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ABSTRACT

This dissertation situates anarchist propaganda and Progressive America in a global scale to reassess the historical significance of anarchism in the early twentieth century. Delving into the multiform propaganda of Emma Goldman’s anarchist monthly *Mother Earth*, it captures an important transfiguration of anarchist communism from a labor-based socioeconomic movement to an inclusive radical culture. The magazine, I argue, forged a new intellectual force and contributed to a wide reception of anarchism without committing to the stateless anarchy. I introduce the concept of space, the “Mother Earth counterfamily,” the “propaganda quartet,” the transnational network, and the non-anarchist public to grasp the magazine’s versatile operation and its lasting intellectual effect. While Goldman remains the primary actor in this dissertation, this dissertation draws a clear picture of the cooperation, as well as tension, within members of *Mother Earth*’s inner circle. I also incorporate multiple perspectives that illustrate the cacophonous views from the anarchist ranks, as well as from various non-anarchist audiences and presses. My five chapters respectively delve into the headquarters’ culture, nationwide propaganda efforts, transnational networks, sex radicalism, and the interplay of free-speech and anti-militarist campaigns in *Mother Earth*’s anarchist project. These underexplored themes reveal the mechanism that the inner circle used to win intellectual audiences and facilitate a social revolution. I map out the local, national, and international activities of *Mother Earth*’s manifold propaganda to reveal a growing anarchist sphere, which extended to Europe, Latin America, Japan, China, Africa, and Australia.
This dissertation demonstrates that the greatest contribution of *Mother Earth* was its success in appealing to anti-authoritarian impulses among white middle-class intellectuals, rather than in mobilizing a politically-charged anarchist movement. The scope of *Mother Earth*’s propaganda transcended anarchist circles, the ranks of labor, and the Western Hemisphere. Its members’ words and deeds helped create a pervasive radical culture, which also expanded the interactions of America and the world. As a formidable minority among the American left, these anarchists encouraged a highly diverse audience to develop the power to think and the desire to rebel. Their anarchist messages proved to be far-reaching among leftists beyond both Progressive America and their era.
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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is a study of why, where, and how anarchism mattered in Progressive America and the world beyond. The anarchist monthly *Mother Earth* (1906-1917), the focus of this dissertation, epitomized the innovation, strengths and limits of anarchist propaganda in reaching white middle-class Americans during the prewar decade. Emma Goldman, the publisher, hoped that *Mother Earth* would create a broad base of support for anarchy in a way that was distinct from earlier anarchist publications. Alexander Berkman, the primary editor of *Mother Earth*, advocated proletarian solidarity across ethnic and national boundaries. Ben Reitman, the business manager of *Mother Earth*, popularized its cultural productions in a commercial manner. Together, they made *Mother Earth* into the nexus of an ever-widening anarchist culture, which had a far-reaching and lasting intellectual influence in American society.

In early twentieth-century America, many people were hostile to anarchism as a political movement and to anarchists. Through *Mother Earth*, Goldman tried to vindicate anarchism and expand public support for it. Thanks to the explosive Haymarket affair and its sensational trial in 1886-7, anarchism became synonymous with violence, danger, and bombs. The assassination of President William McKinley in 1901 by a self-proclaimed

---

1 The core members who were involved in publishing *Mother Earth* and promoting assorted anti-authoritarian campaigns had actively, also positively used the term “propaganda” to denote their explicit intention to propagate anarchism through various genres, forms, and activism.

anarchist helped further conflate anarchism with terrorism in the public’s mind.\(^3\) The 1902 New York Criminal Anarchy Act and the 1903 Federal Immigration Act reified the official suppression of anarchism and its alleged acts of terrorism.\(^4\) As an innocent suspect in several anarchist-involved cases of violence, Goldman worked to publicly spread anarchism in a legal, peaceful, and orderly manner. In March 1906, after keeping a low profile and using an alias for years, she launched the English-language *Mother Earth* with two aims: to “voice untrammeled and unafraid every unpopular cause;” and to “establish a unity between revolutionary thought and artistic expression.”\(^5\) The magazine represented Goldman’s effort to develop a more positive image for anarchism while increasing her appeal to the cultural avant-garde. Though unable to realize fully these twofold aims, *Mother Earth* proved to be “the leading anarchist journal in the United States and one of the best produced anywhere in the world” as historian Paul Avrich commented.\(^6\)

---

5 Emma Goldman, “Mother Earth Tenth Anniversary,” *Mother Earth* 10:1 (Mar. 1915): 403. *Mother Earth* was modeled after French anarchist journal *L’Humanité Nouvelle* (1897-1903), which was founded and edited by Augustin Hamon, who fused social thoughts with literature in the journal. According to Candace Falk, Goldman had submitted articles to this journal, but none were published. See Candace Falk et al., *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. I: Made for America, 1890-1901* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 566.
In June 1917, the U.S. government arrested, tried and soon imprisoned Goldman and Berkman for conspiring against the draft law created after America entered World War I. *Mother Earth’s* publication came to a halt in September 1917 after the Post Office declared it nonmailable.⁷ During her imprisonment, Goldman published and nominally edited the short-lived *Mother Earth Bulletin* (1917-1918). As the “wee Babe of Mother Earth,” the *Mother Earth Bulletin* was Goldman’s feeble attempt to strike against the government that suppressed antiwar speech.⁸ But *Mother Earth*, which she published for 12 years, made a powerful impression on the minds of many thinking people.

Situating *Mother Earth* in a multi-spatial context, this dissertation charts the creation of its propaganda strategy and networks on a global scale to reveal its cultural legacy in the history of American radicalism. The magazine was headquartered in New York and produced in Goldman’s living quarters. She (and at times Berkman) toured from coast to coast annually to promote the magazine and spread anarchism. In 1907, Berkman established the Mother Earth Publishing Association (MEPA). Its publications had an international circulation. Both Jewish immigrants from Russia, Goldman and Berkman managed to excel at English for reaching native speakers in America. They built up worldwide networks that involved *Mother Earth* in various libertarian campaigns and revolutionary activism. The themes promoted by *Mother Earth*—modern school education, modern drama, birth control, free speech, sexual liberation, syndicalism, women’s emancipation, free love, prison reform, anti-militarism, anti-war, among others—were an unusual range of agendas for an American anarchist publication. These agendas partially overlapped with those of other radical and liberal groups. As a result, its

---

members collaborated or competed with socialists, labor unionists, feminists, bohemian rebels, muckrakers, freethinkers, single taxers, birth control advocates, and anti-militarists. In sum, *Mother Earth*'s repertoire encompassed a spectrum of radical ideas for social transformation.

**Core Members**

Historians identify *Mother Earth* as the centerpiece of Goldman’s anarchist propaganda strategy. Yet, they often omit her comrades’ contributions to its production from their studies. In fact, Goldman and a group of anarchist rebels, whose concerns and agendas were no less diverse than their shared causes, created *Mother Earth* as a collective product. Berkman, for example, was at odds with Goldman in terms of his preferred tactics and targets for anarchist propaganda. Voltairine de Cleyre particularly challenged the way Goldman toured to propagate anarchism. Some of the contributors’ views on women’s roles and sexuality also varied from Goldman’s.

