventually split because Sanger could not accept Goldman's resistance to the "single-issue approach." Sanger, her husband William, and her followers were also not anarchists, and Sanger may have felt that associating the birth control issue with the anarchists was detrimental to its wide-spread acceptance. Goldman, in her writing, does not seem to harbor any ill-feelings toward Sanger, but does comment that Sanger became distant from Goldman's group, severing contact. Whereas

Goldman spoke up when William Sanger was arrested for distributing his wife's literature, Margaret Sanger was silent when Ben Reitman was arrested rerpeatedly for similar offenses.

Goldman had a change of heart when William Sanger was arrested for giving a birth control pamphlet to a Comstock agent, and when Margaret ran into conflict with the postal authorities who refused to deliver her magazine, The Woman Rebel, because of its birth control information. Goldman herself had butted heads with the postal authorities and Anthony Comstock in 1909 for a Mother Earth article on the white-slave trade. The Chief Post Office Inspector had declared that nothing objectionable was in Goldman's article. Anthony Comstock denied the whole matter to the New York Times the next day, claiming that it was a publicity stunt on Goldman's part. Goldman had a deep hatred for "St. Anthony," as she dubbed him. When Comstock attacked Sanger's birth control work, Goldman decided "the time had come when I must either stop lecturing on the subject or do it practical justice. I felt that I must share with them the consequences of the birth-control issue."[5] Goldman took a speaking engagement at the Sunrise Club, a libertarian forum. Before 600 people she reviewed the historical and social aspects of birth control and then proceeded to discuss methods of contraception. She was not arrested that night, nor at her

---

[5] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 553.

next address to students at Columbia University. She chose to continue her birth control speeches on the Lower East Side at her Yiddish meetings, feeling that this was the audience that needed the information most. Eventually Goldman was arrested, which pleased her, for it meant that in going to court she had a new forum for her cause. Her arrest led to a protest meeting at Carnegie Hall, and a banquet in her honor the night before her court date. On April 20, 1916, Goldman spoke in court for an hour in defense of birth control, turning her trial into a national forum.[6] She was fined $100, but chose a 15-day jail sentence instead. During her incarceration, Reitman spoke at her scheduled meetings on contraception, and he too was arrested, serving a 60-day jail sentence. Their acts brought the desired publicity, and a number of cities held rallies for the right to disseminate information on contraception. Birth control, said Goldman, "ceased to be a mere theoretical issue; it became an important phase of the social struggle, which could be advanced more by deeds than by words."[7] Goldman had acheived her goal. Birth control was no longer strictly a single-issue, but was beginning to be recognized as a part of the economic and social issues that affected women.

Just as it might have been predictable that Emma Goldman would favor the acceptance of birth control in American

---

[6] "Emma Goldman Exhibit" Emma Goldman Papers Project.

[7] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 571.

society, one might be inclined to think that Goldman would be an advocate of women's suffrage. But Goldman was no suffragist, and her arguments, particularly as put forth in "Woman Suffrage," in the 1910 publication Anarchism and Other Essays, were thought-provoking. Her issue was of course not whether women had the intelligence to vote, but whether they would know how to effect change with the power of the vote.

> "The women of Australia and New Zealand can vote and help make the laws. Are the labor conditions better than they are in England, where the suffragists are making such a heroic struggle? Does there exist a greater motherhood, happier and freer children than in England? Is woman there no longer considered a mere sex commodity? Has she emancipated herself from the Puritanical double standard of morality for men and women?"[8]
>
> "Finland has given women equal suffrage; nay even the right to sit in Parliament. Has that helped to develop a greater heroism, an intenser zeal than that of the women of Russia? Finland, like Russia, smarts under the terrible whip of the bloody Tsar. Where are the Finnish Perovskaias, Spiridonovas, Figners, Breshkovskaias? Where are the countless number of Finnish girls who cheerfully go to Siberia for their cause? Finland is sadly in need of heroic liberators. Why has the ballot not created them?" [9]

Women, Goldman concludes, would be no more successful at effecting social change, once they had the ballot, then men had been. In Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah, women already were voters. In Colorado, according to the research of Dr. Helen Sumner, equal suffrage had "but slightly" affected the economic conditions of women, who were not

---

[8] Goldman, "Woman Suffrage," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 206.

[9] Ibid., p. 207.

receiving equal pay for equal work.[10] The guarantee of equal rights to property was of no avail to low-income women, the wage workers who lived hand-to-mouth, points out Goldman.

Not only had women not enhanced society with their vote, the suffragists seemed determine to create greater evils with the ballot in hand. The suffragists were often connected with Prohibition, intending to use the vote to put forth their puritanism. In Idaho, women had declared prostitutes "lewd characters" and unfit to vote. This, cried Goldman, was bigotry. Men of unclean lives, who were associated with saloons, were being booted out of politics in Colorado, as if these practices determined whether they were good politicians, and as if politics was a pure, clean field.

> " ...[Woman's] narrow and purist attitude toward life makes her a greater danger to liberty wherever she has political power. Man has overcome the superstitions that engulf woman... He has neither time nor inclination to measure everyone's morality with a Puritanic yardstick."[11]

The women suffragists were also not committed to equality within their own sex. It was obvious to Goldman that the suffragists wanted equal rights for women, as long as they were middle- or upper-class, acceptable women. Suffragists were known not to canvas in undesirable districts, Sumner reports.[12] They were detached from the economic needs of the people. Susan B. Anthony had even been

---

[10] Ibid., p. 207.

[11] Ibid., p. 210.

[12] Ibid., p. 211.

antagonistic to labor, claims Goldman, as she explains that in 1869 Anthony advised women to take the place of striking printers in New York.[13]

Goldman's attack on the suffragist movement is more extensive than just a critique of the practices of the suffragists. She is opposed on theoretical grounds. Suffrage does not provide economic nor political equality. Suffrage will not free women, but will enslave them just as men are enslaved. They will be "free," she contends, as men are "free" to starve, "free" to tramp the highways looking for work, "free" to receive labor laws prohibiting their right to boycott and picket. The only "right" that man has retained is the "right" to be robbed of the fruit of his labor. Goldman is looking to change the role and place of women in society, but she clearly rejects suffrage and the suffrage movement as being the means to the end she envisions.

Goldman again treats the topic of equality for women in her popular essay "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation," also included in Anarchism and Other Essays. In this piece Goldman moves beyond a focus on suffrage, choosing instead to address the larger issue of women's equality in society. She begins to make the case in her conclusion to "Woman Suffrage:"

> "Her development, her freedom, her independence, must come from and through herself. First by asserting herself as a personality, and not as a sex commodity. Second, by refusing the right to anyone over her body; by refusing to bear children, unless she wants them; by refusing to be a servant to God, the State, society, the husband, the

---

[13] Ibid., p. 213.

family... by trying to learn the meaning and substance of life in all its complexities, by freeing herself from the fear of public opinion and public condemnation. Only that, and not the ballot, will set woman free and make her a force hitherto unknown in the world, a force for real love, for peace, for harmony; a force of divine power, of life giving: a creator of free men and women."[14]

In her article on emancipation, Goldman eloquently continues her theme:

"The right to vote, or equal civil rights, may be good demands, but true emancipation begins neither at the polls nor in courts. It begins in a woman's soul. History tells us that every oppressed class gains true liberation from its masters through its own efforts... The demand for equal rights in every vocation of life is just and fair, but after all, the most vital right is the right to love and be loved. Indeed, if 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 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." [15]

There is no mistaking the passion in Goldman's works, but this essay reveals a passion coupled with vulnerability, and a loneliness. The issue of equality may have spoken more to Goldman than the score of political issues for which she fought, because the legitimacy of her own equality was something she fought for on a daily basis. Goldman was exceedingly bright; yet she was criticised by others as letting emotions cloud her judgment. Even Alexander Berkman, the prime witness to the heroic and powerful stands Goldman

---

[14] Ibid., p. 217.

[15] Goldman, "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 230.

took during her life, would claim that he believed men and women to be different mentally, which was why their understandings of issues like violence, sex, political action, and revolution was so different.[16] Although an equal to the outstanding men of her time, she still would face sexism, as from Austrian historian and friend Max Nettlau who insisted that every woman wanted broods of children.[17] Goldman was continually disappointed that the anarchist men with whom she associated through her life, the Johann Mosts and Alexander Berkmans notwithstanding, spoke of men and women in socially equal terms, yet wanted to find a docile, serving wife to run their home and take care of them. Berkman's female companion of the 1930's, Emmy Eckstein, was just that, and this was a source of tension between Goldman and Berkman.

Perhaps using her own life as a model, Goldman was able to see the equality that was beginning to creep into society, and she was also able to see the price it exacted. Women were moving into professions that had once been closed to them, but they were not physically prepared to compete with men; to withstand the competition required all of a woman's vitality and energy. If a woman did succeed in becoming a doctor, lawyer, architect, or the like, they did not succeed in receiving the type of confidence and salary that male

---

[16] Goldman and Alexander Berkman, Nowhere At Home pg, 123.

[17] Ibid., "EG to Max Nettlau, February 8, 1935, Montreal," p.185.

colleagues found.

This had personal ramifications also:

"One cannot help but see that the higher the mental development of 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."[18]

A more autobiographic line would be harder to find. Goldman gives intimate expression to her feelings in a 1925 letter she sent to Berkman from London. She had recently been visited by M. Eleanor Fitzgerald, who had served as her and Berkman's longtime assistant in New York. Berkman and Fitzie had at one point been lovers, a relationship that was severed when Berkman and Goldman were deported. Goldman writes to her comrade:

"The particular thing is the tragedy of all emanicipated women, myself included. We are still rooted in the old soil, though our visions are of the future and our desire is to be free and independent... It is a longing for fulfillment which very few modern women find because most modern men are too rooted in the old traditions. They too want the woman as wife and mother more than as lover and friend. 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?"[19]

She continues in a letter sent six days later:

"For while the modern woman, if more exacting and has greater and deeper needs, so too she has considerable richness out of her finer sensibilities and deeper understanding. There is nothing without a price and we must be ready to pay it. Fact is, we have no choice. There is a

---

[18] Goldman, "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 226.

[19] Goldman and Alexander Berkman, "EG to AB, September 4, 1925, London," Nowhere At Home, p. 133.

terrific urge toward freedom, toward the struggle for higher ideals which no one can resist. What then is to be done?"[20]

Goldman very clearly saw-- and felt-- the discomfort and unease of a society experiencing a change in one of its elements. Society was surely changing the way it looked at women, and women were surely struggling to reposition society's attitudes. It was for her insight into the complexity of this social issue that Emma Goldman was "rediscovered" and heralded as the patron saint of the Women's Movement in the 1960's.

While suffrage and emancipation were considered "proper" social issues of the day, prostitution by its very nature was not regarded as a proper topic to be discussed. Goldman approached the issue to expose the social and economic foundations which were perpetuating the condition, but the very impropriety with which society regarded the topic made her lash out at the moral forces which condemned it. While society was condemning the immorality of women who became prostitutes, Goldman was condemning the immorality of a society that forced women into prostitution, by giving them no economic recourse. In "The Traffic in Women," published in 1910, Goldman revealed that one in every ten women were factory workers, working 48-60 hours per week for an average weekly salary of six dollars. Many spent a few months of the year unemployed because of industry trends, rendering these

---

[20] Ibid., "EG to AB, September 10, 1925, London," p. 134.

women an annual salary of $280.[21] These were the women who saw no other choice then to resort to prostitution; it was an economic necessity for their survival. Society must stop hounding prostitutes and understand that they are the product of social conditions. Prostitution would continue until the economic realities of society changed. But economics were only one factor. For Goldman, suffrage, emancipation, and prostitution were all political issues, "state" issues, to be addressed. But prostitution was also a "church" issue, part of the larger picture of marriage, women's morality, and puritanism which she spoke out against. Prostitution was illegal, but engaging a prostitute was not. Men had created and perpetuated the prostitution system, at no disadvantage to themselves. The women were the ones who were arrested, who had to bribe policemen. Patrons were committed to perpetuating prostitution for their own sexual pleasure, and the police were interested in perpetuating prostitution for the good bribe and fine money they received. Prostitutes were victimized by men who were perpetuating the type of societal inequities that kept women going into that livelihood. And yet, who was accused of being immoral? The women, not those who benefitted from prostitution!

As if it was not enough to be victimized by men, prostitutes were being hounded by the spirit of Puritanism in the country. Prostitutes were constantly persecuted and

---

[21] Goldman, "The Traffic In Women," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 185.

harassed. Puritanism, Goldman wrote in "The Hypocrisy of Puritanism," labeled venereal disease as mysterious and shameful, the penalty for "sins of the flesh."[22] The result of this moralizing was that infected women were ashamed to seek treatment, and so the disease, which was cureable, was spread. Puritanism then, according to Goldman's equation, was responsible for the proliferation of venereal disease.

Puritanism was responsible too for perpetuating the myth of marriage. Puritan morality had dictated that women have sex only within the bounds of marriage, yet it was known that 50% of married men frequented prostitutes.[23] The History of Prostitution had reported that 25% of prostitutes were married, proving that the "sanctity" of marriage was no guarantee of "safety and purity." [24] Clearly, marriage was a concept inflicted upon society by the church, the self-appointed arbiter of morality, and this concept benefitted no one. What marriage did was make socially-accepted prostitutes out of the women who married, for their life was similar to the woman on the street. They too used sex to obtain the economic security of men; the prostitute gained the economic security of many men, while the married woman gained the security of one man. At least, says Goldman, the girl on the

---

[22] Goldman, "The Hypocrisy of Puritanism," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 179.

[23] Goldman, "The Traffic in Women," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 194.

[24] Ibid., p. 186.

street was less hypocritical. Marriage was nothing more than a life insurance policy for these women, where they would sign away their life, privacy, and self-respect, to insure that they would have a man around. Married women gave up their employment to run the house, but they also gave up all their personal rights. At least the prostitute could say no to sex when she wanted to say no, a priviledge not found within marriage. The married woman was condemned to a life as a breeder. In an essay entitled "Marriage and Love," Goldman wrote,

> "The institution of marriage makes a parasite of woman, an absolute dependent. It incapacitates her for life's struggle, annhilates her social consciousness, paralyzes her imagination, and then imposes its gracious protection, which is in reality a snare, a travesty on human character."[25]

The advantages of marriage could not even be argued from the standpoint of offering protection to children, continued Goldman in this essay. One had but to look at the thousands of destitute and homeless children, the overflowing orphan asylums and reformatories, and the work of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, saving children from their "loving" parents. Marriage could not guarantee well-being to women, nor to children.

But love could. Marriage and love were not synonymous, rather, they were often antagonistic terms. It was true, Goldman believed, that some marriages were based on love. But love did not continue because of marriage. Goldman believed

---

[25] Goldman, "Marriage and Love," Anarchism and Other Essays, p. 241.

strongly in love-- she had felt its effects before in her life. But women did not marry for love; they married for economic security. Marriage was an economic arrangement, and if love was a factor, it was often incidental. In articles such as "Marriage and Love," "What I Believe," and "Victims of Morality," Goldman urged women to choose their spouses based on his heart and soul rather than his income; to follow the one they loved without the hinderance of the outside world; and to insist upon the absolute right of free motherhood. Goldman was often accused of propagating "Free Love," a charge which could easily be substantiated by her lifestyle; for her adult life in the United States she often lived communally with other men and women, an arrangement which led to various configurations of intimate relationships. But what Goldman believed most was that love was free. It could not be bought, conquered, nor subdued, and so it needed no protection, least of all a "false" protection such as the institution of marriage. Love has its own security, she wrote, and if love is gone, even if there is marriage, no home can exist.[26]

It is possible to draw an all-encompassing picture of the life Goldman pictured for the modern woman. Women should function in society in a productive manner, and for their contribution they should be recompensed in a way that fosters independence and self-esteem. In all aspects of life women

---

[26] Goldman, "What I Believe," New York World 1908.

should be considered equals to men, and perhaps in this way women will become as powerful as men, exerting a capacity to effect change. This modern woman will love whom she chooses and when she chooses, without the strictures of state nor church. In this way, women can free themselves from the double-standards, the hypocrisy, the economic subjugation, and the political impotence of their current situation.