---


Despite these divisions, I will exploit the concept and activities of the “Mother Earth family,” dubbed by Goldman, to showcase how she combined her communal vision and anarchist propaganda. *Mother Earth’s* title, though not the first name chosen, symbolized Goldman’s glorification of humanity and the natural world over the mandates of heaven and manmade governments.\(^{11}\) The title also disclosed her motherly personality and matriarchal position.\(^{12}\) Three front cover images of *Mother Earth* indicated Goldman’s self-projection of her claim to and protection of her magazine. (Images 1 to 3) Both in public and in private, Goldman affectionately called *Mother Earth* her “baby” or “child.”\(^{13}\) Inventively, she fostered a “family” for those who associated with her “baby” and nurtured it. Although anarchists generally repudiated the manmade system of family and marriage, they did embrace voluntary fellowship and communities. The “Mother Earth family” featured two different phenomena after the magazine’s inception.\(^{14}\) One was material, referring to the headquarters and the members living and working there. The other

---


was rhetorical, comprising the publisher, editors, staffs, contributors, subscribers, readers, and supporters of *Mother Earth* all over the world.

Over the years, Goldman conjured up a vision of the “Mother Earth family,” consisting of the Mother (her), the Daughter (the magazine), and the Anarchist Spirit (shared by the members). Her intention was to supplant the paternal Holy Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in Christianity with a maternal, earthly alternative that defied everything inhuman. Goldman purposely described the status of her “baby” as “illegitimate;” namely, it lacked both the recognition of the society (since it was propagating an unpopular cause) and a father. But Goldman was proud of her “baby;” after nine years of publication, “She [*Mother Earth*] has not denied her illegitimacy, nor has she submitted to group control. She has not relaxed her defiance, yet she is able to begin her tenth year with deeper faith and greater determination that she had at her birth.”

---

15 Emma Goldman, “Mother Earth Tenth Anniversary.”
love”—for human liberty, fraternity, and solidarity—that give birth to and sustained *Mother Earth*.16

Alexander Berkman complimented, if not challenged, Goldman’s primal status as the matriarch with his paternalistic editorship. They each took great pains, risked their freedom and even lives, to make sure that *Mother Earth* voiced “the various expressions of the Anarchist spirit” as Berkman wrote.17 Their dual leadership also set *Mother Earth* and its activities into motion. Their equivalent contributions and bifurcated approaches to their propaganda strategy made the duality of their leadership obvious. Goldman’s intellectual communication with the middle class contrasted with Berkman’s fundamentalist conviction to fight exclusively for the working class. His emphasis on grassroots organizing was also at variance with Goldman’s rhetorical persuasion via lectures.

This dissertation identifies Goldman, Berkman and several other key actors, who in different ways made important contributions to *Mother Earth*, as its “inner circle” or “core members.” Kathy Ferguson’s book *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (2011) provides a roll call and succinct portrayal for the inner circle:

The *Mother Earth* family, as Goldman called it, included Goldman herself (nicknamed The Red Queen), Max Baginski (German journalist and the first editor), Alexander Berkman (the second editor, nicknamed The Pope), and others who published the journal for over a decade. The inner circle of *Mother Earth* also included colorful Czech anarchist Hippolyte Havel (often described as charming when sober); soulful American freethinker Leonard Abbott (nicknamed Sister Abbott); well-known art critic Sadakichi Hartmann; printer and trade unionist Harry Kelly, and Goldman’s flamboyant manager and lover, Dr. Ben Reitman.18

---

Ferguson’s list should also include the feminist anarchist Voltairine de Cleyre and the novelist John Russell Coryell in light of their discursive contribution and occasional editorial assistance to *Mother Earth*.\(^{19}\)

The family had a cosmopolitan outlook thanks to the multinational origins of the inner circle. They came from Russia, Germany (Hartmann), Britain (Abbott), Czechoslovakia, Japan (Hartmann), and America (Harry, Reitman, de Cleyre, and Coryell). Goldman’s depiction of *Mother Earth* as “a universal baby” highlighted the international nature of its conception and growth.\(^{20}\) These core members’ connections and joint efforts made *Mother Earth* an epicenter of the transnational anarchist network.

Ben Reitman’s affiliation to the *Mother Earth* family in 1908 sharpened the subtle tension of Goldman and Berkman’s dual leadership.\(^{21}\) The strong chemistry between Goldman and Reitman led to their decade-long tumultuous romance and an effective partnership for creating anarchist propaganda. Serving as Goldman’s tour manager, Reitman succeeded in his role as *Mother Earth*’s business manager. Yet his boastful personality made him an unwelcome outsider within the inner circle. Reitman kept working with other core members although many of them did not like him. With the help of Reitman’s marketing skill, Goldman’s annual tours sustained the magazine while covering the expense of publishing its literature. In collaboration with the inner circle, over 370 national and international contributors collectively built the textual world of

\(^{19}\) De Cleyre and Coryell not only frequently contributed to *Mother Earth*, but also helped maintain some of its editorial work whenever it was in need. Emma Goldman, “To My Readers,” *Mother Earth* 1:10 (Dec. 1906): 7-9; Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life*, 123, 128-130.


\(^{21}\) Several scholars have presented intriguing stories about the Goldman-Berkman-Reitman triangular relationships. See especially Falk, *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman*. Also see Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*; Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life*; Paul Avrich and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*. While these works detailed the interactions of their love, desire, and activities, their focuses were not on the working of *Mother Earth*. 

8
Mother Earth as a transnational product in Progressive America.\textsuperscript{22} The rest of the members related to the magazine as subscribers, donators, organizers, correspondents, local agents, and endorsers of its campaigns.

**Contexts and Texts**

Mother Earth’s core members witnessed the “global turn” of the anarchist movement, while also contributing to it. In both these capacities, they exerted significant intellectual influence in the early twentieth century. Mother Earth was a major vehicle for anarchism when the parameters of anarchist activities expanded beyond transatlantic networks. By 1900, anarchism spearheaded the international dissemination of radicalism, championing the causes of social revolution and sexual liberation to a global audience.\textsuperscript{23} According to Benedict Anderson, anarchism was even more appealing than Marxism to radical intellectuals across the globe before 1917. Anarchists not only stole press headlines with their assassinations, but also the hearts of many thinking people with their idea(l)s.\textsuperscript{24} As an anti-authoritarian philosophy, anarchism greatly inspired young intellectuals in

\textsuperscript{22} Many of the frequent contributors were closely associated with the core members. These important figures included: prominent anarchist leader Peter Kropotkin; Italian anarchist Errico Malatesta; German-born “uncompromising Anarchist” C. L. James; Goldman’s lawyer friends Theodore Schroeder and Bolton Hall; Russian socialist writer Maxim Gorky, English-born anarchist William C. Owen; noted British trade unionist Tom Mann; Portland-based attorney and poet Charles Erskine Scott Wood; Denver-based teacher Gertrude Nafe; Reverend Eliot White; American anarchist and editor W. S. Van Valkenburgh; Ukraine/Russian-born physician and medical journalist Victor Robinson; Jewish American author Anna Strunsky; journalist Grace Potter; journalist and writer Hutchins Hapgood; revolutionary illustrator and artist Robert Minor, who had painted the cover for Mother Earth. While it could go on and on, the list assembled here offers a glimpse of transnational and cross-ideological ties from which Mother Earth developed.


\textsuperscript{24} Benedict Anderson pinpointed out anarchism’s three “early advantages” in attracting radicals beyond national boundaries at the turn of the century: its utopian élan, its positive attitude toward peasants and agricultural laborers, and its more serious internationalism than its competitor, namely Marxists. These qualities interested East Asian radicals when they came across various schools of socialism. Benedict Anderson, “Preface,” in *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Postcolonial World, 1870-1940*, ed. Steven Hirsch & Lucien van der Walt (Leiden: BRILL, 2010), xiii-xxix.
non-Western countries such as China and Japan. Goldman successfully established a transpacific network to spread *Mother Earth* and its anarchist messages. Its core members reached out to revolutionaries and radicals around the world, helping to build revolutionary momentum for anarchism. Their international news coverage and rescue campaigns attested to their transnational solidarity with rebels worldwide.

Notably, *Mother Earth* emerged at a time when America was growing into a new global power, and in the process the U.S. government became the core members’ primary adversary. The huge influx of international immigrants and business capital before WWI, along with frequent transatlantic exchanges of knowledge and technology, built up America’s industrial, capitalist, and cultural power in the fin de siècle. The growth of U.S. armaments and its corporate investments overseas extended its worldwide political-economic importance. Additionally, the U.S. government encouraged foreign exchange student programs in the hope that the students would promote American values after returning to their home countries. America soon became the main channel through which non-Westerners acquired Western knowledge and ideologies. The growing

---


26 Denjirō (Shūsui) Kōtoku, the founder of socialism and anarchism in Japan and the Japanese anarchist feminist Ito Noe (1895-1923) represented *Mother Earth*’s Japanese liaisons. Chinese anarchists like Liu Shifu and some essays in his *The Voice of the People* indicated its connections with Goldman and *Mother Earth*. For more discussions of *Mother Earth* member’s transpacific networks, see Chapter 3.


28 Chinese students, for example, started to choose America, rather than Japan as they originally did, for higher education. The changing destinations/nations of Chinese students’ choices for further study also had a lot to do with Japanese government’s stricter regulation over Chinese students in 1905 due to the latter’s
global influence of American capitalism and militarism drew severe criticism from *Mother Earth*’s members. They condemned the U.S. government and corporations for suppressing international revolutions, domestic labor strikes, and political dissidents. These anarchists defended anarchy as a better alternative to other political-economic organizations.

The multilingual Goldman chose English as her magazine’s language in order to propagate anarchism beyond immigrant communities and the Western world. America’s development as a world power—coupled with the British Empire’s influence in India, Africa, and elsewhere—established English as a major international language. Studying in the U.S. and translating texts into English were two means that non-Westerners used to absorb American radicalism, which had already integrated European philosophies with its native liberal, utopian, and progressive beliefs. Historian John Crump described how English (and America) mediated the reception of Western socialism in Japan:

> When socialists in Japan knew a language other than Japanese it was generally English, and, if an opportunity to travel abroad presented itself, it was usually to the USA. This meant that European (primarily German) social-democratic ideas had to find their way to Japan through what can best be described as an English-language filter. This reliance on English as the language for most of their international contacts exposed the Japanese socialists to a variety of supposedly socialist doctrines popular in one or other of the world’s English-speaking countries.

Crump’s account points to the importance of the “English-language filter” and America as the major exporter of Western radical thought to non-English speaking countries. Goldman’s use of English to publish *Mother Earth* gave it a lingual advantage in

---


reaching worldwide English readers and mobilizing a transnational community for the anarchist revolution.

In the domestic context of Progressive America, *Mother Earth* emerged as an initiative to remedy the socioeconomic consequences of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. Goldman and her comrades demanded the total eradication of existing institutions, which they believed were the cause of oppression, inequality, and injustice in society. The rise of Progressivism was another. Progressives heralded extensive programs of social reform driven by the middle classes, upheld state interventionism, efficient government, regulation of trusts, and social justice. 31 Muckraking journalism from the 1890s was an expression of the liberal conscience of progressive elites dedicated to exposing industrial monopolies and political corruption to the public. 32 Another critical initiative was the Socialist Party of America (SPA), formed in 1901, which endeavored to democratize and socialize the American economy through political means. 33 The SPA wanted to abolish wage slavery and establish a socialist government of cooperative commonwealth.


Progressive liberals, socialists, and anarchists demanded various degrees of socioeconomic and political change. In terms of principle, progressive liberals were anti-monopoly, socialists were anti-capitalism, and anarchists were anti-state. Anarchists’ anti-state stance entailed objections to having any kind of government or systems of authority. Socialists meant to overthrow the capitalist system and the current plutocratic government, but they were not interested in destroying the state altogether. Progressive liberals, appalled by the socioeconomic chaos and political correction, set forth various government-based reforms that would impose order on society.34 Through *Mother Earth*’s propaganda, Goldman and her comrades tried to radicalize the reform mindsets of liberals into a willingness to question the basic legitimacy of the governing system. In a sense, the *Mother Earth* anarchists were appealing to the Progressive liberals’ anti-authoritarian impulses. To paraphrase Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin, Goldman sought to rouse among Progressive liberals “the power to think and the desire to rebel.”35

*Mother Earth*’s self-advertisement as “a revolutionary literary magazine devoted to Anarchist thought in sociology, economics, education, and life” summarized its orientation.36 Goldman published the magazine as an 8 by 5 inch pamphlet of 64 (later 32) pages that differed from the format of 4- to 8-page broadsides used by most of its precursors.37 A subscription was ten cents a copy or one dollar for a year. 3,000 copies
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34 I borrow Candace Falk’s definition of the term “liberal” to encompass “a wide variety of political activists, some of whom identified most closely with the establishment (including future president Woodrow Wilson), while for others the term was conflated with free speech and radicalism.” Candace Falk, “Raising Her Voices: An Introduction,” in *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II*, 3, note 5.
36 “To Our Comrades,” *Mother Earth* 2:7 (Sept. 1907): 292-293. This advertising statement was also reflected in the subtitle of *Mother Earth*, “Monthly Magazine Devoted to Social Science and Literature.”
37 For example, previous anarchist papers, such as *Firebrand* (1895-1897), had 4 pages; *Free Society* (1897-1904) had 8 pages (but sometimes 4 pages), in each number. Jessica M. Moran, “Propaganda
were sold within the first week of its initial publication, and another printing of 1,000 copies followed.\textsuperscript{38} The magazine’s circulation peaked at 10,000 copies around the mid-1910s, exceeding that of all previous English-language anarchist papers in the U.S.\textsuperscript{39} Scholars have pointed out that \textit{Mother Earth}’s cultural-intellectual influence far surpassed its insignificant circulation.\textsuperscript{40} In addition to editorials, reports, essays, and international notes, the magazine also published poetry, fiction, and short drama. From 1907, new genres such as travelogue and review essays about Goldman’s lecture tours appeared. A range of open letters, public manifestos, and fundraising solicitations carried by the magazine indicated its extensive associations with international revolutionaries and labor leaders. Advertisements informed readers of assorted happenings, events, and publications in anarchist and radical circles. Occasional editorial announcements directed readers’ attention to the magazine’s financial conditions, current campaigns, and future prospects.\textsuperscript{41} Cover illustrations contributed by vanguard artists infused a sense of revolutionary modernism into the aesthetics of the magazine.\textsuperscript{42}

The texts of \textit{Mother Earth} presented a polyphonic ensemble that expressed the central principle of anarchist communism without subordinating various individual

---


\textsuperscript{40} Falk, “Raising Her Voices,” 42.