Great strides have been made in the United States towards realizing the portrait which Goldman painted through her essays and lectures. Certainly women's rights is one of the social issues which have advanced immeasureably in the twentieth century. It is almost difficult to imagine the world at which her essays were aimed, and how provocative her words might have been to a pre-World War I society. Yet for these views she was hated and feared, condemned as being "against God" and "against the government." Goldman and her rhetoric were considered dangerous, because somebody might take her ideas to heart and force a social change. But most of her opinions were not accepted: the state and church of her day still officiated at marriages, women were still paid subservient wages, and women were granted the right to vote. But the seeds planted by her rhetoric undoubtedly were far-reaching. On the women's issue, her words inspired a later generation to fight for changes which Goldman could only dream would someday be realized.

SECTION TWO: 1887-1919: THE LIFE AND WORK OF AN AMERICAN ANARCHIST

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE FIGHT AGAINST CONSCRIPTION

Emma Goldman was not opposed to all war-- she believed in class war to bring about social and political change. It was military war she abhorred, claiming the political leaders used the helpless masses to defend ideals that only the rich enjoyed. Goldman began speaking out against militarism in 1908, and it was for her sentiments that the United States deported her eleven years later. Goldman's rhetoric began as anti-militarism and as anti-patriotism, but as world conflicts escalated through the decade, she began to attack the issue of "preparedness," and, finally, conscription. Her views were spread through three essays in particular: "What I Believe," published in 1908 in the New York World; "Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty," which appeared in her 1910 collection Anarchism and Other Essays; and "Preparedness: The Road to Universal Slaughter," which appeared originally in the December 1915 edition of Mother Earth. This last piece was widely-acclaimed for its anti-war stand and was in great demand. It underwent subsequent re-printings and was highly circulated as a pamphlet. As was often the case, Goldman became more involved in the issue of militarism after an incident in her life aroused her to anger.

The incident occured in 1908, when Goldman and Reitman were in San Francisco on a lecture tour. They found the city anticipating her tour; as usual, exaggerated and far-fetched

rumors about Goldman had riled the city officials. This time, the rumor was that Goldman had come to San Francisco, the naval base of the Pacific, to blow up the American fleet docked in the harbor. Goldman was stunned that anyone would report such a rumor, yet reporter after reporter put the question to her. No, she replied, she was not there to blow up anything, but to expose the people to the uselessness of military institutions. The publicity-- as well as the intense police survelliance-- did wonders for her lectures; the hall, which seated more than five thousand, was packed for each lecture.[1] One of Goldman's lectures was entitled "Patriotism." She spoke passionately that patriotism was not a commitment to the homeland of one's youth, because the preponderance of factories and the mills and mines had taken that nostalgic vision away. Patriotism was now a concept that justified the training of wholesale murderers, she said, quoting Tolstoy.[2] Goldman's lecture went on to analyze the nature of patriotism, and what its true cost was to a country. She derided the military and the American love of war. Her hour-long speech was met with thunderous applause, and Goldman had a sense that she had spoken about an issue with which the public was greatly concerned. As she was shaking hands with members of the audience after her speech,

---

[1] Goldman says five thousand in Living My Life. In "Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty" she says there were fifteen hundred at the meeting.

[2] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 428.

she clasped one hand, and was surprised to look up and find she was holding a soldier's hand. With this unlikely scene, the audience let out a yell, clapping and shouting in joy, and tossing their hats in the air.[3] The soldier thanked her and disappeared into the crowd. Goldman thought this was a wonderfully dramatic ending to her speaking engagement.

But the incident had serious repercussions for the soldier. Goldman read in the morning paper that the soldier, Private William Buwalda, was followed by plain-clothes police back to the Presidio and was arrested, to be court-martialled for attending her meeting and shaking her hand. Goldman immediately set to work raising money for his defense. Buwalda, who had served fifteen years in the military, was sentenced to five years in Alcatraz prison, and dishonorably discharged. Buwalda's crime was equal to treason and was worse than desertion, said General Funston, who had charged Buwalda. In deference to what he termed the soldier's "unimpeachable" record, he reduced the sentence to three years.[4] Buwalda served ten months in prison before he was pardoned by President Theodore Roosevelt. In a meeting with Goldman after his release, he explained that he had been out for a walk and happened upon the crowd of people heading toward the pavilion for her speech. It was a spontaneous decision on his part to hear her lecture. He couldn't believe

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Goldman, "What I Believe," Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeeches by Emma Goldman, p. 39.

the things that she had said about the military stifling an individual's right to think and act, until he was arrested. Goldman had made him think. Upon his release, he sent his medal for faithful service in the Philippines back to the army. The accompanying letter, to the Secretary of War, stated that he had no further use for such trinkets and baubles, and that, while it represented service, it also represented killing, burning, raiding, and the inhumane treatment of others. The letter was printed in the May 1909 Mother Earth. Buwalda joined the anarchist movement.[5]

The Buwalda affair was included in Goldman's essay "What I Believe," in a brief section on militarism. Without expanding on her views, Goldman claimed that militarism was making the United States imperialistic and despotic, creating cold-blooded, mechanical killers. How could militarism stand in the face of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?" In the essay Goldman defended anarchism in opposition to United States militarism; how was it that people feared and hated anarchism, because it supposedly "taught violence," yet they wanted the United States to build up its arms supply and go to war?[6]

Goldman was much more detailed in her 1910 book with her essay "Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty." The text was taken from the lecture she delivered in San Francisco in 1908, the

---

[5] Goldman, Living My Life, pp. 448-9.

[6] Goldman, "What I Believe," Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Essays by Emma Goldman, p. 38-41.

lecture Buwalda attended. Goldman used a combination of her wit, sarcasm, and statistics to make her point.

> "Indeed, conceit, arrogance, and egotism are the essentials of patriotism.... Patriotism assumes that our globe is divided into little spots, each one surrounded by an iron gate. Those who have had the fortune of being born on some particular spot, consider themselves better, nobler, grander, more intelligent than the living beings inhabiting any other spot. It is therefore the duty of everyone living on that chosen spot to fight, kill, and die in the attempt to impose his superiority upon all the others.
>
> "The inhabitants of the other spots reason in like manner, of course, with the result that, from early infancy, the mind of the child is poisoned with bloodcurdling stories about the Germans, the French, the Italians, Russians, etc. When the child has reached manhood, he is thoroughly saturated with the belief that he is chosen by the Lord himself to defend his country against the attack or invasion of any foreigner."[7]

If Goldman's discounting of the concept of patriotism didn't move readers, perhaps her use of statistics did. The United States had "within a short time" spent four hundred million dollars on the armed forces, although Goldman did not tell the reader where she found that figure, nor what "a short time" is.[8] She looked at actual military expenditures from 1881 through 1905, for the United States, Russia, Italy, France, Japan, Germany, and Great Britain. The United States had tripled its outlay for the army in those 24 years, increasing its army outlay from 15% to 23% of its total army budget. During the same period the naval expenses of the United States increased 525%. While in 1881, $6.20 of every $100 went to the navy, in 1905 it was $16.40 per $100.

---

[7] Goldman, "Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty," Anarchism and Other Essays, pp. 134-35.

[8] Ibid., p. 135.

Computed as a per capita tax, the figure went from $5.62 to $13.64.[9] And, Goldman pointed out, this money was the people's money, collected not from the wealthy, but from the working masses.

The perceived need for an ever-increasing military was rooted in the United States' imperialistic motives. The Spanish-American war, in which tempers were fanned by months of journalistic agitation, was not fought to liberate Cuba. Soldiers gave their lives to protect the interests of the capitalists in the sugar trade. The order to shoot Cuban workers during the great cigarmakers' strike after the war proved this, claimed Goldman.[10]

The truth was, according to Goldman, Americans were very impressed with their military. Thousands of dollars were spent to dress and entertain the officers, even though the enlisted men had to fight to get decent food rations. In Seattle, Tacoma, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, $260,000 had been spent on fireworks and theatre parties for the officers.[11] Children were brought to see the fleet at every port, to show them the spectactular and impressive navy. And the charade was effective; the gala of the military would wipe away one's despair over the hardships one faced.

To rationalize having a military of this magnitude,

---

[9] Ibid., pp. 137-38.

[10] Ibid., p. 140.

[11] Ibid., p. 141.

Americans used the pretense that we were most secure if we were armed to the hilt, but being armed only made us anxious to want to try out our shiny new equipment. Countries that were peaceful by nature did not need such extensive weaponry. But that was not the United States. She wrote:

> "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... our hearts swell with pride at the thought that America is becoming the most powerful nation on earth, and that it will eventually plant her iron foot on the necks of all other nations. Such is the logic of patriotism."[12]

In 1910 conscription was not the issue for Goldman that it would later be, but she addressed the topic in a theoretical way. Conscription was practiced in Europe, and was the cause of deep hatred toward the military, among all social classes. The United States did not have conscription, said Goldman, but industrial depression led many to enlist, just to earn the $13 per month and to guarantee the enlistee three meals a day and a bed. There was no need for conscription because economic conditions accomplished the job; both methods, felt Goldman, were coercive.

Events in Europe and the outbreak of World War I in August 1914 brought Goldman to the front of the anti-war movement. Even before the United States entered the conflict in April 1917, the country was full of talk about the war, U.S. preparedness, eventual involvment, and the possibility of conscription. Goldman's campaign against preparedness was

---

[12] Ibid., p. 142.

but an outgrowth of her anti-militarism rhetoric, but now the discussion was not theoretical-- the spectre of war loomed on the American horizon, and the papers were overflowing with accounts of the debacle in Europe. The December 1915 issue of Mother Earth included an essay entitled "Preparedness: The Road to Universal Slaughter." In her usual form, Goldman began with harsh words and imagery, then attacked the political situation which led to the current predicament, and finally, ended by making a plea for a new economic reality. For its time, it was probably the most well-read essay Goldman ever penned. Her opening paragraph was a fine display of her usual caustic style:

> "Ever since the beginning of the European conflagration, the whole human race almost has fallen into the deathly grip of the war anesthesis, overcome by the mad teeming fumes of a blood soaked chloroform, which has obscured its vision and paralyzed its heart. Indeed, with the exception of some savage tribes who know nothing of Christian religion or of brotherly love, and who also know nothing of dreadnaughts, submarines, munition manufacture and war loans, the rest of the race is under this terrible narcosis. 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.
>
> "Ammunition! Ammunition! O Lord, thou who rulest heaven and earth, thou God of love, of mercy and of justice, provide us with enough ammunition to destroy our enemy. Such is the prayer which is ascending daily to the Christian heaven. Just like cattle, panic-striken in the face of fire, throw themselves into the very flames, so all of the European people have fallen over each other into the devouring flames of the furies of war, and America, pushed to the very brink by unscrupulous politicians, by ranting demagogues, and by military sharks, is preparing for the same terrible feat."[13]

---

[13] Goldman, "Preparedness: The Road to Universal Slaughter," Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, pp.301-302.

Goldman, as in her anti-militarism essays, wanted to make the point that preparedness never led to peace. Germany, four decades before, had declared that, to achieve peace, it must prepare for war. The rhetoric of the time had been "Germany above everything... Germany for the Germans, first, last and always... a nation can maintain peace and command respect."[14] Germany's preparedness had forced the other European countries to do the same. The current war was a culmination of all that preparedness. Americans, Goldman warned, had been crying, "America first, last and all the time. America for Americans."[15] But those who cried "America for Americans" were not committed to the America of Jefferson or Thoreau. Roosevelt was a "born bully, who uses the club;" and while Wilson gave the facade of being a universalist, his real aim was to serve big business: the war manufacturers who are growing rich. The cry was to:

> "...uphold the institutions of our country... the institutions which protect and sustain a handful of people in the robbery and plunder of the masses, the institutions which drain the blood of the native as well as of the foreigner, and turns it into wealth and power; the institution which robs the alien of whatever originality he brings with him and in return gives him cheap Americanism..."

Within one month of U.S. involvment in World War I, the military draft was instituted. Goldman bitterly attacked Wilson for this most despotic act, countering that while Great Britain had resorted to conscription only after 18

---

[14] Ibid., p. 303.

[15] Ibid., p. 302.

months of war, the United States had wasted no time in taking away the rights of its citizens. Goldman wrote in her autobiography:

> "[Wilson] did not hesitiate to destroy every democratic principle at one blow. He had assured the world that America was moved by the highest humanitarian motives, her aim being to democratize Germany. What if he had to Prussianize the United States in order to achieve it? Free-born Americans had to be forcibly pressed into the military mould, herded like cattle, and shipped across the waters to fertilize the fields of France. Their sacrifice would earn them the glory of having demonstrated the superiority of **My Country 'Tis of Thee** over **Die Wacht am Rhein**. No American president had ever before succeeded in so humbugging the people as Woodrow Wilson, who wrote and talked democracy, acted despotically, privately and officially, and yet managed to keep up the myth that he was championing humanity and freedom.
>
> "We had no illusions about the outcome of the conscription bill pending before Congress. We regarded the measure as a complete denial of every human right, the death-knell to liberty of conscience, and we determined to fight it unconditionally. We did not expect to be able to stem the tidal wave of hatred and violence which compulsory service was bound to bring, but we felt that we had at least to make known at large that there were some in the United States who owned their souls and who meant to preserve their integrity, no matter what the cost."[16]

Goldman's immediate move was to create a No-Conscription League. The idea took root, and, as was the case with her Free Speech League, local branches were started in the communities she visited and in the towns where she had colleagues to spearhead the group. Goldman would speak against the war and against the Conscription Bill, which Congress had passed and which was to be enacted on June 4, 1916. But she would not tell men not to register; as a woman, she felt she had no right to tell men what to do, since she was not subject to the draft. Further, as an anarchist, she

---

[16] Goldman, Living My Life, pp. 597-98.

felt she could not decide the fate of others. But for those who chose to resist the draft, she vowed to plead their case and stand by them.

Goldman and Berkman planned a peace meeting for June 4. In the distribution of a publicity flyer at a June 1 meeting, several young men were arrested. Morris Becker, Louis Kramer, Joseph Walker and Louis Sternberg were among those arrested. Goldman and Berkman sent a letter to the district attorney, asking for the release of the boys, and assuming responsibility for the action, since they were the authors of the handbill. This did no good. Federal Judge Julius M. Mayer sentenced Kramer to two years in the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta and a $10,000 fine, the limit of the law. Becker was sentenced to one year and eight months, and also fined. The judge chastised both for being cowards. Sternberg and Walker were acquitted. Kramer, while awaiting his transfer to Atlanta, refused to register for the draft and was sentenced to an additional year. [17]

The June 4 meeting was crowded and mobbed. The local media had publicized the event. The June Mother Earth had stirred up an audience, as well as sentiments, for the cover was in black and bore a tombstone with the inscription "IN MEMORIAM- AMERICAN DEMOCRACY. In addition to the audience and the speakers, officials from the Department of Justice were present, as well as representatives from the Federal

---

[17] Goldman, Living My Life, pp. 602-03.

Attorney's office, U.S. marshals, detectives from the New York police "anarchist squad," and reporters. Goldman and Berkman spoke, as well as Stella Caminsky Ballantine, Goldman's niece. As a young mother, Stella made an attractive and powerful speaker, Goldman had decided. As was often the case, the highly-charged crowd was kept under control only by Goldman's skill. The soldiers and sailors in the audience who had been taunting speakers were planted by the police, Goldman assured the audience, to start a riot to insure the arrest of speakers and attendees alike. Chaos was averted.