\textsuperscript{41} Peter Glassgold, “Introduction,” xvii-xxxxviii.

concerns of its writers.\textsuperscript{43} These anarchists agreed that all forms of government were essentially violent, hierarchical, and thereby authoritarian. Fundamentally, they advocated the abolition of existing institutions, such as the state, capitalism, private property, wage labor, the family, marriage, prison, the military, and the church. Goldman’s editorial in November 1906 summed up the anarchist beliefs of her magazine—“The hopes of the Anarchists for a grand future are based upon the exercise of the feeling of solidarity of free individuals…Anarchism recognizes the diversity of life, the differentiation of individuality in its fullest sense. It finds in voluntary communism—free enjoyment of commodities—the safest material basis for the highest development of diversity, which after all is the only creative source of life.”\textsuperscript{44} This statement clarified the kernel of Goldman’s anarchism—individual freedom and creativity would (only) find their true meaning through voluntary communism. The core members’ ideal of anarchy, to quote Berkman, “expresse[s] the highest conception of individual liberty and social solidarity.”\textsuperscript{45} Their belief in not only personal freedom but also collective unity in social life distinguished them from individualist anarchists. This distinction explained the ultimate collective activism that they felt was necessary in order to create social revolution. Accordingly, they could not escape the public’s association of them with either the rhetoric of violence or acts of violence. Anarchism, they insisted, did

\textsuperscript{43} The term “anarchist communism” was interchangeable with “anarcho-communism,” “communist anarchism,” “free communism,” and “libertarian communism.” Generally the writers of \textit{Mother Earth} used “anarchist communism;” but more often, they simply stated “anarchism,” since their belief in anarchist communism actually encompassed both the individualist and communist principles of anarchism. When referring to anarchists of other schools, they would specify their identities by adding an adjective, for example “individualist anarchist.”

\textsuperscript{44} “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 1:9 (Nov. 1906): 4-5.

not promote violence or crime.\textsuperscript{46} They denounced authorities’ use of violence in all forms, even as they claimed that it was necessary for the people to use force to create a social revolution. Goldman conceded in a press interview that “It may be that a revolution will be necessary in which blood will be shed, but I hope that blood will not flow as it did in the French Revolution.”\textsuperscript{47}

Tactically, \textit{Mother Earth}’s core members felt they should overthrow the present forms of government through a general labor strike and non-political direct action. Direct action, by their definition, meant “conscious individual or collective effort to protest against, or remedy, social conditions through the systematic assertion of the economic power of the workers.”\textsuperscript{48} In practice, the direct action that they advocated went beyond asserting the worker’s economic power. Demands for individual freedom or defenses of the persecuted and the suppressed—free speech, birth control, and various rescue campaigns—all found the inner circle calling for supporters’ direct action. It included sending protest letters, telegrams, speaking publicly against authorities, joining the rallies or demonstrations, and donating funds.

\textbf{A New Audience for an Inclusive Anarchism}

Direct action—that is, actions decoupled from violence—turned out to be the major practice of anarchism by \textit{Mother Earth}’s new audience: native-born, middle-class intellectuals. The American “middle class” was diverse in terms of its members’ social status and material wealth. Thanks to Goldman’s propaganda strategy, the unusually


\textsuperscript{48} “DIRECT ACTION,” \textit{Mother Earth} 7:10 (Dec. 1912): 357.
heterogeneous audience of *Mother Earth* included a considerable number of educated individuals. They ranged from autodidacts like Goldman and many of her comrades and white collar workers with intellectual aspirations, to college graduates with family fortunes, published writers, and renowned professionals. “Intellectuals” or “thinking people,” however, had strategic importance in Goldman’s anarchist propaganda.

“Intellectuals” to her meant “those who work for their living...with brain,” rather than “with hand.” Consciously or unconsciously, Goldman distinguished intellectuals from labor, ascribing to the former a (broadly defined) middle-class status. Intellectuals’ social respectability lay more in their education, profession, and social conscience than in their financial standing or family background. Many of them considered themselves to be liberal, like journalist Hutchins Hapgood, who was a self-professed philosophical (or intellectual) anarchist. Since the late 1870s, a number of socially-conscious intellectuals, known as liberals, free thinkers, or Progressives, had defended persecuted anarchists’ right to free speech. In late 1903, various liberal elements answered Goldman’s appeal to support a free-speech campaign challenging the Immigration Act. This experience reinforced her faith in the passion of intellectual elites for social change,
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51 The American free thinkers, liberals, sex radicals and anarchists had since the 1870s organized to uphold the constitutional freedom of speech, which was suppressed by the 1873 Comstock Act, which criminalized the act of mailing “obscene” publications, materials, or instruments via the U.S. postal service. The prosecutions of some anarchists, such as Ezra Heywood (the editor of The Word, Moses Harman (editor of *Lucifer, the Light-bearer*), and Abe Isaak, Henry Addis, and A. J. Pope (editors of *Firebrand*), mostly for publishing obscene materials drew the middle-class intellectuals’ attention to collaborate and defended free speech. See David M. Rabban, *Free Speech in Its Forgotten Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 23-76; Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II, 557-558.
52 British anarchist John Turner became the first foreigner held for deportation under the Immigration Act of 1903, which triggered Emma’s collaboration with the middle-class liberals to defend free speech. For more accounts of the free-speech campaign on behalf of Turner, see Chapter 5, note 7.
which she had first observed in Russia.\textsuperscript{53} The demise of the labor-oriented anarchist paper \textit{Free Society} in 1904 due to a lack of funding inspired Goldman to seek middle-class support.\textsuperscript{54} Berkman, who was in prison for his failed attempt on the life of a capitalist, reconfirmed her thoughts in their correspondence.\textsuperscript{55} “The intelligent minority of the natives constitutes our real hope,” he wrote to Goldman in 1904.\textsuperscript{56}

\textit{Mother Earth} marked the first attempt made by the anarcho-communist press to cultivate a middle-class intellectual readership in America. Goldman viewed these intellectuals as the mainstay of society who could help with the anarchist cause when awakened to action. Strategically, Goldman classified intellectuals and professionals as “proletarians” in the context of labor-capital confrontation, arguing that they were also wage earners though not laborers.\textsuperscript{57} She worked to bring what she termed the (middle-class) “intellectual proletarians” and the (working-class) “revolutionary proletarians” together to overthrow the existing order.