June 14 was the date for the next meeting, but Goldman found that no hall owners were willing to rent to them, not for fear of arrest, but because soldiers had threatened them. The Jewish Socialist Party willingly provided the Forward Hall, on East Broadway. Goldman had heard that in the 10 days since the law had taken effect, thousands had been arrested for not registering. The newspapers were not printing this fact. Since June 4, the anti-war and pacifist groups had been very quiet. The meeting of the 14th was to continue the appeal against conscription. But this time the police and federal officials outsmarted Goldman. As the crowd dispersed after the speeches, each man was stopped and asked to produce his registration card. Those who failed to do so were arrested. Realizing that the authorities were going to use their meetings as bait to trap draft dodgers, they decided to restrict their campaign to print.

But for Goldman and Berkman, their efforts were not to

proceed much further. The following day, while working at the Mother Earth offices, United States Marshal Thomas D. McCarthy, accompanied by other officers, came into the offices. Goldman knew McCarthy; he had been stationed near the platform for each of her anti-conscription rallies, waiting for the opportunity to arrest her. He had told the newspapers that he had been repeatedly contacting Washington for permission to make the arrest. Goldman asked for a warrant; instead he produced a copy of the June issue of Mother Earth, claiming that the "treasonable" magazine was all he needed to arrest her. In their arrest, McCarthy and his men confiscated all of the papers, personal letters, and magazines found in the offices; these were never returned. The following account of Goldman's arrest and trial is compiled from her autobiography, Living My Life, and the booklet, Trial and Speeches of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman.

The arrest was staged for late in the day, so there would be no opportunity for the two to be released on bail. The following day, the federal attorney for the District of New York charged them with "conspiracy against the draft." Bail was set at $25,000 each, to insure that the two could not be released. Friends contributed to raise the bail money; $300,000 was offered in real estate, but the federal attorney would not accept anything other than cash. Goldman was bailed out first; Berkman was not released until two days before their June 27 trial.

Berkman and Goldman were certain that their trial would end in conviction. Although the charge was conspiracy against the draft, they were confident that all of their work as anarchists would be cited by the prosecution during the trial. The maximum sentence was two years and a $10,000 fine. The two decided, as they had done on occasion before, to defend themselves, rather than let Harry Weinberger, their dear friend and longtime attorney, take the case. They were sure they would be convicted-- for many reasons, including the fact that Julius M. Mayer would be the presiding judge-- but they would make every attempt to use the trial as a forum to vent their beliefs.

On every level the pair refuted the charges leveled against them, claimed Goldman. In the selection of jurors, Berkman examined dozens of candidates, exposing their ignorance and prejudice on social, political, and religious issues; Goldman's inquiries made clear that all were biased against her by virtue of her stand on marriage, divorce, sex-education and birth control: issues which were not germane to the trial. They knew the jurors who were finally selected were not unbiased, but they felt they made their point by airing issues which had never been exposed in a U.S. courtroom. The prosecutor could not prove that Goldman had, either in writing or verbally, counseled young men not to register for the draft. A false New York World charge that Goldman's bail money was provided by the German kaiser was dispelled when Goldman and Berkman produced the aging

gentleman who had recently willed a large sum of money to Mother Earth. A stenographic expert explained that the prosecution's stenographic witness was lying. The expert, who recorded 180 words per minute, had a hard time keeping up with Goldman's fast-paced oration; the police detective who brought in notes from 1893-- notes which said that Goldman advocated violence-- could barely record 100 words per minute. The defense brought in the hallkeeper from the 1893 rally, who said Goldman had never spoken of violence. The defense produced witnesses who supported the fact that Goldman did not call for violence, as well as conscientious objectors who had solicited Goldman's advice and found that she would not tell them what to do. A ploy by the prosecutors to show that most of the defense's witnesses were foreigners-- an attempt to play on juror prejudices-- failed. What hurt Goldman most was the use of a copy of a July 1914 Mother Earth as evidence against her. The issue included a number of articles advocating violence. They were written by young men and women in the wake of the unemployment campaign, and most of the authors had since drifted out of the anarchist movement. Goldman had not supported their writing but was committed to non-censorship. Although Berkman tried to defend her by proving that Goldman was on a speaking tour when the issue had been published, Goldman saw that this would place the blame on him. As publisher of the magazine, she insisted that she was responsible for everything published.

What was happening around the courtroom was every bit as

interesting as what was happening inside. Very few Goldman and Berkman supporters were admitted to the proceedings. Outside the courthouse a recruiting station was erected. A military band was on hand, and every time the band would play the national anthem, everyone in court was commanded to rise, and the soldiers present would stand at attention. Goldman and Berkman remained seated. Any of their supporters who refused to rise were forcibly thrown out of the courtroom.

What Goldman and Berkman were waiting for was the closing statement, when they could both openly speak their minds, unchecked by the judge. Berkman spoke for two hours: first, exposing the lack of governmental evidence against them, and then giving an explanation of anarchism. Goldman spoke for an hour about the suppression of democracy. When the trial concluded, Judge Mayer sent the jurors out to deliberate, all but saying that they were to return a guilty verdict. This they did in 39 minutes. Judge Mayer then sentenced each of the two defendants to two years in jail and a $10,000 fine. Berkman was to be sent to the Atlanta Penitentiary; Goldman to the Missouri Penitentiary in Jefferson City. The judge ordered the federal attorney to send the transcripts of the trial to the Department of Immigration, with his recommendation that both Berkman and Goldman be deported at the end of their prison terms.[18]

In their anti-war stand, Goldman and Berkman were not

---

[18] Goldman, Living My Life, pp. 616-623.

alone, two voices crying out against a sea of patriotism. Many were active in anti-war campaigns, and many of the activists were Jews. The East Side Jews, conservative, liberal or radical, found themselves actively opposing conscription, militarism, and preparedness, each to a different extent. Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were among a host of Yiddish, Italian, and English speakers at a No-Conscription League meeting held on the East Side in May 1917.[19] The League would meet at the Forward building on occasion, as did the Committee on Current Events of the Ladies' Waist and Dressmakers Union for their "War against war."[20] It was not just the immigrant masses who were part of the peace movements. Prominent Jews such as Felix Adler, Felix Frankfurter, Emil G. Hirsch, Henry Morgenthau, Jacob H. Schiff, Lillian D. Wald, and Stephen S. Wise belonged to the American League to Limit Armaments, the American Neutral Conference Committee, and the Peace Society of Chicago.[21] Wise spoke on "Peace Preparedness Versus Military Preparedness: An Appeal to the Nation." Wald's Henry Street Settlement became a center for pacifist activities. A number of conferences were convened there, and a declaration entitled "Towards the Peace that Shall Last" was issued,

---

[19] Zosa Szajkowski, Jews, Wars, and Communism, Vol.1: The Attitude of American Jews to World War I, the Russian Revolutions of 1917 and Communism (1914-45),(New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc. 1974,) p.336.

[20] Ibid., p. 69.

[21] Ibid., p. 65.

signed by Wald, Wise, Jane Addams, and a host of other participants, Jewish and non-Jewish.[22] Louis D. Brandeis and Felix Frankfurter assisted at several of the Settlement meetings. Wald and Wise were active on the Anti-Preparedness Committee, Wald serving as its chairperson.[23] Goldman and Berkman may have been in the radical camp with their views and methods, but they found companionship with most of the Jewish socialists. Likewise, non-radical Jews were in support of the endeavors against conscription. On this particular issue, Goldman's views were supported by many fellow Jews.

---

[22] Ibid., p. 67.

[23] Ibid., p. 69.

SECTION THREE: EXILE FROM AMERICA AND THE RUSSIAN EXPERIENCE

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE DEPORTATION OF EMMA GOLDMAN AND ALEXANDER BERKMAN

Although Berkman and Goldman were immediately escorted to their respective penitentiaries, they found themselves free just two weeks later. Lawyer Harry Weinberger had succeeded in getting Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis to sign an application appealing the case against the two, as well as the case against Louis Kramer and Morris Becker. Goldman and Berkman were released on bail, but their freedom brought new problems for Berkman. On July 22, 1916, a bomb had exploded at a Preparedness Parade in San Francisco. Labor leaders were being set up as the culprits, in an attempt by industrial owners to squash their power. Berkman had spoken up in support of those arrested, using his own magazine, the Blast, as a vehicle for his outcry. Berkman's exposure of the frame-up made it difficult for the San Francisco prosecutors to close the case, and so the fabrication against the five defendants-- Thomas Mooney of the Molder's Union; his wife Rena; Warren K. Billings, president of the Boot and Shoe Worker's Union; Edward D. Nolan of the Machinist's Union; and Israel Weinberg of the executive board of the Jitney Bus Operators' Union[1]-- included charges that Berkman was connected with the crime. The Chamber of Commerce and the district attorney had asked the State of New York for permission to extradite Berkman to California to stand trial.

---

[1] Goldman, Living My Life, pp. 578-79.

Now that Berkman was free on appeal, they urgently sought his extradition. The United Hebrew Trades came to Berkman's defense, rallying labor to support him against the obvious falsehood. Meetings were held, as were theatre benefits, press interviews, and conferences. The radical Yiddish press went all out in championing Berkman's cause. Shaul Yanovsky, editor of the Freie Arbeiter Stimme, and Abraham Cahan, editor of the Forward, spoke tirelessly against the proposed injustice. A special group of Yiddish poets and writers was organized, and notables such as Sholom Asch and Abraham Raisin spoke at theatre fundraisers. At one such event Shaul Yanovsky spoke on Berkman's behalf. United States Marshal Thomas D. McCarthy, having decided that Goldman's freedom of speech needed to be curtailed, forbade her from addressing the crowd. Yanovsky remarked in his address, "He has gagged Emma, too stupid to realize that her voice will now carry far beyond the walls of this theatre."[2] At that, Goldman rose to the platform, having stuffed a handkerchief in her mouth.

The work of the unions was effective. Max Pine and M. Firestone of the United Hebrew Trades asked Morris Hillquit[3], a socialist attorney and candidate for the New York mayoral seat, to head a delegation to see Governor Whitman in Rochester. Hillquit and more than 100 labor representatives

---

[2] Ibid., p. 635.

[3] Hillquit was an old acquaintance of Berkman's and Goldman's, from the early 1890's when all three would frequent Jewish anarchist and socialist meetings. Morris' name then was Hilkowich.

were received by the Governor, whose reaction was favorable. When Whitman requisitioned the records of the case, the San Francisco district attorney responded that the Berkman extradition would not be pursued at that time. To release the records would only confirm that the trial was a fraud and the evidence against Berkman nonexistent. Eventually the case against Berkman was dropped.[4]

But one stroke of legal luck was all Berkman and Goldman were afforded. The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Conscription Law and refused to grant them a re-trial. On February 5, 1918 the two were re-committed to prison. For Berkman, prison was exceedingly hard labor. He had complained about the beating death of a black prisoner by a prison guard, and for this he was placed in solitary confinement for almost eight months, given limited food rations, and mistreated. He was subjected to the worse punishment of the Atlanta prison: a 2 1/2- by 4 1/2- foot hole designed to gradually suffocate the prisoner. He survived by lying flat on the floor with his mouth close to the groove where the door closed. He endured his sentence but his health was broken.[5] Goldman's experience was much better, although the

---

[4] The trial proceedings were finally investigated by Federal investigators, but not until Mooney had been sentenced to death and Billings had been sentenced to life imprisonment. Rena Mooney, Nolan and Weinberg were acquitted, Weinberg's acquittal coming after the jury had deliberated all of three minutes. In 1918, Mooney's sentence was reduced to life imprisonment.

[5] Goldman, Living My Life, pp. 698-99.

daily shop work of sewing was physically draining for a fifty-year-old woman. She endured her time by reading, writing letters-- although she and Berkman were not allowed to correspond-- and by socializing with the other inmates. Under the newly-passed Espionage Act, two other political criminals were incarcerated after her, and the opportunity for intellectual discussion with them was uplifting.

But there was much going on in the outside world to occupy Goldman's thoughts. Her nephew David Hochstein, son of her dear sister Helena, with whom she had remained close, had enlisted in the Army. Helena was sick with worry about the safety of David, a gifted violinist who had been trained abroad. Goldman continually tried to cheer Helena. But there was no consoling Helena when it was learned that David had died in the Argonne forest on October 15, 1918, one month before Armistice Day.[6] It was to Helena that Goldman returned upon her prison release one year later.

News of the February and October uprisings in Russia interested Goldman. She was not a Bolshevik, but she supported their work in leading the people in the Revolution. During her respite from prison, November 1917 through February 1918, she had toured the United States in defense of Bolshevism, her rhetoric reflecting the view she had espoused in her February 1917 pamphlet, "The Truth About the Bolsheviki." She was shocked to read the speeches of

---

[6] Ibid., p. 674.

Catherine Breshkovskaya, who had returned to the United States on a speaking tour. Babushka, with whom she and niece Stella had worked in 1905, was hailing Wilson and American democracy, and criticizing the conditions in Russia, and the Bolsheviki. It was inconceivable to Goldman. Since the beginning of the Revolution, socialist and anarchist acquaintances of hers had returned to Russia. The thought of going back had crossed Goldman's mind, too, but the anti-war campaign kept her in the United States. "When the news of the February Revolution flashed across the world," she wrote in the preface to My Disillusionment in Russia, "I longed to hasten to the land which had performed the miracle and had freed her people from the age-old yoke of Tsarism. But America held me. The thought of 30 years of struggle for my ideals, of my friends and associates, made it impossible to tear myself away."[7] The Bolsheviki were not particularly fond of the anarchists, but the two groups had cooperated during the Revolution. When the Allies attacked the Soviets, the American anarchists rose verbally to their defense. But the paranoia in the United States against anything less than pro-Americanism made this a dangerous position; this was evident in the raids Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer had instituted on institutions of "questionable loyalty." In addition, thousands of dissidents were being arrested in the name of the Espionage Act, which had severely limited the

---

[7] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 2.

parameters of free speech. Eastern European immigrants seemed to be the most suspect in the eyes of the government.

Among those arrested was a group of comrades. Mollie Steimer, Jacob Schwartz, Jacob Abrams, Samuel Lipman, and Hyman Lachowsky were arrested for handing out pamphlets which decried American involvement in Russia. Each was severely beaten and assaulted under police interrogation. Schwartz died in prison from his injuries before the trial began, but the other young men were sentenced to 20 years imprisonment. Mollie Steimer was sentenced to 15 years. They were to be deported at the end of their terms. Goldman had never met the group before but reports reached her of the intelligence and courage of Steimer. Harry Weinberger, Goldman's lawyer, was defending the young people. Goldman added her support to the group, and Steimer was one of the first people to greet Goldman when she returned to New York after her prison release. Goldman used her police savvy to obtain visiting privileges for Steimer during an interim imprisonment which preceded Steimer's penitentiary term. The friendship that grew between the two women-- during this period of political suppression in the United States-- continued throughout their lives, when they both lived in Russia and abroad.

Both Goldman and Berkman had their two-year sentences reduced to 20 months, because of good behavior. One more month was added, as payment of the $10,000 fine. On September 28, 1919 Goldman left the Missouri Penitentiary, released to her niece Stella. Except for an interim stop in Chicago, they

headed to Rochester to be with Goldman's family. Goldman's relationship with her family had grown stronger and stronger. She wrote:

"My own family's affection for me had grown with the years. Sister Lena had blossomed out like a flower in her love for me. Her life, filled with hardships and pain, might have corroded the heart of many another woman. But Lena had become more gentle and understanding... It made me remorseful to think of the poor affection I had given her in the past. My old mother also had come very close to me of late years. She kept sending me gifts, things made by her own trembling hands. Her birthday letter, written in Yiddish, was filled with affection for her most wayward child."[8]

Upon her return to Rochester, Goldman had this to say about her 81-year-old mother:

"She was in poor health, but still busy with her charity interests, and she was the moving spirit in the numerous lodges to which she belonged... always strong and self-assertive, Mother had, since Father's death, become a veritable autocrat. No statesman or diplomat excelled her in wit, shrewdness, and force of character, Whenever I visited Rochester, Mother had new conquests to report. For years the orthodox Jews of the city had discussed the need of an orphanage and a home for the indigent aged. Mother did not waste words; she located two sites, purchased them on the spot, and for months canvassed the Jewish neighbourhood for contributions to pay off the mortgage and build the institutions the others had only talked about. There was no prouder queen than Mother on the opening day of the new orphanage. She invited me to 'come and speak a piece' on the great occasion. I had once told her that my aim was to enable the workers to reap the fruit of their labours, and every child to enjoy our social wealth. A mischievous twinkle had come into her still sparkling eyes as she replied: 'Yes, my daughter, that is all very good for the future; but what is to become of our orphans now, and the old and decrepit who are alone in the world? Tell me that.' And I had no answer."[9]

Goldman was infinitely proud of her mother, the woman who ruined a "capitalist" shroud manufacturer by organizing a

---

[8] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 687.

[9] Ibid., p. 696.

dry-goods owner and a team of women sewers to produce affordable burial shrouds. And Taube Goldman was infinitely proud of her daughter. When asked to be seated after she had spoken for too long at a lodge meeting, the elderly woman replied, "The whole United States Government could not stop my daughter Emma Goldman from speaking, and a fine chance you have to make her mother shut up!"[10] Before Goldman left Rochester, Taube gave to Emma those possessions she valued so much: her charity organization medals.

Goldman and Berkman were both aware that their release from prison meant that they would now face deportation. Anti-Russian sentiment was running high, and the United States was not granting political amnesty, as all other European countries had. Goldman had known since 1909 that the United States government was collecting evidence in an effort to deport her; at that time they had stripped Jacob Kershner of his citizenship-- although he was already dead-- as a way of rescinding the citizenship that Goldman enjoyed by virtue of her brief marriage to him.[11] Even before her prison release the government was completing its case. In an August 23, 1919 letter, J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the General Intelligence Division for the Department of Justice, stated the case.

---

[10] Ibid., p. 697.

[11] In the preface to My Disillusionment in Russia, Goldman states that the police had either bribed or terrorized Kershner's aged parents to testify that when he took his citizenship papers he had been in the U.S. less than five years, and that he was under 21 years of age.

While Berkman had admitted to being an alien, Goldman had claimed citizenship by virtue of her husband's and her father's citizenship. The Department of Labor had reviewed the case a few times, but Assistant Secretary Louis F. Post had concluded that there was not enough evidence to warrant deportation. Hoover was requesting that the Bureau of Immigration search their files for adequate material upon which to deport Goldman,[12] whom he at one time had termed the "most dangerous woman in America." Hoover was in the process of advancing his career by implementing a government plan to deport foreign radicals, using the Immigration Act, approved in 1918, and the Alien Exclusion Act. A post-World War I, anti-radical hysteria was gripping the United States; within two years Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer had arrested 5,000 people, and ransacked countless homes and offices, including the offices of Mother Earth and the I.W.W.[13]

Berkman had no intention of fighting the deportation. He refused to attend a federal hearing. He read the following statement-- one of the finest defenses of democracy-- to officials of the United States Federal Immigration Service at the Atlanta Penitentiary, upon his release from prison.

"The purpose of the present hearing is to determine my 'attitude of mind.' It does not admittedly, concern itself with my actions, past or present. It is purely an inquiry

---

[12] Letter from J. Edgar Hoover, Department of Justice, to a Mr. Creighton, as displayed at the "Emma Goldman Exhibit," Emma Goldman Papers Project.

[13] "Emma Goldman Exhibit," Emma Goldman Papers Project.

into my views and opinions.

"I deny the right of anyone-- individually or collectively-- to set up an inquisition of thought. Thought is, or should be, free. My social views and political opinions are my personal concern. I owe no one responsibility for them. Responsibility begins only with the effects of thought expressed in action. Not before. Free thought, necessarily involving freedom of speech and press, I may tersely define thus: no opinion a law-- no opinion a crime. For the government to attempt to control thought, to prescribe certain opinions or proscribe others, is the height of despotism.

"This proposed hearing is an invasion of my conscience. I therefore refuse, most emphatically, to participate in it."[14]

Goldman was emotionally torn about the course of action she should take. She felt she could fight deportation and win. Yet, Berkman was going to be deported. He was an alien and there was no battle to be fought. The two of them had long talked of returning to Russia, and now that the Revolution was over and the Soviet Union was a reality, they could offer so much to their homeland. But Goldman was entrenched in the United States. She had spent her life traveling the country, and had thousands of acquaintances. If she hadn't cared for the country she never would have fought so hard for its liberties. But she could not bear to be parted from Berkman. The vision of going to Russia together to work with the masses lured her. Overarching these considerations, the issue of deportation seemed like a dream. She wrote later, "It did not seem credible then that America

---

[14] Richard and Anna Maria Drinnon, ed., Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman p. 10.

would stoop to the Tsaristic method of deportation."[15] Her deportation hearing was held in New York on October 27, 1919. The following is an excerpt from her statement.

"At the very outset of this hearing I wish to register my protest against these star-chamber proceedings, whose very spirit is nothing less than a revival of the ancient days of the Spanish Inquisition or the more recently defunct Third Degree system of Czarist Russia.

"This star-chamber hearing is, furthermore, a denial of the insistent claim on the part of the government that in this country we have free speech and free press...

"Every human being is entitled to hold any opinion that appeals to her or him without making herself or himself liable to persecution. Ever since I have been in this country-- and I have lived here practically all my life-- it has been dinned into my ears that under the institutions of this alleged democracy one is entirely free to think and feel as he pleases. What becomes of this sacred guarantee of freedom of thought and conscience when persons are being persecuted and driven out for the very motives and purposes for which the pioneers who built up this country laid down their lives?

"Under the mask of the anti-anarchist law every criticism of a corrupt administration, every attack on governmental abuse, every manifestation of sympathy with the struggle of another country in the pangs of a new birth- in short, every free expression of untrammeled thought may be suppressed utterly, without even the semblance of an unprejudiced hearing or a fair trial. It is for these reasons chiefly, that I strenuously protest against this despotic law and its star-chamber methods of procedure. I protest against the whole spirit underlying it- the spirit of an irresponsible hysteria, the result of the terrible war, and of the evil tendencies of bigotry and persecution and violence which are the epilogue of five years of bloodshed..."[16]

On December 3, 1919 Goldman and Berkman were informed that they were to surrender on December 5. The Federal Department of Labor had ordered their deportation, by the signature of Louis F. Post, the assistant secretary who had

---

[15] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 1.

[16] Drinnon, pp. 10-11.

previously not found any grounds for deportation. They were locked up on Ellis Island. Goldman was assigned to a room with Ethel Bernstein and Dora Lipkin, who were arrested at a meeting of the Union of Russian Workers. Ethel was the girlfriend of Samuel Lipman, one of the young men with Mollie Steimer, who was serving 20 years in prison. The government had dropped their charge of criminal anarchy against Ethel, but she was to be deported just the same, even though her entire family was in the United States. She knew no one in Russia, and did not know Russian. Dora and Ethel kept watch from their room at night as Goldman wrote a pamphlet about deportation, and a farewell letter to her friends. Both were smuggled out of the prison.

Conditions on Ellis Island were deplorable. The emigrants were crowded into rooms, fed abominable food, and treated like felons. But this was one social wrong that Goldman and Berkman did not have time to right. At midnight on December 20, the emigrants were awakened and told to pack their belongings. They were herded into a corridor. Confusion was everywhere. Many of the group had been promised reviews of their cases, or had not yet had a decision rendered in their case. Yet all were to be deported. Immigration officials had told many of the detainees that no deportations would occur until after Christmas. The detainees were in a panic. Ever the organizer, Berkman organized the men, and, prevailing upon the island commissioner, succeeding in allowing the men to telegraph, at their own expense, friends

and family in New York for money and necessary items. The island officials assured the men that there would be ample time for replies, yet when the last wire was sent and the money collected, the entire group was moved out.

At 4 a.m., December 21, 1919, some 249 deportees, including Morris Becker, plus Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, were marched through deep snow to the barge that transported them to the SS Buford, an old Spanish-American War transport that had been discarded as unsafe.

"Through the porthole I could see the great city receding in the distance, its sky-line of buildings traceable by their rearing heads. It was my beloved city, the metropolis of the New World. It was America, indeed America repeating the terrible scenes of tsarist Russia! I glanced up- the Statue of Liberty!"[17]

It was the beginning of a life of exile for both Goldman and Berkman. Their friends received a farewell letter, written just hours before their deportation, and smuggled off Ellis Island. It read, in part:

"Do not be sad about our forced departure. Rather rejoice with us that our common enemies, prompted by fear and stupidity, have resorted to this mad act of driving political refugees out of the land. This act must ultimately lead to the undoing of the madmen themselves. For now the American people will see more clearly than our ardent work of thirty years could prove to them, that liberty in America has been sold into bondage, that justice has been outraged, and life made cheap and ugly.

"We have great faith in the American people. We know that once the truth is borne in upon them what the masters have made of this once promising land, the people will rise to the situation. With Samson strength they will pull down the rotten structure of the capitalist regime. Confident in this, we leave with joy in our hearts...

"Dear friends, it is an old truism which most of you have surely experienced: He who ascends to the greatest

---

[17] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 717.

heights of faith is often hurled into the depths of doubt. We have known the ecstasy of the one and the torture of the other. If we have not despaired utterly, it is because of the boundless love and devotion of our friends. That has been our sustaining, our inspiring power. Few fighters in the struggle for human freedom have known such beautiful comradeship. If we have been among the most hated, reviled, and persecuted, we have also been the most beloved. What greater tribute to one's integrity can one wish?

"Be of good cheer, beloved comrades. Our enemies are fighting a losing battle. They are of the dying past. We are of the glowing future. Fraternally and joyously,

Emma Goldman Alexander Berkman."[18]

---

[18] Drinnon, pp. 12-13.

SECTION THREE: EXILE FROM AMERICA AND THE RUSSIAN EXPERIENCE

CHAPTER NINE: RUSSIA 1919-1921

Emma Goldman's dream of seeing a new order in Russia was rooted in her childhood in St. Petersburg. From the time she had seen the Tsar's troops oppressing the Nihilists, she longed for a day when the common men and women of Russia would throw off the yoke of Tsarism and be able to live equitably. In the preface to My Disillusionment in Russia, Goldman explains that she never expected that anarchism would replace Tsarism; anarchism couldn't immediately follow centuries of despotism. Russia was in need of a revolution to bring about social change. Anarchism was a long-term goal. Goldman was not a communist, nor did she ideologically agree with the Bolsheviki. But they had brought about the 1917 Revolution, and the anarchists and Bolsheviki had set aside differences to unite in the common cause of overthrowing the Tsar and, subsequently, the Mensheviki. Since 1905 Goldman and Berkman had spoken of being a part of the dream, of returning to Russia and helping the oppressed peasant masses establish an egalitarian system. It was this dream that cushioned the blow of deportation for Goldman, and inspired her to work energetically upon her arrival in Matushka Rossiya, Mother Russia.

Goldman and Berkman spent 22 months in Russia. Goldman wrote in detail about the experience in her novel, My Disillusionment in Russia. The book, originally published in

the mid 1920's, was the victim of a publishing mishap. Titled My Two Years in Russia, the original publisher omitted the last 12 chapters and Goldman's afterward, and changed the title. Goldman was furious, claiming that "disillusionment" would indicate to readers that she was disappointed in the Revolution, when it was Bolshevik communism that had been the disillusionment.[1] It took Goldman almost two years to fully accept that the Revolution, and the reality of the Soviet state it created, were two separate phenomena, even though she began to witness evidence of this reality from her arrival. Her observations were both political and social. This brief account of her experiences in Russia will focus more on the latter rather than the former, for the social conditions serve as an insight into the general political reality.

Goldman and Berkman were welcomed to Petrograd, the St. Petersburg of Goldman's youth. A pre-war city of two million people, war ruination and shortages of fuel and food had affected the city, and now it was home to 500,000 people. Goldman's first friendship was with the Secretary of the Communist Party of Petrograd Zorin, and his wife. They lived at the Astoria, a fashionable pre-revolution hotel that had become the new apartments for the party members of Petrograd. A room for Goldman was arranged there. The "First House," as it was called, became one of the first insights for Goldman

---

[1] Goldman, Living My Life, p.953.

that all was not equitable. The rations provided for the Communist party members were much better than others received, and those who worked at the First House, while called "comrades," were really servants. Goldman blamed the inequity on the Allied Blockade of supplies to Russia. The Bolsheviki must be doing the best they can in the face of the blockade, she rationalized. And her rationalization was supported by the Communists she questioned about her observation. Yet, she couldn't help notice that the children of the Party members attended the best schools, and the townspeople outside the headquarters of the Petro-Soviet stood in lines for hours to secure food. There was nothing to be had in the storefronts that she passed by.

Goldman was contacted by anarchists after she had been in Russia for a number of weeks. They invited her to a meeting. She was shocked to find that the meeting was held in secret, in the back of a house. The anarchists spoke about the betrayal of the Revolution by the Bolsheviki. Goldman was dumfounded as she sat for hours listening to accounts of suppression of speech and thought by the Tchekists (the communist police,) the imprisonment of workers and peasants, the Trotsky-ordered raid of the anarchist offices in Moscow, the executions without hearings.[2] Zorin had told Goldman that the prisons were nearly empty and that capital punishment had been abolished. Yet she had heard shots at night from the

---

[2] Ibid., p. 735.

Tcheka prison. She could not sort out the information presented by Zorin and the Communists, nor could she believe the anarchists' accounts. She spoke to Berkman. The anarchists must be disgruntled old men, with unrealistic expectations, he convinced her. The Bolsheviki were instituting harsh measures because of the Allied blockade, the fear of counter-revolutionaries, and the White Generals who still attacked. For the safety and good of the country, it would be necessary to understand the difficult position of the Bolsheviki and to support them.[3] Get out of the First House, the anarchists had prodded her. Live with the people and see the truth.

Goldman went to see "the people." She was in a watchmaker's shop in Petrograd when a soldier entered and asked the proprietor in Yiddish if he would like to purchase 50 pounds of tea. The proprietor accepted the offer. Wasn't he worried about conducting illegal business in the open, Goldman inquired of the man. The Tcheka knows about this, he replied, and receives a percentage from both the seller and the buyer.[4] Goldman rationalized that graft must be the by-product of three years of hardship. In the Moscow market, people were absorbed with getting their daily food. Everyone was selling everything, risking arrest as "speculators" for selling illegally. Nothing had changed since the days of the

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 17.

Tsar, the peasants told her, its just a different master today than yesterday.[5]

The Moscow Anarchist Conference, held in March 1920, confirmed the stories of the Petrograd anarchists. The anarchists were particularly outstanding in the Revolution: they had led the Kronstadt sailors' uprising, they were often on the front lines. They had helped the Bolsheviki into power. Once Lenin, Trotsky and Zinoviev had achieved power, they had turned against the anarchists. Anarchists had been persecuted, killed and imprisoned. The conference created a resolution demanding the release of imprisoned anarchists. Goldman vowed to discuss the matter with Lenin, as she was to meet him soon. But Lenin maintained that there were no anarchists in Soviet prisons.

Goldman was searching for meaningful work in Russia, but she was not ready to become a Party member, to totally ally herself with the Bolsheviki. The Bolsheviki respected her and Berkman for their work abroad, and so they treated the pair courteously, encouraging their participation but not forcing their acceptance of the Party. The two became involved in a number of projects, but the bureaucracy and inefficiency of the government frustrated each cause. They worked with the Commission for Resettling American Deportees. After three months in Russia, the rest of the deportees aboard the SS Buford had still not been settled. Goldman

---

[5] Ibid, p. 25.

wrote,

> "They were a sorry lot-- those men who had come to Russia with such high hopes, eager to render service to the revolutionary people. Most of them were skilled workers, mechanics-- men Russia needed badly; but the cumbersome Bolshevik machine and general inefficiency made it a very complex matter to put them to work."[6]

Did Goldman realize that within these words she was writing about herself? One thousand new deportees were expected in two weeks. Berkman was dispatched to the Latvian border to greet them. Goldman-- through much bribery with chocolate, cigars, and condensed milk-- obtained three old buildings, enlisted workers to have them cleaned and inhabitable, and found linens, dishes and other essentials. In the end it was discovered that the arriving trains contained Russian prisoners-of-war from Germany, not deportees. The buildings were locked up, and not put to use in any way. The energy expended was simply wasted.[7]

Goldman and Berkman, as a favor to Zorin, agreed to oversee the restoration of a number of nice, aristocratic homes into rest homes for workers. Goldman began cooking meals for the workers, only to find that the Bolshevik staff members were eating the workers' portions. The workers, in angry retribution, were doing shoddy work. Goldman and Berkman fell out of favor with Zorin when Berkman refused to evict old teachers, bourgeois victims of the Revolution who

---

[6] Ibid., p. 39.