Goldman pursued a new audience by adopting an inclusive approach and innovative genre to build support for anarchism. She embraced anarchism as an ideal that freed people, body and soul, rather than merely as a political ideology that would lead to the demise of


\textsuperscript{54} The rise of several socialist organizations in the early 1900s, including the Socialist Party of America (formed in 1901) and the Industrial Workers of the World (formed in Chicago in 1905), attracted the majority of workers when the 1901 McKinley assassination diminished the force of the anarchist movement. \textit{Free Society}'s headquarters migrated from San Francisco to Chicago in 1901, and, by 1904, settled in New York for seeking better development. Unfortunately, the paper did not general sufficient income to sustain its existence. It folded in November 1904. Moran, “‘Propaganda Work,’” 60-93.

\textsuperscript{55} For the steel labor strikes in Homestead, Pennsylvania in 1892, the bloody suppression from the private guards hired by Henry Frick, the manager of Homestead plants of the Carnegie Steel Company, the plan of Berkman and Goldman to assassinate Frick, Berkman’s decision to go alone and failure of killing Frick, and the trial aftermath, see Paul Avrich & Karen Avrich, \textit{Sasha and Emma}, 51-97.


\textsuperscript{57} Goldman, “Intellectual Proletarians.”
Falk, “Raising Her Voices,” 16.  
Eminent progressive magazines like Harper’s (1850-) and McClure’s Magazine (1893-1929) did mix politics and literature such as poetry and fiction, but not drama.  
Drinnon, Rebel in Paradise, 155-164; Falk, “Raising Her Voices,” 35-36.
with the heyday of her drama lectures that attracted middle-class audiences who would otherwise have shunned anarchism.\textsuperscript{64}

**Popularizing an Unpopular Cause: The Propaganda Quartet**

One remarkable feature of *Mother Earth*’s propaganda was the popularity that it gained for voicing the unpopular cause of anarchism. No research to date, including thorough biographies of Goldman, has evaluated *Mother Earth*’s effect on American society in a systematic manner. Moreover, scholars have overlooked the interplay of the publication, its core members’ lecture tours, the works published through MEPA, and the core members’ organized activities. These four propaganda forms—public speeches, the magazine, publications, and local events—mutually sustained and expanded each other’s influence.

I identify this fourfold cultural product as *Mother Earth*’s “propaganda quartet” to highlight their synergy and mutual interdependence. In the past few decades, the scope of historical studies of periodicals has been widened to include not only textual and contextual parameters, but also the networks and reception of publications. Lucy Delap’s book shows how magazines dominated transatlantic encounters of fin-de-siècle vanguard feminists despite the growth of cross-continental telegraph and telephone communication.\textsuperscript{65} Isabel Hofmeyr’s work on the printing press of Mahatma Gandhi during his years in South Africa from 1898 to 1914 unfolds what she calls the “Gandhian


textual culture,” around which reading, writing, publishing, and practice of his nonviolence philosophy revolved. In a similar fashion to these scholars, this dissertation enriches the historical variables and spatiotemporal activities involved in the operation of a journal. Goldman’s annual, cross-country promotional tours for her magazine greatly boosted its circulation, the morale of local anarchists, and the interests of new audiences. Her self-dramatizing performance, plus Reitman’s versatile marketing, turned her lectures into an unprecedented mobile buffet of anarchist ideas. These lectures gave non-anarchist audiences easy access to anarchism. The magazine launched the tours by advertising them in advance. It promoted the tours with travelogues written by Goldman and Reitman and tour reviews contributed by nationwide attendees. Soliciting subscriptions for *Mother Earth* and pushing the sale of MEPA literature were two must-dos before and after each lecture. The result, according to some attendees, was an intellectual feast that spread anarchist messages in an effective way. *Mother Earth’s* monthly publication captured the essence of these lectures and broadcast their local effect to its international subscribers. Printed propaganda like the MEPA literature helped to extend the temporary stimulation of the lectures into a deeper interest in anarchism. The local events, most frequent in New York, provided occasions for member reunions, protest rallies, fund raisings, and tributes to social rebels. Geopolitically, the circulation of the magazine and its literature were international; the lecture tours were national; and the

---

68 Goldman felt that printed materials had more lasting value than speeches. Emma Goldman, “Preface,” in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, 41-45.
events were local. The propaganda of *Mother Earth* evolved from speeches to journal essays, and to printed literature, and finally on to actual events and radical activism.

The quartet of anarchist propaganda expanded the influence of *Mother Earth* beyond what its sole monthly publication could have achieved. The division of labor in touring, soliciting funds, editing, printing, organizing, and miscellaneous work allowed each core member to develop his/her strength. *Mother Earth*’s various outlets and multiform operations helped reduce tensions and disagreements among members of the inner circle. Being on tour with Goldman kept Reitman occupied in selling tickets and securing venues, instead of fighting with Berkman in the headquarters. At the same time, Berkman was able to be more militant in his activism in New York when Goldman was on tour. These core members worked both individually and collectively to build up an extensive network with a diverse range of groups. Goldman spent more time befriending middle-class Progressives and avant-garde bohemians, while Berkman won growing support from junior militant anarchists and radical labor. Over the years, the inner circle garnered considerable amount of money for various printing and campaign funds, including bail money for themselves and other persecuted comrades. Most of the donations came from Goldman’s lecture meetings and local events, particularly the “Mother Earth family” reunions in New York.

**A Global Remapping of the *Mother Earth* Propaganda Quartet**

This dissertation carves out the geopolitical contour of *Mother Earth*’s propaganda quartet to clarify the practice and influence of its anarchist propaganda. Previous studies of *Mother Earth* basically fall into two research categories: studies of American
anarchist/radical culture and studies of the writings and life of Goldman. With rare exceptions, these works tend to concentrate on Goldman’s activities as an anarchist leader, eloquent lecturer, and sex radical. Genevieve Madden’s 1995 doctoral dissertation, “‘Home of Lost Dogs’: A Study of the ‘Mother Earth’ ‘Family,’” is to date the only monograph in English that scrutinizes the discourses of six core members while leaving Goldman out with no sound explanation. Madden’s narrow identification of the “family” members and her sole focus on the six core members’ publications leads her to a simplistic conclusion that “[U]nfortunately Mother Earth never converted the American middle class;” thereby, “Mother Earth was a great attempt that failed.” Linda L. Lumsden’s essay on the gender discourses of Mother Earth includes the views of several writers other than Goldman, but overlooks their defense of homosexuality. Numerous biographies of Goldman include chapter-length encapsulations of Mother Earth. They


70 These six core members of Mother Earth were Alexander Berkman, Max Baginski, Voltairine de Cleyre, Hippolyte Havel, Harry Kelly, and Ben Reitman. Genevieve Madden, “‘Home of Lost Dogs’: A Study of the ‘Mother Earth’ ‘Family’” (PhD diss., State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1995).