[7] Ibid., pp. 41-42.

were now penniless, who were living in some of the homes. They were removed from the project. The rest homes were opened, with the heavy suspicion that the only workers they would house would be Party workers.[8]

Yet another project dissolved before them. Through Zorin's suggestion, Berkman planned a city-wide system of cafeterias, designed to eliminate food waste and provide healthy meals for workers. Zinoviev approved of the plan, promising support. But bureaucracy blocked the plan on every level, finally telling the two that wholesome cafeterias were really a low-priority item. It was really the pair's "bourgeois sentimentality" that caused them to think that nice cafeterias should be important at such a crucial political time.[9] These events and more led Goldman to comment:

> "I had come to realize that the Communists believed implicitly in the Jesuitic formula that the end justifies all means... Any suggestion of the value of human life, quality of character, the importance of revolutionary integrity as the basis of a new social order was repudiated as 'bourgeois sentimentality' which had no place in the revolutionary scheme of things."[10]

Permanent work found them five months after they reached Soviet soil. They accepted positions to join a document-gathering expedition for the Petrograd Museum of the Revolution. "I had hoped for a more vital share in Russia's

---

[8] Ibid., p. 44.

[9] Goldman, Living My Life, pp.777-78.

[10] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 70.

life than the collecting of historic material," Goldman wrote, "still, I considered it valuable and necessary work."[11] The position was non-partisan, and meant that they could tour Russia. Using a railroad car equipped with plates and linens from the storerooms of the Winter Palace of the deposed Tsar, the expedition was comprised of six workers: Berkman; Goldman, the treasurer and housekeeper; Alexandra T. Shakol, the secretary of the Museum and an anarchist; and three others, including a Jewish communist. Goldman's job was to gather data from the Departments of Education and Health, the Bureaus of Social Welfare, and Labor Distribution. After bureaucratic delays, the expedition began in mid-July 1920, heading into the Ukraine.

The Ukraine was home to the greatest percentage of Jews in Russia, particularly Kiev in the North and Odessa in the South. Goldman met Jews in a number of cities and towns. Only a handful of times did she make a point of writing specifically about these encounters in Living My Life. But in My Disillusionment in Russia, written immediately after her exit from Russia and a few years before her autobiography, Goldman wrote at length about meetings with Jewish intelligentsia, and Jewish pogrom victims.

The Ukraine was well-known for its anti-Semitism. Goldman inquired about the condition upon their arrival. The Ukrainians were anti-Semitic, came the reply, but many of the

---

[11] Ibid., pg. 76.

Ukrainian Bolsheviki were not. There was anti-Semitism in the north too-- not just the Ukraine-- and it was prevalent in the Red Army. But in the Ukraine, the pogroms had been at the hands of the White Army. Moscow, in fact, was trying to prevent anti-Jewish pogroms.[12] But the pogroms had happened, and the scars of the attacks were readily visible. When the expedition arrived in Fastov, Goldman noted that there were only women in the marketplace. She wrote:

> "I was struck by the strange expression in their eyes. They did not look you full in the face; they stared past you with a dumb, hunted animal expression. We told the women we had heard many terrible pogroms had taken place in Fastov and we wished to get data on the subject to be sent to America to enlighten them on the condition of the Ukrainian Jews."[13]

Goldman, Berkman, Shatov, the Jewish communist with the expedition, and Henry Alsberg, a Jewish American journalist who had temporarily joined the expedition, were taken to the synagogue and the townspeople began to talk. The worst pogrom had been led by General Denikin of the White Army in September of 1919, just 10 months before. In eight days, 4,000 people were killed and thousands more died of wounds and shock. Another 7,000 had died of hunger and exposure trying to escape to Kiev. The greater part of the city had been burned or otherwise destroyed. Many older Jews had been trapped in the synagogue, tortured, and murdered. The younger ones were driven to the public square and slaughtered. Women

---

[12] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 809. Perhaps "Moscow" was trying to prevent anti-Semitic violence because Trotsky (formerly Lev Bronstein) and Zinoviev were Jewish.

[13] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 130.

of all ages were raped, many in front of their male relatives who were held captive to view the violation. Not a woman was left untouched.[14] Goldman met a Gentile man, a former lawyer, who had saved many Jews. He read to her his diary of the pogroms. "It was a simple recital of facts and dates, terrible in its unadorned objectivity. It was the soul cry of a people continuously violated and tortured and living in daily fear of new indignities and outrages."[15] The Jews of Fastov were pro-Bolshevik because there had been no pogroms since the Revolution. Goldman comments that the Bolsheviki do seem free from "that worst of all Russian curses, pogroms against Jews."[16] We pray for Lenin, the old men had informed her. Why not also Trotsky and Zinoviev, she asked. They are **Yehudim**, they do not need to be praised for helping their own people. But Lenin was a **goy**, so for helping the Jews he deserved praise. While in Fastov, she collected letters which the Jews would write to relatives in the United States. The townspeople would crowd onto their railroad car with letters bearing just a name on the outside. "It was touching to see the people's deep faith that their relatives in America would save them."[17] Goldman later recalled:

---

[14] This account of the pogrom was compiled from Goldman's accounts as written in Living My Life, pp.822-825, and My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 130-132.

[15] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p.131.

[16] Ibid., p. 132.

[17] Ibid., p. 131.

"Their religious fervour was all these people had rescued from their hideous experiences, and in spite of all certainty that there was no Jehovah to hear them, I was strangely stirred by the tragic scene in the poverty-stricken synagogue in outraged and devastated Fastov. The Jews of America were more likely to answer their prayers, and, alas, neither Sasha nor I had access to them. All we could do was write about the dreadful pogroms. Excepting the Anarchist press, however, we had no assurance that any paper would publish our account. It would have been too cruel to tell these people that in America we were considered **Ahasverus**. We could make known their great tragedy only to the radical labour world and to our own comrades. But there was Henry [Alsberg]. He could do a great deal for these unfortunates and I was sure he would. Our fellow traveler had been with us six weeks and he had witnessed some heart-rending scenes. Yet I had never seen him so affected as in Fastov... it was true that his kind heart ached more when Jews were being persecuted, which in view of the fearful Denikin atrocities was not at all surprising."[18]

In Kiev, Goldman's group visited the Jewish hospital. Recently renamed the Soviet Clinic, it had been one of the most famous hospitals in all Russia, to the pride of the local Jews who had built and maintained it. Kiev had changed hands 14 times in the fighting of the previous two years between the White and Red armies. The only thing constant in all the governmental changes, concluded Goldman, was the pogroms against the Jews. They were given the hospital's history by Dr. Mandelstamm, the surgeon of the hospital, who was Jewish. Critically ill Jewish patients had been forced out of the hospital so the beds would be available for the friends of the reigning regime. Denikin's army had driven them into the streets, where they survived solely by the mercy of the Gentile doctors.[19] The group visited the victims

---

[18] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 824.

[19] Ibid., pp. 828-29.

of the Fastov pogrom still in the hospital: a group of teenage girls who had been raped, and children still in shock from having witnessed the tortured deaths of their parents.

Besides witnessing the tragic circumstances of the Jews in Russia, there was also a chance for meaningful dialogue with the more sophisticated elements. In Kiev, Goldman met a gentleman named Latzke, the former Minister for Jewish Affairs in the Rada, the Ukrainian National Assembly. He had recently been given a few copies of Mother Earth. Would Goldman and Berkman come meet with the Yiddish intelligentsia, the "Kulturliga"? An evening was arranged at Latzke's, and he, Dr. Mandelstamm, and a variety of Jewish professionals shared with their visitors their current political stances. None of the group were communists, but many were defenders of the Bolshevik regime for one simple reason: things were better for the Jews under the Bolsheviki. There had not been pogroms since the Bolsheviki took power, although none favored the dictatorship the Bolsheviki had instituted. Goldman understood that their opinions were the result of their fears, fears which were understandable for those living in so anti-Semitic a place as the Ukraine. But unlike the men of the Kulturliga, she "could not translate the October upheaval into terms of Jew or Gentile."[20] These men felt that anti-Semitism was on the rise, and that if the Bolsheviki were overthrown, the "wholesale slaughter of the

---

[20] Ibid., p. 834.

Jews would undoubtedly follow."[21] Many of the younger men felt that anti-Semitism was being advanced because the Bolsheviki were in power. The masses, they argued, equated the Communists with the Jews. A large percentage of communists were Jews, and the Communists were equated with taxation, punishment, and the Tcheka. The rise in anti-Communist feelings, particularly in areas outside of Moscow, was being translated into anti-Semitism. In an attempt, then, to prove that they were not favoring Jews, the Bolsheviki were arresting and punishing Jews for acts which the Gentiles could do with impunity. Cultural work was encouraged in the Ukrainian language, for instance, but blocked in Yiddish. The Kulturliga itself was permitted to exist but its work was hampered. The members understood this as being condemned to a physical existence but a cultural death.[22] This was not the experience of the **Yevkom**, the Jewish Communist Section. They were supported by the government, for they were seen as spreading the blessings of proletariat dictatorship to the Ukrainian Jews. Berkman debated that it was the Bolshevik dictatorship which was crushing the spirit of the Revolution, and this was manifested in the acts of anti-Semitism. Goldman's reaction to the two factions was this:

"I felt that both Jewish factions took a purely nationalistic view of the Russian situation. I could well understand their personal attitude, the result of their own suffering and the persecution of the Jewish race. Still, my

---

[21] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 139.

[22] Ibid., p. 139.

chief concern was the Revolution and its effect upon Russia as a whole. Whether the Bolsheviki should be supported or not could not depend merely on their attitude to the Jews and the Jewish question. The latter was surely a very vital and pressing issue, especially in the Ukraine; yet the general problem involved was much greater. It embraced the complete economic and social emancipation of the whole people of Russia, the Jews included... [The Bolsheviki] might be innocent of the pogroms against the Jews, but if they were pogroming the whole of Russia then they had failed in their mission as a revolutionary party. I was not prepared to say that I had reached a clear understanding of all the problems involved, but my experience so far led me to think that it was the basic Bolshevik conception of the Revolution which was false, its practical application necessarily resulting in the great Russian catastrophe of which the Jewish tragedy was but a minor part."[23]

Goldman and Berkman found that some agreed with their view, many disagreed, but that the spirit of intellectual exchange was pleasant and supportive, and that the visit with the Kulturliga was among the highlights of their stay in Kiev.

In Odessa too, Goldman met Jews. She wrote:

"...they had suffered many pogroms and were now living in constant terror of the repetition. But the will to live is indestructible, particularly in the Jews, otherwise centuries of persecution and slaughter would long since have destroyed the race. Its peculiar perseverance was manifest everywhere: the Jews continued to trade as if nothing had happened."[24]

Goldman met a member of the Bund, the Jewish Social Democratic organization, and this Bundist introduced her to a Dr. Landesman. Landesman ran a sanatorium, perched on a hillside overlooking the Black Sea. Furthermore, he was a Zionist, and part of a group of Zionists that included Haim Nachman Bialik. Upon meeting the two visitors, Landesman informed Berkman and Goldman that it was Rosh Hashana, and

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 140-41.

[24] Ibid., p. 153.

that he should be delighted to have them celebrate with his family. Goldman replied that, while they had been unaware that it was the New Year, they "were Jews enough to want to spend the holiday with him."[25]

Landesman arranged a meeting for Goldman and Berkman with some of the Zionists, Bialik included. One of the guests had conducted an historical investigation of the pogroms. Berkman particularly was fascinated. The man had visited 72 cities where pogroms had occurred. He believed-- contrary to popular notion-- that the pogroms during 1918-1921 under the various Ukrainian governments, were worse than the pogroms under the Tsars.[26] He, like the rest of the Zionists and the young men in Kiev, agreed that, while no pogroms had occurred under the Bolsheviki, the anti-Jewish sentiments arising under the Bolsheviki would lead to a massive slaughtering of Jews in the future. Anti-Semitism had existed under the most reactionary elements of the Tsarist regime. Under the Bolsheviki, anti-Semitism had infected all sectors of the population: the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. Berkman argued with the investigator: there had been no pogroms under the Bolsheviki. Didn't this point to a Bolshevik commitment to eradicate anti-Semitism? No, was the reply. The Jews had requested the right to arm themselves for defense in cities where there was the threat of violence. The

---

[25] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 841.

[26] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 158.

government had refused, and there was even suspicion that the Jews wanted arms to attack the Soviet government. Landesman had wanted to form a local Yiddish boy scout troop to serve as a defense for Jews and Gentiles alike against a gang of Odessa ruffians. Permission had been denied. After the discussions with the Zionists-- which, Goldman comments, was very pleasant despite the differences of opinions-- she concluded:

> "It was the general sentiment of the Zionists that the continuation of the Bolsheviki in power meant the destruction of the Jews. The Russian Jews, as a rule, were not workers. From time immemorial they had engaged in trade; but business had been destroyed by the Communists and before the Jew could be turned into a worker he would deteriorate, as a race, and become extinct. Specific Jewish culture, the most priceless thing to the Zionists, was frowned upon by the Bolsheviki. That phase of the situation seemed to affect them even more deeply than pogroms.
>
> "These intellectual Jews were not of the proletarian class. They were bourgeois without any revolutionary spirit. Their criticism of the Bolsheviki did not appeal to me for it was a criticism from the Right. If I had still believed in the Communists as the true champions of the Revolution I could have defended them against the Zionist complaints. But I myself had lost faith in the revolutionary integrity of the Bolsheviki."[27]

The attitude of the Zionist intelligentsia in Odessa was similar to the attitude of the Zionists the expedition had encountered earlier in their trip, in the town of Poltava. These Zionists had been Orthodox Jews, mostly tradesmen, whom the revolution had deprived of a livelihood. Goldman had heard in Moscow that many Bolsheviki viewed the Zionists as counter-revolutionaries. These men were certainly not conspirators! But the Bolshevik officials in Poltava were

---

[27] Ibid., pg. 159.

Gentile, and their anti-Semitism was openly visible. There she had made the argument that no pogroms had been committed under the Bolsheviki. The Jews of Poltava had responded that there were two types of pogroms: the loud, violent type, and the silent type. The silent type was a constant discrimination, persecution, and hounding; it was the closing of the Jewish hospital, and the lack of available kosher meat. Violent pogroms had an ending, but the silent pogroms could go on indefinitely, and this, in many ways, was the worst type of abuse.[28]

The Jews whom they had encountered in Kiev, Odessa, and Poltava, seemed to be giving them many messages. Some believed that life for the Jews was worse under Bolshevism, even though there wasn't the outward violence of other regimes. There was a virulent anti-Semitism bubbling under the surface, they feared, and this would someday explode. The older men in Kiev believed that life was better under Bolshevism, and they feared that violence would explode if the Bolsheviki were overthrown. Yet, while none were communists, both sides supported the Bolsheviki, perhaps because there was no acceptable alternative, and fear of an unknown ruler was greater than fear of a known entity. Other Jews were communists in the Bolshevik ranks, but these men did not care about the Jews of Russia. Russian Jewish history mandated that the Jews watch out for their own welfare above

---

[28] Ibid., pp. 129-30.

any concerns for political Russia. While Goldman understood the position of the Jews she met, she could not agree with this final belief. Even though she too was a child of anti-Semitic Russia, she was too much a universalist to accept the Jewish position. It was not that she believed in the Bolsheviki. But she did believe in the Russian people, and she hoped that the spirit of the Revolution was still alive within them, regardless of how the Bolsheviki had corrupted it. If the true Revolution could overcome the current regime and be victorious, Goldman believed, the Jews would share in the enriched life of all Russians. Berkman, for all the discussion, could not surrender his belief that the Bolsheviki could be the tool to a better future.