71 Madden, “‘Home of Lost Dogs,’” iv, 4.

often acknowledge the magazine’s “significant role in American radicalism” (in Richard Drinnon’s words) without including a sufficient analysis of that role.73

By addressing new concepts, overlooked perspectives and underexplored themes, this dissertation remaps Mother Earth in order to capture its historical significance in a global context. I introduce the concepts of space, the “Mother Earth counterfamily,” the “propaganda quartet,” and their non-anarchist audiences to grasp the multiform operation of Mother Earth and its importance. While Goldman remains the primary actor in this dissertation, I also incorporate multiple perspectives that illustrate the cacophonous views from the anarchist ranks, as well as from various non-anarchist audiences and presses. My five chapters respectively delve into the headquarters’ culture, nationwide propaganda efforts, transnational networks, sex radicalism, and the interplay of free-speech and anti-militarist campaigns in Mother Earth’s anarchist project. These underexplored themes reveal the mechanism that the inner circle used to win intellectual audiences and facilitate a social revolution. Their efforts have not yet received systematic discussion. I map out core members’ activities on the local, national, and international levels to reveal a broadening anarchist sphere, extending from America to Europe, Latin America, Japan, China, Africa, and Australia. Mother Earth’s previously ignored influence in East Asia particularly contributes to our knowledge of the spread of anarchism in non-Western countries.

This dissertation, moreover, highlights the core members’ “public-making” and the audiences’ reception to assess the effects of Mother Earth’s anarchist propaganda in

73 Drinnon, Rebel in Paradise, 99. For examples of the chapter-length account of Mother Earth in Goldman’s biographies, see Drinnon, Rebel in Paradise, 95-101; Wexler, Emma Goldman (1984), 115-161; Falk, Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman, 52-273; Solomon, Emma Goldman, 92-96; Chalberg, Emma Goldman, 83-99.
American society. My focus on the interaction of *Mother Earth*’s inner circle with non-anarchists represents a major departure from other studies of the anarchist movement. In keeping with Goldman’s wish to reach non-anarchist intellectuals, my study lays emphasis on the latter’s responses to her work. The greatest contribution of *Mother Earth*, I argue, was its success in appealing to anti-authoritarian impulses among American elites, rather than in mobilizing a politically-charged anarchist movement.

Failing to explore the reaction and reception of *Mother Earth*’s target audience makes it difficult to gauge the magazine’s intellectual influence. While this dissertation details the working of the magazine within anarchist circles and among non-anarchist audiences, it also examines the news coverage of some socialist and capitalist presses about *Mother Earth* and its activities. The views of these “outsiders” allow us to observe how, and to what extent, anarchism reached the general public. Their opinions free us from merely emphasizing the political “failure” of anarchist propaganda. The story of *Mother Earth* in this dissertation centers on its interactions with libertarian intellectual elites in the heyday of progressive reform. Only when we cover the opinions of both the “insiders” and the “outsiders” of *Mother Earth*’s anarchist propaganda can we have a balanced historical account of the organization and its influence on the cultural and political sphere.
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74 For the elaboration on *Mother Earth* core members’ “(counter)public-making,” see Chapter 1.
75 Brigitte Anne Koenig’s 2000 doctoral dissertation on American anarchism is a good contrast to my dissertation. While Koenig presents a detailed and comprehensive study of American anarchism—including political culture, sexual politics, literary politics, and the politics of community—from the late 1880s to WWI, she focuses on the anarchist world without paying attention to the non-anarchist audiences’ reaction to or reception of anarchism. Brigitte Anne Koenig, “American Anarchism.”
76 Lewis Gould, in his definition of the prime time during the Progressive Era, wrote that “Allowing for shrinkage at both ends [1897 and 1921], a single decade, from 1906 to the start of the war, encompasses the significant years of progressive achievement.” This “significant years” was exactly when *Mother Earth*’s inner circle actively pushed their anarchist propaganda. Lewis L. Gould ed., *The Progressive Era* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1974), 9.
This dissertation mobilizes a rich array of primary sources while engaging previous scholarship to illuminate the interplay of anarchist propaganda, Progressive America, and the world beyond. Chapter 1 brings to light the spaces in which *Mother Earth* carried out its anarchist propagandizing through the personal, social, and political landscape of New York City. The cultural-spatial development of its core members’ activities in Gotham reveals the interactions of radical ideas, daily practices, and social imaginaries that created the anarchist—albeit not exclusive—counterfamily and its counterpublic.

Chapter 2 analyzes how the synergy of *Mother Earth*’s magazine, the lecture tours, local events, and the MEPA literature broadened the nationwide anarchist sphere. Goldman’s annual tours for promoting her magazine decisively transfigured the nature of its anarchist propaganda. Lecturing on anarchism became inspiration and entertainment at once; propaganda could be both a dramatic performance and a source of intellectual enlightenment. Goldman’s oratory invited frequent debates with anarchist rivals, most often socialists. Debate was a double-edged sword for the anarchists, boosting their comrades’ morale while also playing into socialists’ desire to smear anarchism. The inner circle established the MEPA to issue anarchist literature so they could extend the intellectual (and hopefully political) effect of their lectures and debates. The mobile operation of *Mother Earth*’s multiform propaganda managed to weather frequent political-economic storms.

Chapter 3 brings *Mother Earth*’s transnational network into view to showcase how its core members tried to forge international revolutionary solidarity against the state and corporate powers. This chapter echoes several scholars’ emphasis on the central role of

---

The primary sources that this dissertation consults include the archival collections of the core members, letters, diaries, essay collections, anthologies, periodical press, and government documents, among others.
journals in associating and federating anarchist individuals and groups all over the world. Goldman and her comrades launched a counter-mainstream campaign through their international reporting and domestic activist propaganda. *Mother Earth*’s news coverage of the Russian and Mexican revolutions and the Japanese persecution of revolutionaries illustrated the core members’ rhetoric for attacking all authorities and uniting international social rebels.

While chapters 1 to 3 mark the ever-broadening geopolitical practices of the core members, the next two chapters develop the themes that drew popular attention and exerted intellectual effect on their audiences. Chapter 4 explicates the members’ defiance of the systems, customs, and beliefs that impeded sexual liberation and woman’s emancipation. While articulating a variety of concerns, they all advocated for gender equality, liberated intimacies and individual self-expression for both sexes. Goldman’s discourse on sex radicalism and her activism for birth control highlighted her commitment to woman’s sex autonomy as a key to personal emancipation and social revolution. Goldman and Berkman’s defense of homosexuality ratified an anarchist dedication to free sexuality. At the same time, both of them prioritized free heterosexual intimacies to challenge the existing sexuo-ethical order. Goldman’s subversive sex radicalism was the leading anarchist message of this sort disseminated outside of the Western world. East Asian intellectuals, however, conflated her sex radicalism with other Euro-American
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78 Scholars have demonstrated that anarchists used the periodical press to communicate ideas, advocate doctrines, and develop movements. For example, John Crump’s study of anarchism in interwar Japan reveals the critical role of journals in consolidating individuals with anarcho-communist belief. As he remarked, “Apart from their obvious propaganda function, these journals provided the movement with its public ‘face,’ and acted both as channels of communication and foci for coordinated activity by the otherwise dispersed anarchist communist groups.” John Crump, *Hatta Shūzō and Pure Anarchism in Interwar Japan* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993), 12-13. Brigitte Anne Koenig also states that: “For American anarchists, then, the community of the press acted as a substitute for party membership.” Koenig, “American Anarchism,” 28.
thinkers’ ideas under the category of “progressive ideas.” Japanese and Chinese intellectuals drew a similar iconoclastic import from a cohort of Western philosophies despite their ideological differences. The (stateless) anarchist premise of Goldman’s sex radicalism was somehow lost in translation. The dissemination of her sex radicalism disclosed both its potential and the risk it posed to *Mother Earth*’s attempts to spread anarchist propaganda in a non-Western context.

Chapter 5 examines the reciprocity between the core members’ free-speech and anti-militarist fights to demonstrate their shared principles and collaborative tactics for gaining universal freedom. Throughout the publication of *Mother Earth*, its members invented various tactics to counter legal, civilian, patriotic, corporate, and state violence. While these anarchists’ anti-militarist principles depended on free expression, their free-speech fights became anti-militaristic in practice. Their last battle—the anti-conscription campaign—crystallized their belief in the individual right to reject militarism and it helped fuel government suppression of radicalism.

The scope of *Mother Earth*’s propaganda transcended anarchist circles, the ranks of labor, and the Western Hemisphere. Its members’ words and deeds helped create a pervasive radical culture, which also expanded the interactions of America and the world. As a formidable minority among the American left, these anarchists encouraged a highly diverse audience to develop “the power to think and the desire to rebel.” Their anarchist messages, as we shall see, proved to be pervasive among non-anarchists beyond both Progressive America and their era.
CHAPTER 1
Germinating in New York:
An Ever-Broadening Anarchist Sphere

The activities of Mother Earth’s members in various spaces of New York created an ever-broadening but also contested anarchist sphere that spanned class, ethnic, gender, and age divides. These activities, both personal and collective, evinced the magazine’s propaganda and its members’ practice of anarchism. Goldman occupied several different dwellings while Mother Earth was in publication and her home always served as the core members’ office. There they created an anarchist communal household, a “Mother Earth family,” where they lived and toiled collectively. Household members experimented with cohabitation and collaboration to spread the anarchist lifestyle and propagate anarchism through diverse activities. Their use of space expanded the radius of anarcho-communist propaganda beyond its original immigrant, working-class, and ghetto circles.

This chapter charts the magazine members’ spatiotemporal movements in New York to illuminate the creation of their propaganda and the intellectual effects of anarchism on the city. These anarchists’ daily practices demonstrated their capacity and drive for self-expression, their ideological persuasiveness with varied audiences, and their engagement with class struggle and collective action. Their cohabitation for the sake of Mother Earth and anarchist propaganda illustrated how they related, cooperated, and put up with each other. The division of labor, free love romances, social networks, and mutualism within the headquarters epitomized the porous boundaries of their anarchist world. Some
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1 Thus far few scholars have pointed out the importance of space in the making of anarchist activities. Tom Goyens marks out the spaces and territories where German anarchists agitated in New York from 1880 to 1914; but he only focuses on the German radical circle. Tom Goyens, Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880-1914 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007).
core members feared losing the revolutionary edge of anarchism; yet Goldman continued to open membership to anyone who showed interest in anarchism. The ideological and spatial openness of the “Mother Earth family” in an urban setting distinguished itself from other rural, anarchist-exclusive communities. The spaces where core members used to produce texts and set up contexts reveal the material and ritualized practices that embodied their versions of anarchism. They selected a wide variety of venues for staging events so they could attract members who were not part of the orthodox constituency of anarchism.

Goldman’s inclusive approach to anarchism coincided with the open-mindedness of some progressive liberals, who found her analysis of social injustice, economic inequality, sex trade, modern drama, and free love compelling. Her friendship with cultural elites facilitated the events (co-)hosted by Mother Earth in respectable spaces like Carnegie Hall and midtown theatres that were not open to anarcho-communists before. The inner circle’s unfailing allegiance to labor and the underprivileged were manifest in their demonstrations in the streets or outdoor venues like Union Square.

The political spaces that Mother Earth’s core members carved out in the face of government suppression created an exceptionally heterogeneous audience for anarchism. Kathy Ferguson, in examining Goldman’s radical public space, defines this audience as the “counterpublic.” Her term refers to the multi-contextual spaces where they circulated ideas that challenged the exclusionary norms of the mainstream. The Anarchist counterpublic, in Ferguson’s analysis, emerged out of a triangle of political ideologies,
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2 The Home, an anarchist colony located on Puget Sound in Washington, was one of the most famous anarchist utopian communities in fin-de-siècle U.S. It was found in 1896 and dissolved around 1919. Other experimental anarchist communities included Aurora (California), Stelton (New Jersey), Mohegan (New York), and Sunrise (Michigan). For a detailed study, see Koenig, “American Anarchism,” 375-461.

social imaginaries, and bodily practices. She emphasized the textual counterpublic, who were “not just a group of people, but a collectivity organized by discourse” and capable of action.⁴ Goldman’s anarchist counterpublic, according to Ferguson, encompassed her “friends, acquaintances, and identifiable groups (such as militant unions, alternative theatre companies, anarchist colonies, radical educators, and civil libertarians) while extending further into the realm of strangers and operating under the surveillance of the authorities.”⁵ Ferguson outlines the spaces in which Goldman, her precursors and her comrades created anarchist counterpublics: salons, clubs, parks, unions, beer halls, journals, schools, prisons, print shops, and bookstores, among others.

Ferguson’s analysis of Goldman’s “anarchist public-making” illuminates the mechanism of anarchist movements while simplifying the contested terrain in which Goldman propagated anarchism. Anarchists were not the only group who used the public spaces where Ferguson’s so-called anarchist counterpublics emerged. Members of the anarchist counterpublic often overlapped with other radical counterpublics. Goldman and her comrades faced complex ideological competition as they worked to develop their counterpublics. From the prewar decade to WWI, accelerating immigration, industrialization, and urbanization resulted in significant social and economic problems. Anarchism stood at one extreme of the spectrum of problem-solving programs, vying with a variety of ideologies to build public support for radical social change. The conditions in prewar New York fostered an unusual level of cooperation for radicals of
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⁵ Kathy E. Ferguson, *Emma Goldman*, 73.
varied ideological leanings. Intellectuals of the new generation rebelled against genteel tradition, demanding self-expression, artistic creativity, and social justice despite their different backgrounds. They embraced the liberating messages from diverse radical schools, be it socialism, feminism, syndicalism, single tax, psychoanalysis, or anarchism. Their ideological eclecticism produced a fertile yet competitive ground for anarchists like Goldman, who started to target them as her potential audience. Ferguson highlights the partial convergence, but understates the tension between Goldman’s anarchism and other radical groups in recruiting members from the same audience.