In other areas, too, it was apparent that post-Revolutionary Russia was in turmoil. Goldman's visits to factories and her discussions with laborers convinced her that there was a deep division between the masses and the Bolsheviki leaders. Her vision of a Revolution of the masses had indeed happened, but once the Bolsheviki were in power, labor found that nothing had changed for them, just their management. They had not been empowered. They were not in charge of their production. There was no spirit of joint endeavor for the mutual good, but a continued sense of struggle against the oppressor. At the 9th Congress of the All-Russian Communist Party in May 1920, Lenin had called for

a "militarization of labor."[29] The goal was to fight economic disorganization, to use labor to its fullest to pull Russia out of the economic crisis it had been enduring. Lenin's plan called for a major resettling of laborers, moving them from their towns and families to areas where they were deemed to be more productive. Already many laborers were displaced; having starved in the cities where no work was available, they left in the hope of finding work in villages. Now they were to be rounded up, registered, and classified according to a trade, and resettled where their skills were needed. Those too weak to work were sent to concentration camps. Only in this way could Russia build up its industries in a revolutionary period. So-called specialists were put in charge of factories, placed in power over the laborers. Goldman toured factories after the new system was initiated. A car factory which had 40,000 pre-war employees was producing with just 7,000 workers, she was told by its managers. The employees with whom she spoke were being driven to produce, but they were exhausted and suffering from starvation. The food shortage would hopefully be alleviated by next year, she reassured them. What food shortage, they countered. There is plenty of food-- look at the markets. But the new bourgeois-- the Bolshevik party members-- were sabotaging the system and creating food shortages for the masses. And, they informed her, there were only 5,000 workers

---

[29] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 790-91.

at the factory, and 3,000 of those were government clerks.[30]

At a flour mill, Goldman observed military police watching the workers. Flour was being stolen by workers, she was informed. Yet, when she spoke with the workers, they explained that the military and the commissar knew just who was getting the flour, but if the workers complained they would be labeled counter-revolutionaries and thrown in jail. A visit to a tobacco factory revealed conditions as bad as any she had seen in the United States. Women were working, some pregnant, with no ventilation, no rest area, and no break in an 8-hour shift. A number of the women were suffering from consumption.[31]

Enormous numbers of workers were sent to the Donetz Basin, the site of extensive coal mines. Russians had been promised that the quantities of coal being mined would amply keep them warm through the next winter. Goldman heard a more realistic account from an engineer in the Basin. The mines were in terrible condition. The miners were starved, barefoot, and often standing ankle-deep in water. Little coal was being mined mostly because of Bolshevik inefficiency. Political commissars had been appointed who had no interest in how the mines ran. The engineer had reported this to Moscow, and now he was in fear of the tchekists because the

---

[30] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Russia, p. 55.

[31] Ibid., p. 57.

report was so unfavorable.[32]

A more sweeping picture of the state of Russian labor was painted for Goldman by the Chairman of the Moscow Trade Union Soviet, a man named Melnichansky. The combined trade unions had a membership of seven million workers, who had owned and managed their own industries. But that was not the current reality-- it was only the side paraded before foreign investigators and visitors. In reality there had been strikes quelled by soldiers, skirmishes between workers and authorities, arrests of workers, and strong-arming. In the Printers' Union, internal strife had been suppressed and the managing board had been sent to prison. The Bakers' Union was also suppressed, and management replaced with communists.[33] Unionists claimed that the bakers' were now the lackeys of the government. The workers had no power, no say, no independence. In March of 1920 Goldman attended a workers meeting of a large Moscow factory. For the third time, the group had elected one particular man, an anarchist, to the Moscow Soviet. The workers had been threatened with a cut in rations and imprisonment in the Tcheka, yet they continued to elect the anarchist. The man was arrested after the workers elected him for the third time as their representative. It was clear to Goldman that in every facet of labor, the workers were being mistreated. The Revolution which they had

---

[32] Ibid., p. 114.

[33] Ibid., p. 86.

worked to bring about had not improved their lives.

The expedition traveled extensively through Russia, spanning from Odessa by the Black Sea in the South to Archangel by the White Sea in the extreme North. The reality of Soviet Russia crushed Goldman, moving her to write on the anniversary of her first year in Russia that "nothing was left but the ashes of my fervent dreams, my burning faith, my joyous song."[34] Their travels came to a bureaucratic end when the Ispart, a Communist organization, was created by the Communists to collect data on the history of the Communist Party. Although Zinoviev had jurisdiction over Petrograd, and was a chairman of the Petrograd Museum, red tape blocked the expedition's work, making it impossible for them to function. When the issue finally resolved itself, the Museum expedition was placed under the eye of a political commissar. Goldman and Berkman, sad to part from their colleagues of many months, chose to leave.

Although Petrograd's Secretary of the Communist Party Zorin had maintained to Goldman that there were no strikes under the "dictatorship of the proletariat," Goldman had come to know this was false. In the winter of early 1921, strikes broke out in Petrograd. The strikers were protesting the lack of food, fuel, and other necessities of life. The unusually severe winter had stalled the inadequate supplies which the city was expecting. In addition, the Petro-Soviet had closed

---

[34] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 860.

a number of factories, reducing the employees rations by one-half.[35] It became clear to the workers that they were the only ones lacking; the Communist Party members had received a new shipment of clothes and shoes. The cry of the workers had escalated, but the authorities cancelled a workers' meeting called to find a solution to their problems. Faced with no alternative, the millmen at the Troubetskoy mill works struck for increased food rations which had been promised to them, and for the shoes.[36] The Petro-Soviet sent soldiers to disperse the strikers. The strikers were not to be swayed, and called for support. Five more groups joined them, from the docks, the shops, the mills and the factories. Force was used against the strikers, but they would not return to work. Instead, having been so mistreated by the authorities, their demands increased to include political needs. The workers called for policy changes in the government, the right to determine their own destinies and to control their own lives. They demanded a Constituent Assembly be called. The Petro-Soviet responded by enforcing martial law, ordering workers to return to work or be deprived entirely of their rations. The men refused. A number of unions were dissolved and workers were imprisoned. Goldman and Berkman sought to help by contacting Zinoviev, Zorin, and other Communist officials whom they knew, but all had made themselves inaccessible.

---

[35] Ibid., p. 873.

[36] Ibid.

Meanwhile, armed troops had blocked off the industrial zones of Petrograd-- there was no way to smuggle meager rations in to the strikers.

At this point of crisis, the sailors in Kronstadt decided to join in solidarity with their striking brethren. The Kronstadt sailors had proven themselves outstanding in 1905 and 1917, so much so that Trotsky had dubbed them "the pride and flower of the Revolution." They had sent a few members undercover to investigate the situation in Petrograd, and they had concurred with the strikers demands for rations and for independence. They did not agree with the call for a Constituent Assembly. But they would back their Petrograd comrades. At a March 1 meeting of 16,000 sailors, workers, and Red Army soldiers, called with the permission of the Kronstadt Soviet, the men voted unanimously to support Petrograd and to support a resolution calling for new elections of Soviet officials, freedoms of speech, press, and assembly, and the release of political prisoners.[37] The three dissenting votes were from President of the Kronstadt Soviet Vassiliev, Commissar of the Baltic Fleet Kuzmin, and President of the Socialist Soviet Republics Kalinin. Even though the sailors had affirmed that they were loyal communists and dedicated to the Party, the dissenters called them counter-revolutionaries, whom the Communist Party must fight. They ordered Kronstadt's food storehouses be emptied

---

[37] Goldman, My Disillusionment in Rusia, pp. 194-95.

and removed from the city. The sailors detained Kuzmin and Vassiliev, blocking their orders to starve the city. Lenin responded with an order declaring that Kronstadt had mutinied against the Soviet government, having joined with former Tsarist generals and Socialist-Revolutionist traitors to stage a counter-revolutionary revolt against proletariat Russia.[38]

Goldman and Berkman sent a letter to Zinoviev, imploring that a peaceful resolution be found. But Lenin had dispatched troops to Kronstadt, with Trotsky in command. The Petrograd strikers were totally demoralized by the turn of events: their hunger, the rumors spread of the Kronstadt defection, the detachment of forces sent to Kronstadt. The strikers gave themselves up, to be imprisoned by the tchekists. Kronstadt would not change its stance, and, although feeling abandoned, continued to maintain that they were faithful sons of the Revolution. They repeatedly requested the Bolshevik leaders to meet with them to find an acceptable, peaceful solution. The government had no interest in a peaceful resolution, and on March 7 began a seige on Kronstadt. For 10 days the soldiers, sailors and workers of Kronstadt stood up against the Soviet military. When the city finally was silenced, tens of thousands had been slain.[39] Throughout the long seige, Goldman and Berkman spoke with Communist acquaintances. All

---

[38] Goldman, Living My Life, p. 878.

[39] Ibid., p. 886.

knew that the charge against Kronstadt had been a frame; the sailors were not following a White Army commander. Yet they were terrified to speak out, for fear of what would happen to them. They feared being cut off from the party and starving to death, or simply disappearing. All had the feeling of helplessness, that the Communist State was out of their hands, that it was something tremendous that could not be stopped. Goldman and Berkman agreed. They had felt utterly helpless in the face of the crisis, knowing that there was no way to affect the system.

There was no longer any doubt that the Revolution had turned evil. The Bolsheviki had put a tighter noose around dissident groups. Anarchists were imprisoned by the score, their bookstores closed, and their press halted. The rumors of horrible Soviet prisons and the abuses which took place within were all substantiated. Goldman and Berkman decided it was time to leave. Berkman began to pursue illegal means of flight, but Goldman protested, preferring to find a legal way to exit the country. The endeavor took them months, with adjoining countries refusing to grant them visas. Berkman had finally come to Goldman's position regarding the Bolsheviki, and, once accepting of the reality of Bolshevism, he became venomously anti-Soviet. Their remaining months in Russia were painful. Anarchist friends were arrested and shot in the Tcheka prison. Their own Moscow apartment was raided by the Tcheka. They met with foreign delegations, silently enduring the praises the delegates bestowed on the Soviet leaders.

Passports were finally secured for the pair-- they were to be delegates to the Anarchist Congress in Berlin. But Germany would not grant a visa: nor would Latvia nor Estonia. Lithuania was finally forthcoming with a 2-week visa. Emotionally drained, ideologically crushed, and with no other thought than to leave the country of which they had so long dreamed, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman bade farewell to Soviet Russia on December 1, 1921, twenty-two months after their arrival.

SECTION FOUR: 1921-40: THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIK YEARS OF AN EXILED ANARCHIST

CHAPTER TEN: THE WORK OF AN ANTI-BOLSHEVIK IN THE LIBERAL, SOVIET-ENAMORED WORLD, AND THE FIGHT FOR SPAIN

Goldman and Berkman were never to know a more permanent home than the one they had left in the United States. Deported from Russia, they spent a good part of the rest of their lives moving from one country to another. Permanent residency was never to be established; in fact, they spent a good deal of energy and time applying and re-applying for visas and extensions by which to remain in any particular place. Sweden, Germany, France, England, and Canada all hosted Goldman. Their first months out of Russia were unusually difficult, and the two suspected that the Soviet government was behind the visa refusals, the interrogations, and the expulsions which they regularly encountered. They finally settled in Berlin in 1923, and it was there that Goldman forced herself to re-live the Russian experience and record it in My Disillusionment in Russia. The months of writing were dark and painful. Berkman was writing his account in The Bolshevik Myth, and Goldman was producing articles she hoped would be run in the New York World. Goldman kept intimate contact with her U.S. friends and publishers through her continued correspondence with her nieces, Stella Cominsky and Ruth Commins, and her nephew Saxe Commins. The two were financially supported by family, friends, Goldman's writing and lecturing, and Berkman's

writing and editing work. Nonetheless, finances were a continual problem. Goldman received a $7,500 advance for her autobiography, Living My Life, which appeared in 1931, but the book did not sell well, most probably due to the U.S. Depression and the high cost of the 1,000-page book.[1]

In her writing about the Soviet experience, Goldman was given the time for personal re-evaluation of her beliefs, or as Goldman termed it, to "revalue my values."[2] It was not anarchism that she needed to re-think, but the role of revolution. Berkman spoke for both of them when he wrote, "We are not disenchanted with our ideals, but only disillusioned in the achievements of the Russian Revolution."[3] In a 1925 letter which she wrote to her friend Havelock Ellis, she said:

> "It is true that my Russian experience has made me see what I did not see before, namely the imperative necessity of intensive educational work which would help to emancipate people from their deep-rooted fetishes and superstitions. With many revolutionists I foolishly believed that the principal thing is to get people to rise against the oppressive institutions and that everything else will take care of itself. I have learned since the fallacy of this...
>
> "The people who so heroically made the Revolution were so easily whipped into line and so easily became submissive to the communist state because they were taught it is sufficient to make a revolution and the rest will follow...
>
> "I still believe that great social changes have not and cannot take place without some clash... But I have come to the conclusion that the amount of violence in any revolution will depend entirely upon the amount of preparation on the part of the conflicting forces-- the amount of INNER

---

[1] Drinnon, Nowhere at Home, p. 175.

[2] Ibid., p. 99.

[3] Ibid., "AB to EG, February 9, 1932, Nice," p. 102.

preparation."[4]

What she and Berkman did not have to re-think was their attitude toward Bolshevism. Berkman wrote, "Bolshevism and fascism prove that there is no other salvation except a society based on economic equality without any political invasion or control."[5] It was almost a cruel twist of fate, and one quite befitting their lives, that when the two were supportive of Russia, the United States was virulently anti-Russian; and that in the 1920's when the two spoke against Russia, the rest of the world was becoming enamored with Bolshevism. Goldman penned "There is No Communism in Russia," which appeared in the American Mercury in April 1935. The premise of her article was that what the Bolsheviki had instituted in Russia was not communism at all, but state capitalism. Communism, she went on to explain, was derived from the ideal of human equality and brotherhood. Common ownership of the means of production and distribution was the hallmark of communism. Bolshevik communism was centralized and authoritarian, and what was more, it was based on government violence and coercion. An individual had no choice of "voluntary association;" Bolshevik communism was compulsory. The land and the machinery did not belong to the individuals; in other words, it was not "socialized." In Russia it was "nationalized," which meant that it was owned

---

[4] Ibid., "EG to Havelock Ellis, November 8, 1925, Bristol," p. 69.

[5] Ibid., "AB to EG, February 9, 1932, Nice," p. 102.

by the government. "Nationalized" was a convenient term applied to all aspects of the economy-- the foreign trade, printing, publishing-- which in reality meant that the government owned them. In terms of production and consumption, the amounts that were produced were determined by the central government through the Supreme Economic Council, not by a community determining its needs. In 1932-1933, the Soviet country had exported wheat and grain, while two million Russians died of starvation in South and Southeast Russia;[6] this would not have happened had the people been permitted to negotiate trade directly, Goldman maintained. The "proletariat dictatorship" did not represent the will of the people, but rather, the will of Stalin, and thus it was an autocracy more absolute than Tsarism. [7]

Social justice could only be achieved through economic equality. To that end, communism was devised to eliminate all socio-economic classes, but this had not happened either. During Goldman's stay in Russia, the Bolsheviki had been known to give the best food rations to the sailors, and then the soldiers, feeding in descending order of importance the military industrial workers, the skilled workers, artisans, laborers. The former bourgeoisie received the minimum. Red-card-carrying members of the Communist Party received special

---

[6] Goldman, "There is No Communism in Russia," reprrinted in RRed Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 362.

[7] Ibid., p. 363.

rations, underwear, leather boots, and fur coats.[8] This inequity angered and alienated the masses, enough to result in strikes, revolts, and sabotage. Lenin had instituted his New Economic Policy, to reverse the inequity of the system which had allowed the expropriation of basic necessities by the Party members. But nothing had changed nor improved in the 14 years since she had been in Russia. "From the beginning of the Bolshevik rule to this day it has been nothing but expropriation... a continuous process of state robbery of the peasantry, prohibitions, violence, chicanery and reprisals, exactly as in the worst days of Tsarism and the World War."[9] The excuses of Lenin's era-- the Allied blockade, the counter-revolutionists, the bands of White Army militia still fighting-- all these enemies of Bolshevism no longer existed, yet the practices that had been justified as legitimate during the time of crisis continued. And now Russia was looking at an ever-growing dictatorship under Stalin. "Soviet Russia," summarized Goldman, "is an absolute despotism politically and the crassest form of state capitalism economically."[10]

But the world did not want to hear the negatives of Bolshevism, and they certainly did not want to hear it from Emma Goldman. In a 1934 letter sent to Nation writer Freda

---

[8] Ibid., p. 364-365.

[9] Ibid., pp. 368-69.

[10] Ibid., p. 374.

Kirchwey, Goldman reminded the liberal, pro-Soviet writer and her colleagues that the Soviet government could not be painted in all-glowing terms. She wrote Kirchwey:

> "To cite one instance: When the Cheka was turned into the GPU you and all the other apologists of soviet Russia proclaimed the glad tidings to the whole world. Because I refused to believe in the change I was denounced as a counter-revolutionist and charged with having sold myself to the capitalistic class. Nevertheless we who had insisted that terror goes merrily on have been vindicated by subsequent events. And now the soviet press itself admits that the GPU had 'overstepped' its power, had sent immeasurable people to concentration camps and to Siberia without a hearing or trial by the old Tsarist administrative methods..."[11]

Even in England, where Goldman had often lectured to a strong liberal corpus, there seemed to be no tolerance for anti-Bolshevism. Berkman had started a campaign to raise funds for the political prisoners in Russia, and Goldman had ventured to London in hopes of raising money, as well as to do some writing. There she found the Anti-Alien Laws had all but destroyed the Yiddish Anarchist movement as well as the entire Anarchist movement. The East End liberals feared expulsion. While the older rebels were disillusioned, like Goldman, at the collapse of the Revolution, the younger ones supported the Bolsheviki. Goldman was invited to speak at a dinner of more than 250 guests. Her speech was preceded by messages of greeting by such notables as H.G. Wells, Israel Zangwill, and Bertrand Russell. When Goldman turned her speech to the issue of Russia, she recalled, the atmosphere in the room changed from one of attentiveness to one of

---

[11] Ibid., "EG to Freda Kirchwey, August 2, 1934, Toronto," p. 53.

uneasiness. At the conclusion there was an equal amount of shouting against her as there was applause in her favor. Angry diners accused her of having sold out the workers.[12]

The war had truly played havoc with traditional British liberalism and the right of asylum, Goldman concluded. The British were supporting the Bolsheviki in order to safeguard the economic trade between the countries. Try as she might, she could not convince the British about the truth of Bolshevik Russia. The Independent Labor Party had been swayed by the favorable reports of the British Trade Union's delegation to Russia. Goldman had met the delegation in Russia and knew the one-sided propaganda it had received. But the ILP had chosen to accept the report of the delegation.

Deflated, Goldman turned her attention to another interest, her love for drama. She spent the summer researching at the British Museum, and conducted an East End Yiddish lecture series in the fall on Russian theatre and drama. To obtain a British passport she married a Welsh miner, James Colton, in June of 1925. She had met Colton during her 1900 trip to Great Britain. A poor man of little education, he periodically donated money to the anarchist cause. Goldman paid his fare to and from London for their marriage, and his lost day's wages.[13] With a British passport, traveling became possible. Goldman visited

---

[12] Goldman, Living My Life, pp. 964-65.

[13] Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p.19.

Montreal, finding that the only active anarchists were Yiddish. Yiddish lectures were arranged for her, and by the time she left the city, a permanent group had been established to raise funds for the Russian political prisoners. She continued on to Winnipeg, Edmonton, and Toronto, hosted by the Yiddish anarchists in each city, speaking to every Jewish group, from the **Arbeiter Ring** to the **Council of Jewish Women.**[14] The Toronto anarchists were so taken with Goldman that she was convinced to spend a year in the community. Yet, she felt there was no permanent place for her professional work there. Berkman concurred in a 1927 letter to Goldman :"It seems to me there is no field in the world for the propaganda of anarchistic ideas; at least not just now."[15] In 1928 she finally returned to Europe, settling for three years in St. Tropez, France to write Living My Life.

The traveling was hard for Goldman, who was nearly sixty years old. In Europe and in Canada she had been visited by family: her brother Morris and his wife Babsie; brother Herman, his wife and child; her dear niece Stella; and others: families ties had been retained through all of Goldman's exploits. But she was an exile. Berkman was an ex-patriot; he harbored no interest in returning to America. But Goldman was in exile. She longed for re-patriation. Through

---

[14] GOldman, Living My Life, pp. 986-89.

[15] Ibid., "AB to EG December 7, 1927, St.Cloud," p. 78.

the early 1920's, the two had rubbed elbows with the "Lost Generation" crowd of writers and artists living in France. They had spent their share of time at all-night parties. But, as biographers Richard and Anna Maria Drinnon point out, they were not of the same movement. "The two older rebels...were not playing at exile... free to return when the postman stopped delivering checks from home."[16] She wrote to Roger Baldwin, whom she had inspired to begin the group which became the American Civil Liberties Union: "To wit that I had failed to acclimatize myself during all these years to any place in Europe. For a revolutionist and internationalist it is indeed disgraceful to be so rooted to the soil of one country... I know now that I will remain an alien abroad for the rest of my life." [17]

In 1934, Goldman was granted a 90-day visa to lecture in the United States. The visit was uneventful, in spite of a boycott of her visit by the American Communist Party.[18] Even though Goldman was not seen as the "dangerous" woman she once was, her old foe J. Edgar Hoover had her under surveillance for her entire stay. Her visit had been arranged by Mabel Carver Crouch and Roger Baldwin, and the Department of Immigration and Labor had found no reason to deny her a

---

[16] Drinnon, p.192.

[17] Ibid., "EG to Roger Baldwin, June 19, 1935, St. Tropez," p. 59.

[18] Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 19.

temporary visa. Goldman toured the country, but felt that the tours were a failure because of poor management. Only in Chicago did she speak to packed audiences.[19] But Goldman loved being back in the United States. In a letter to Berkman she wrote:

"In all the years in Europe I have not felt so vital or alive as I did while in the States and even in Canada. I guess it has as much to do with the interest one meets in social affairs as it is that I feel at home in America. I am certain you too would feel reawakened and your faith strengthened."[20]

The truth of the matter was that the 1930's were proving an extremely difficult decade for the two unabashed liberals. Their ideas of libertarianism and equality were passé in a world that was embracing Fascism, Nazism, and Bolshevism. The ideas that had threatened a nation less than two decades before were seen as outmoded and out-of-step. Goldman wrote to her "dear ol' pal" in January of 1935:

"It is sickening to see how callous everybody has become. No one is interested any longer in human suffering and in incessant butchery. Yes, they kick when it is in Germany or their own countries. But Russia can and does get away with murder-- As you said.. . Hitler is beginning to be praised. Sure, nothing succeeds like success. Fact is, dearest, we are fools. We cling to an ideal no one wants or cares about... I go on eating out my heart and poisoning every minute of my life in the attempt to rouse people's sensibilities....The irony is I see the futility of my efforts and yet I can't let go. Just clear **meshugeh**, that's what I am." [21]

---

[19] Drinnon, "EG to Henry Alsberg, April 9, 1934, St. Louis," p. 233.

[20] Ibid., "EG to AB, May 15, 1934, Montreal," p. 234.

[21] Drinnon, "EG to AB, January 5, 1935, Montreal," pp. 57-58.

They couldn't let go. Both spoke against the rise in authoritarian governments: in their letters to each other, and their letters to friends. But they were not the public figures they once were; Goldman could not do for world liberalism what she had done for women's independence, free speech, worker's rights, and a host of other issues. Goldman, to the extent she could avoid the obstacles of various governments and censorship, traveled in Europe denouncing Hitler.[22] Berkman was, as usual the stronger in his pure revolutionary ideology. In a letter to Mollie Steimer,[23] responding to her request to join a group appealing for political prisoners in Germany, he wrote:

> "The situation in Germany is PAST appeals. I have made plenty of appeals in my life-- when there was at least the smallest shadow of a chance that such appeals will do the least good, even among our own people. But the time for appeals in re [:] German persecution has passed. ACTION is needed. Unfortunately, we have no people for such action. Let us realize that. It is very sad, but it is the fact.
>
> "There is a wave of reaction all through the world. That wave will have to pass, but we are too powerless to stem against it. Maybe it will soon bring another war. And against that we are also powerless. The truth is, our movement has

---

[22] Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Essays by Emma Goldman, p.19.

[23] Living My Life relates that Steimer followed the same path as Goldman and Berkman. Deported from the United States to Russia, she quickly saw the inequities of Bolshevism. In her fight for food for imprisoned anarchists, she herself was imprisoned and finally deported. She met up with Goldman and Berkman in Berlin. Their relationships were lifelong. Berkman's views on Germany, cited here, were related to Steimer in a letter dated July 14, 1933, which he asked her to destroy. The letter was filed at the International Institute of Social History but has been misplaced.

accomplished nothing, anywhere."[24]

Berkman had suggested to Steimer more drastic measures.

"I have grown older since 1892, and I have gained experience. But neither my character nor my views have changed in any fundamental manner. Nor my temperament and revolutionary logic. I believe today, as I believed in 1892, in the justification and necessity (under certain circumstances) of revolutionary action, collective as well as individual. I believe that assassinations and taking hostages would be the most effective and ethical methods just now in reference to the Hitler regime. I also believe, very strongly that an international boycott of Germany, economic and social, would be the most desireable thing. Never mind that some innocent people would suffer... There ARE NO INNOCENT people in the world today, for everyone is responsible for the hell we live in... they deserve to suffer for their abject submission to the Hitler regime and its unspeakable, worse-than-feudal barbarities."[25]

As with their response to politics in Russia, Berkman and Goldman rejected the political centrism in the world from their anarchistic ideology, and not from any nationalistic feeling toward the Jews. Goldman wrote to Berkman from Montreal in early 1935, saying:

"...the main cause of anti-Semitism is economic... but there is so much more to anti-Semitism, traditions of centuries, ingrained antipathies, and what not. I don't see how it is going to be done away with even in a free society...for the present the situation of Jews all over the world is not enviable. I can see the anti-Jewish feeling here and the discrimination. It's sad..."[26]

But her case for rejecting Fascism and Nazism, for speaking out against Mussolini and Hitler, was not grounded in any Jewish bias, just as her rejection of Bolshevism was not

---

[24] Drinnon, "AB to Mollie Steimer, August 16, 1933, Nice," p. 104.

[25] Ibid., footnote, p. 104-05.

[26] Drinnon, "EG to AB, February 12, 1935, Montreal," p. 114-15.

founded on her experiences with Russian Jews. For her, centralization of power in a dictator was the antithesis to her beliefs of a world order. No one prospered under this type of government, the Jews included.

Goldman spent the late 1920's and the first half of the 1930's in St. Tropez, in the South of France. Berkman had settled in Nice, and married Emmy Eckstein, a devoted younger woman who fastidiously looked after Berkman. Their work, as each pursued their interests, and the opportunity for income, seemed to be the reason Goldman and Berkman lived apart from each other. They wrote constantly to each other, sharing their work and their ideologies through the postal service, often continuing discussions and debates through many postal exchanges. Their relationship was beautifully written of in this letter from Goldman to Berkman in 1935.

"As a greeting to your sixty-fifth birthday it is fitting that I should tell you the secret of my life. It is that the one treasure I have rescued from my long and bitter struggle is my friendship for you. Believe it or not, dear Sash. But I know of no other value, whether in people or achievements, than your presence in my life and the love and affection you have roused....it is not an exaggeration when I say that no one ever was so rooted in my being, so ingrained in every fiber, as you have been and are to this day. Men have come and gone in my long life. But you, my dearest, will remain forever. I do not know why this should be so. Our common struggle and all it has brought us in travail and disappointment hardly explain what I feel for you. Indeed, I know that the only loss that would matter would be to lose your friendship.

"Such an abiding feeling could be better explained if you had always been all kindness and understanding. But you were not that. On the contrary, you were and still are often harsh and lacking in comprehension of the inner motivations of my acts. But all that is as nothing [compared] with the force you have been from the moment I first heard your voice and met you at Sach's cafe and all through the forty-five years of our comradeship. I seem to have been born then as

woman, mother, comrade, and friend. Yes, I believe my strongest and most compelling feeling for you is that of the mother. You have often resented that, saying you are no mollycoddle. Of course, you failed to understand that it was not my desire to impose my mother authority on you. It was the ever-present concern in your welfare and the equally present fear that something might befall you that would tear you away from me. Terribly selfish feeling, isn't it, dear heart? Or is it that you had bound me by a thousand threads? I don't know and don't care. I only know that I always wanted to give you more than I expected from you... I feel bound to you spiritually. And it is this which keeps you ever present and real to me when we are separated by thousands of miles. So it is alright my being away from you on your birthday. I will be with you in my thoughts and with my heart.[27]

Alexander Berkman was not a well man. The abuses he had suffered during his imprisonments had all but destroyed his health. He had lived with an ulcerated stomach from his days in Russia, if not earlier. In February 1936, and again in March, he underwent prostate gland surgery. After three months of near-constant pain, he had a relapse. When his wife Emmy had gone out in the street to await the doctor, he wrote a short note of apology to Emmy and Emma, stating that he did not want to live as a dependent, sick man. Then Berkman committed suicide, shooting himself in the stomach and the lower part of his lung. He did not die immediately. Berkman hid the gun, and returned to his sickbed, where his act was not discovered until the doctor arrived. Eckstein was actually arrested until it was proven that Berkman had shot himself. It was sixteen hours later before he died, and they were extremely painful hours for him. Goldman made the almost three-hour trip from St. Tropez to Nice with Michael Cohn, a

---

[27] Ibid., "EG to AB, November 19, 1935, London," pp.246-47.

lifelong American friend of both Berkman and Goldman. Berkman was able to recognize his visitors-- that Goldman was by his side-- until he slipped into a coma. Because they could not afford to cremate Berkman, he was buried in the Caucade Cemetery in Nice. He died June 28, 1936, one day after Goldman's 67th birthday.[28]

There was only one thing that could save Goldman from the sense of loss she felt at Berkman's death, and that was a Cause to which she could apply herself. Spain was such a cause. A month after Berkman's death, anarchist comrades called her to Spain. The Spanish Civil War had been an difficult issue for Goldman to reconcile. In March of 1936, she and Berkman had agreed that the Spanish Anarchists should not support the Spanish Communists. But now it seemed to her they had little choice, and so she responded to their call. General Francisco Franco had begun an insurrection, with the military, the Church, and Spanish nobility by his side. The Socialists, Anarchists, Communists and Republican Liberals had begun fighting together-- using their individual militia-- as a Popular Front.[29] But the Front split, with the Anarchists and Left Socialists looking for workers' control, and the Communists, Right Socialists, and Republican Liberals looking for state-control and militarization. The Communists

---

[28] Drinnon, "EG to Comrades, July 12, 1936, St. Tropez," pp. 265-67.

[29] Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Essays by Emma Goldman, p. 333.

were receiving arms from Stalin. The Anarchists, through their organization, the Confederacion Nacional del Trabajo/Federacion Anarquista Iberica (CNT-FAI), chose to join with the Communists against the Fascists. Goldman was torn-- how could she support the Communists? But how could she turn her back on the Spanish Anarchists? They had no choice but to join with the Communists, and hope that they would not be sold out after the war, as the Russian Communists had done to their compatriate anarchists. Goldman went to Spain in September of 1936, to join in what she saw as the internationally-crucial struggle against fascism. The Anarchists had controlled one-third of Spain[30], with the CNT-FAI representing 500,000 workers.[31] In Barcelona and Catalonia, where the CNT-FAI was particularly strong, Goldman visited factories, farms, collectives, schools, and utilities run by the libertarian principles she had espoused her whole life.[32]

The CNT-FAI asked Goldman to take charge of their press service and propaganda bureau in London. She stationed herself there, pledging her total support in bringing the Anarchists' plight to the forefront of world consciousness. As their spokesperson, she was attacked by the Left and the Right for joining with the group which was now aligned with

---

30 "Emma Goldman Exhibit" Emma Goldman Papers Project.

31 Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Collected Writings & Essays by Emma Goldman, p. 333.

32 Ibid., p. 20.

the Communists. In Paris, in 1937, she defended her role in an address to the International Working Men's Association Congress. The CNT-FAI had to choose between Franco and Stalin, and in this case, Stalin was the lesser of two evils. There was no doubt that Stalin was using Spain for his own purposes: selling arms for gold, and supporting a communist movement that was connected by loose puppet strings to Russia. Goldman knew that the Anarchists were making concessions in a way which lead them far from their revolutionary aims. But, she said, this was not the time to criticize the CNT-FAI. "Comrades," she said in her address,

> "...the CNT-FAI are in a burning house; the flames are shooting up through every crevice, coming nearer and nearer to scorch our comrades. At this crucial moment, and with but few people trying to help save our people from the consuming flame, it seems to be a breach of solidarity to pour the acid of your criticism on their burned flesh. I cannot join you in this. I know the CNT-FAI have gone far afield from their and our ideology. But that cannot make me forget their glorious revolutionary traditions of seventy years. Their gallant struggle-- always haunted, always driven at bay, always in prison and exile. This makes me think that the CNT-FAI is fundamentally the same, and that the time is not far off when they will again prove themselves the symbol, the inspirational force, that the Spanish Anarcho-Syndicalists and Anarchists have always been to the rest of the Anarchists in the world."[33]

Even when it had become clear that Franco was to be the victor in the Spanish Civil War, Goldman would not relinquish the dream that Spain could be the model for anarchism. She had experienced a foretaste of the dream in her visit to Barcelona's factories and collectives in fall, 1936. In the

---

[33] Goldman, "Address to the International Working Men's Association Congress," Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Essays by Emma Goldman, p. 385.

spring of 1939 she ventured to Canada to raise funds among the Canadian anarchists. But the War years had taken their toll on Goldman. She had fallen ill in August 1938 in Paris, but forced herself to make a second trip to Spain the following month, surviving the daily bombardment of Barcelona. In November of that year she had returned to her work in London. There she had fallen down a flight of stairs, and was forced to recuperate. But immediately she was off again, in December 1938, to the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam to sort through Alexander Berkman's papers. Her trip to Canada in the spring was an extended stay, and she celebrated her 70th birthday with friends in Montreal. But her work was ever-present, as she set about trying to prevent the deportation of anti-fascist Italian anarchists. In the midst of that campaign, Goldman suffered a stroke on February 17, 1940. Her stroke was something between a cruel irony and a poetic agony, for it rendered Emma Goldman, the champion of the individual's right to be heard, without the ability to speak. Three months later, on May 18, Goldman died.

The exile which had marked the last 21 years of her life finally came to an end. The United States government, deeming that Emma Goldman could no longer be dangerous, allowed her body to be returned to the United States. She was buried in the Waldheim Cemetery in Chicago, next to the victims of the Haymarket Affair. A few weeks after her death, a tribute meeting was held in her honor in New York. Among those

colleagues who paid tribute to Goldman were Roger Baldwin, Harry Weinberger, and Rudolf Rocker, a lifelong British anarchist, who spoke in Yiddish. But the most fitting tribute to Goldman was the epitaph engraved on her tombstone. If it was ever possible to summarize the work, the energy, and the vision of Goldman, her memorial marker did just that. It read:

"LIBERTY WILL NOT DESCEND TO A PEOPLE,
A PEOPLE MUST RAISE THEMSELVES TO LIBERTY."[34]

---

[34] "Emma Goldman Exhibit," Emma Goldman Papers Project.

SECTION FIVE: RETROSPECT ON AN ASPIRING HUMANIST

CHAPTER ELEVEN: CLOSING OBSERVATIONS ON EMMA GOLDMAN

A rabbinic thesis cannot begin to do justice to the complexity and brilliance of Emma Goldman. Born in the Pale of Settlement, Goldman had the gift of observation-- she took in the entire Russian world that was presented before her, a world of Tsarist Autocracy, peasantry, growing industrialization, exploitation, and a world of anti-Semitism. Even as a young girl, she could not shut the negative images out of her mind; she could not just accept that this was the way of life. Perhaps her soul was born out of a naiveté-- that the world could be a better place if men and women would only care; that every human being had intrinsic worth and dignity, a purpose on the earth greater than to be used by another. Her fortitude was evident, in that Goldman dedicated her life to transmitting this message. Her brilliance was that she could reduce every political and social issue down to this value. Thus she fought for women's independence, birth control, the rights of the working class, the freedom of young men to choose whether they wished to be soldiers, the creation of honest, non-coercive relationships between adults, the elimination of war-- she fought for these and a dozen other issues, inspired by her belief that each human being was to be valued.

Emma Goldman, more often that not, was in the minority on the issues she advocated. It had become colloquial to

equate the word "anarchy" with "chaos" even though the two concepts were dissimilar, yet Goldman continued her attempts to enlighten others as to the true nature of anarchism. What she advocated was the utopian society that could exist if people dealt equitably with their neighbor. In such a society the need for governmental management would be non-existent. Bravely she espoused this view as the United States was entering the 20th Century and emerging as a strong economic and military world power. The United States was very narrow in its accepted norms, and this challenged Goldman to espouse the minority views, if for no other reason than to foster the spirit of acceptance and tolerance. Goldman was not a homosexual, yet she lectured on homosexuality simply to bring the issue to public understanding. Goldman was not eligible for the military draft, yet she pleaded the case of those who did not want to be forced into military service. Goldman was not a mother, yet she advocated the merits of family limitation. For Emma Goldman, the right of the individual was precious.

Perhaps the human right underlying all others was the right to free speech. Goldman believed in this with such tenacity that she became a thorn in the side of virtually every police department she encountered. Never mind the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution; whatever Emma Goldman advocated must be "bad" and so this dangerous woman must be silenced. Goldman was arrested so often that she made it a habit to carry a book in her purse when she gave

lectures-- she might as well utilize the time advantageously if she was going to spend the night in jail. It was no secret that when the United States deported Goldman in 1919, they were doing so to silence her. For three decades she had been employing her First Amendment right to the fullest, and this was beyond toleration.

Emma Goldman is worth studying for her clarity of mind, her oratorical and writing ability, her commitment to ideals, her commentary on the socio-political world. But as a rabbinic student, I was curious to ascertain what influence Judaism had in Goldman's life, and how this avowed anti-religionist felt about Judaism. It is clear that the anti-Semitism that she witnessed in Russia affected her. As a child she imagined herself to be the apocryphal Judith, defending the Jews against those who would do them harm. It was from this ethnocentric beginning that she grew to recognize that it was not just the Jews who needed a heroine to champion their cause. She would be a Judith to all nations.

But Goldman was plagued by this call to universality within herself. Nationalism and patriotism gave rise to war and conflict. Humankind needed to lift itself above partisanism and embrace others of differing backgrounds. She opposed Zionism: there was "no hope for mankind so long as they are divided through boundaries and blinded by their

nationalistic viewpoints."[1] Yet there is no mistaking that Goldman felt a part of the Jewish people. She had no interest in the Jewish religion, but she was always cognizant and accepting of her Jewish background. She spoke of her "people" in reference to her family and Jews. In the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, she was surrounded by Jews. Certainly she traveled in wider circles. But throughout her entire life, Goldman chose to speak in Jewish neighborhoods, lecture in Yiddish, and visit Jewish groups. While many of her acquaintances were non-Jews, many of her lifelong friends were Jews. Alexander Berkman, her lawyer Harry Weinberger, friends Michael Cohn, Mollie Steimer, Henry Alsberg, Max Baginski, and Rudolf Rocker were but a few of the Jews with whom she corresponded. In times of need or trouble it was to the Jewish anarchist Freie Arbeiter Stimme and the Jewish socialist Forward that she turned. Often the Jewish publications would berate Goldman and Berkman for their actions, many times they would rally to their support, but they always reported on them, for they were a part of the Jewish world of the East Side.

During her two years in Russia, Goldman visited with many Russian Jews. She was an eyewitness to the emotional and physical destruction of the pogroms. She was torn between her concern for the endangered Jews in anti-Semitic Russia and her commitment to bettering the country for all of its

---

[1] Drinnon, "EG to Ben Capes, February 16, 1927, Paris," p. 71.

citizens. She believed that if society could be changed, anti-Semitism would disappear. She disagreed with many of the Russian Jewish intellectuals she met, but, in researching how Goldman felt about Jews and Judaism, what is important is that she often met with other Jews, regardless of the conversation. In Russia, as well as other countries, Goldman sought out the Jewish connection.

Yet for all her talk of universalism, Goldman harbored a special place for Jews. Ben Reitman, her lover between 1908-1917, would sometimes write anti-Semitic comments to Goldman, as well as allusions to the teachings of Jesus. Most probably this was done to emotionally separate himself from Goldman, but it always brought response from Goldman. In a 1914 letter criticizing the Jews, he wrote that they were only interested in bettering themselves :

"...and the Rest can go to hell. Also the Jews bring their Religion, their customs, into everything. Socialist, IWW, Anarchist, Jewish-- they won't combine with the American and Irish. Also labor, Hebrew trade unions. I am convinced that we have to do anti-Jewish propaganda and do something [to] break down the Racial feeling. It would make a wonderful lecture, especially for the Jews."[2]

Goldman responded to Reitman's letter:

"Hobo, you are quite an anti-Semite, aren't you? I am afraid I cannot take your point of view regarding the Jews. You see dear, you know nothing about them, since you said yourself that you never came in touch with them until you met me. You are really not in a position to judge them one way or another. But if what you say were really true I should not condemn them, because they are a persecuted people and owe

---

[2] Falk, Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman, p. 136.

their survival only to the capacity of sticking together."[3]

If Goldman criticized the Jews, it was out of a feeling of loyalty, although this could be difficult to discern as she always wrote of Jews as "them," never "we." In a 1906 Mother Earth article she said that Jews were bound together not by a nation but by an idea. The Jews..."owing to a lack of country of their own,... developed, crystallized and idealized their cosmopolitan reasoning faculty... working for the great moment when the earth will become the home for all, without distinction of ancestry or race."[4] She agreed with Norwegian dramatist Henrik Ibsen that the Jews were able to make great contributions to culture because they weren't handicapped with a state. "It is certain that the moment the Jews will have their own state," she wrote in 1927, "they will become as reactionary and centralistic as all other nations."[5] Goldman was disappointed at the growing Jewish nationalism, fueled particularly by the pogroms and anti-Semitism in Russia, but she understood the motivation.

Throughout Goldman's life she maintained a close relationship with her family. As an adult she understood the tensions of the family home in Russia, and she developed a relationship of mutual respect with her father which she enjoyed for years before his death. A closeness grew with her

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 136-37.

[4] Ibid., p. 137.

[5] Drinnon, "EG to Ben Capes, February 16, 1927, Paris," p. 71.

mother, who seemed committed to giving the love and support to Emma that had been absent in her childhood. Her family defended and sheltered Goldman during times of personal attack, and the warm relationships created with her nieces and nephews were solid friendships which spanned oceans and borders. Perhaps it was this experience of familial love and care that inspired Goldman's maternal streak, her need and desire to protect and care for those around her.

There is no doubt that Emma Goldman, the anarchist and pursuer of human rights, was influenced in her work by Jewish ideals, and was supported in her work by the Jewish world in which she operated. She was not mainstream in her thinking, nor in her actions. But her words were appealing and inspirational to many Jewish workers, and her tours and magazine were supported by Jews and Gentiles alike. Her message did not embrace all Jews but it did embrace some, and it spread to a larger and more diversified audience. But never did Goldman forget or reject the community from which she emerged.

In an essay she penned in 1934, "Was My Life Worth Living?" Goldman wrote that "The craving for liberty and self-expression is a very fundamental and dominant trait."[6] One can only be awed by how Goldman chose to live her life--her acceptance of prison sentences and deportation, her ability to look persecution in the eye, her unrelenting cry

---

[6] Goldman, Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman, p. 393.

to people who refused to listen to her truths-- all to make sure that liberty and self-expression remained a sacred value. Goldman has been dead 51 years, and yet her words are timeless. If Emma Goldman were living today, she would be walking in the front rank of Pro-Choice gatherings in Washington, D.C. She would be leading the rallies in San Francisco, protesting the United States involvement in the Persian Gulf War. And she could be delivering the same speeches she wrote on birth control and militarism 75 years ago, because the issues of personal freedom and aggression are the same. For that reason, Goldman's writings and actions continue to inform and inspire us today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Berkman, Alexander, and Emma Goldman. Trial and Speeches of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman (before the United States District Court in the City of New York, July 1917.) Edited transcripts, no publisher, no date.

Goldman, Emma. "Address to the International Working Men's Association Congress." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- "Anarchism: What it Really Stands For." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- "The Assassination of McKinley." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "The Child and Its Enemies." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "The Failure of Christianity." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Francisco Ferrer and the Modern School." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- "The Hypocrisy of Puritanism." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- "The Individual, Society and the State." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Intellectual Proletarians." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Jealousy: Causes and a Possible Cure." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- Living My Life: An Autobiography. Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith, Inc., 1982.

------- "Marriage and Love." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- "Minorities versus Majorities." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- My Disillusionment in Russia. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1970.

Goldman, Emma, and Alexander Berkman. Nowhere at Home: Letters from Exile of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman. Ed. Richard and Anna Maria Drinnon. New York: Schocken Books, 1975.

------- "Outrage at San Diego." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972,

------- "Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------ "The Philosophy of Atheism." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Prisons: A Social Crime and Failure." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- "The Psychology of Political Violence." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings and Speeches. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Socialism: Caught in the Political Trap." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Syndicalism: Its Theory and Practice." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "There is No Communism in Russia." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "The Traffic in Women." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- "The Tragedy of Women's Emancipation." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

------- "Victims of Morality." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Was My Life Worth Living?" Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "What I Believe." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "What We Did About the Slaughter at Homestead." Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman. New York: Random House, 1972.

------- "Woman Suffrage." Anarchism and Other Essays. New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Epstein, Melech. Jewish Labor in the U.S.A. 1914-1952. New York: Trade Union Sponsoring Committee, 1953.

Falk, Candace. Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Szajkowski, Zosa. The Attitude of American Jews to World War I, the Russian Revolutions of 1917 and Communism (1914-45). New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974.

Szajkowski, Zosa. The Impact of the 1919-20 Red Scare on American Jewish Life. New York: KTAV Publishing, Inc., 1974.

ENCYCLOPEDIAS

"Anarchism." Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol. 1. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1910-11.

Jaszi, Oscar. "Anarchism." Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. Vol. 1. Ed. Edwin R. A. Seligman. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.

Miller, Joseph Dana. "Anarchism." The Americana Vol. 1. Ed. F. C. Beach. New York: Scientific American Compiling Department, 1917.

Sibley, Mulford Q. "Anarchists." Dictionary of American History. Vol. 1. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1976.

Taylor, R. Bruce. "Anarchy, Anarchism." Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. 1. Ed. James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1917.

339635