This chapter analyzes the contested and hybrid nature of the radical counterpublics to assess the *Mother Earth* members’ performance at spreading anarchist messages. I unpack Ferguson’s notion of the anarchist counterpublic from the perspective of the inner circle by categorizing three types of spaces where people gathered to forge an anarchist sphere in New York. The first type of space was “family” space, the base for which was the magazine’s headquarters. It also included the venues where core members held “family events,” such as the magazine’s annual reunions and memorial services for anarchist martyrs. The second type, “friendly” space included places where core members’ anarchist messages gained a responsive reception. Various radical and liberal groups, including the Liberal Club and Ferrer Center, hosted anarchists in these spaces. The third type, “competing” space featured a variety of places where the core members’ potential

---


7 The notion of “genteel tradition” was propagated by the philosopher and poet George Santayana in his 1911 essay “The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy.” Scholars studying the prewar radicalism have referred the term of “genteel tradition” to the dominating norm in American literature and art espousing idealism, moral progress, political conservatism, which was challenged by the new generation who demanded “literary realism, artistic experimentation, or social criticism” in the early twentieth century. Wertheim, *The New York Little Renaissance*, 3; Ellery Sedgwick iii, “The American Genteel Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century,” *American Studies* 25:1 (Spring 1984): 49-67.

8 Kathy Ferguson, “Anarchist Counterpublics.”
rivals and the non-anarchist public gathered. It ranged from respectable salons and theatres to the outdoor space of Union Square. *Mother Earth*’s inner circle worked to make these spaces into venues, even if temporarily, congenial for promoting anarchist agendas.

A nuanced study of these three spaces sheds light on the operation of *Mother Earth* in the culturally-diversified, socially-stratified environment of New York. This analysis allows me to account for a mixture of class, ideology, gender, ethnicity, region, and age factors in characterizing the public that *Mother Earth* reached. Its members’ spatiotemporal practices in New York laid the groundwork for its propaganda quartet to develop a national and transnational audience. The behavior of core members in different socio-cultural spaces pointed to the variations in anarchist etiquette, self-projection, and spirit embodied in the philosophy of *Mother Earth*. Their efforts attracted a growing non-anarchist public and anarchist sympathizers who, however, did not share their anarchist vision of a stateless society.

**Living and Working for *Mother Earth*: The Birth of an Anarchist Counterfamily**

In 1906, Emma Goldman created a new kind of anarchist journalism. To begin with, she was the first female publisher in New York’s anarcho-communist press. Goldman could rightly claim *Mother Earth* as her “baby,” as she was its sole proprietor, publisher, and one of its editors. Her next invention was to locate *Mother Earth*’s office in her lodging place. “My room was the living-room, dining-room, and *Mother Earth* office, all in one,”

---

9 Lucy Parsons, a veteran anarchist and the wife of Albert Parsons (one of the executed anarchists after the 1886 Haymarket affair), was the first female publisher in the U.S. anarcho-communist press. She issued and edited the weekly, *The Liberator*, from 1905 to 1906, in Chicago. Longa, *Anarchist Periodicals in English Published in the United States (1833–1955)*, 122-126.
Goldman recorded. Either out of financial concern or editorial convenience, she hosted an increasing numbers of lodgers toiling for her magazine in her flat. Their cohabitation bonded them into an unconventional “family.” Germinating from the physical space of its headquarters in New York, Mother Earth went on to forge an extended, symbolic counterfamily animated with anarchist spirit. Last but not least, Goldman courted native-born intellectuals in order to win their support for the workers’ social revolution. The result was the creation of a multi-ethnic, cross-class, and not exclusively anarchist counterpublic.

These new features of anarchist journalism first converged in Goldman’s flat at 210 East 13th Street (referred to hereafter as 210), the birth place of Mother Earth. (Images 4 and 5) Before 1906, Goldman had lived through seventeen years of turmoil as an anarchist in New York. Upon her arrival in Gotham alone in August 1899, she settled in the Lower East Side, the Russian Jewish enclave. Her numerous, mostly involuntary moves from one residence to the next reflected her vulnerability as an anarchist agitator. The worst situation occurred after Leon Czolgosz, a self-proclaimed anarchist assassinated President William McKinley in September 1901. Czolgosz’s claim that Goldman’s lectures inspired his actions triggered public condemnation and police arrest. Soon the police had to release her for lack of evidence. The stigma that burdened Goldman, however, kept her from finding accommodations and from using her real name. For a few years, Goldman adopted the pseudonym “E. G. Smith” and involved herself in fewer anarchist activities. During this period, she started to associate with middle-class liberal figures. Their friendship began after their joint free-speech protest against the 1903 Federal anti-anarchist Immigration

11 Wexler, Emma Goldman, 103-112.
12 Goldman was forced to live under an alias, “E. G. Smith,” for several years since late 1901. Drinnon, Rebel in Paradise, 68-77.
210, a rental flat that Goldman moved into in 1903, was no stranger to a social mixture of new friends and old comrades. Prominent supporters of Russian freedom, for instance, had crowded into her little home around 1905. In early 1906, Goldman, her comrades and friends met in 210 and gave birth to her magazine venture.

The cultural geography and communal milieu of 210 anticipated the socio-ethical vanguardism that Emma designed for *Mother Earth*. Non-anarchist intellectuals and avant-garde artists could easily visit the inner circle at 210 thanks to its proximity to Greenwich Village. The constant exchange of new ideas about art and society in 210 encouraged Emma to publish a magazine that offered “a place of expression for the young...

---

14 For more discussion of the 1905 Russian Revolution, which stirred great protest against the Tsar and support of Russian revolutionists in America, see Chapter 3.
17 In order to showcase the closeness of the members in the “*Mother Earth* family,” I refer to the magazine’s core members by their first name in the rest of the chapter.
idealists in art and letters.”

Many writers and artists who had been guests at 210 later contributed to Mother Earth. The spatial arrangement and lifestyle in 210 created a new moral code that led to the growth of the Mother Earth counterfamily. 210 was already a place for communal living before Emma started her magazine. Her niece Stella Comyn joined 210 around 1905; later came her good friend Max Baginski and his family. Max was a German émigré anarchist and seasoned journalist from Chicago. He became Mother Earth’s first editor and strongly supported Emma’s incorporation of art and drama into anarchist propaganda. Emma’s hospitable character instilled an open and liberal spirit in the daily life of 210 and her magazine.

While admitting new inhabitants in 210 who became related to the work of Mother Earth, Goldman transformed the household into a counterfamily. The lead writers of older anarcho-communist papers at most identified themselves as “groups.” The home of Abe Issak, where he, his wife and three children together issued Firebrand (1895-1897) and Free Society (1897-1904), featured a traditional nuclear family. By contrast, the foundation of the Mother Earth family was not biological kin, parents, and progeny. The members living in 210 were bound by their voluntary commitment to anarchism, instead of legal or biological ties (except Emma and Stella). They upheld the anarchist principle of personal freedom from parental authorities. From 1906 on, Max, Rebecca (Becky) Edelsohn (a young anarchist), Alexander Berkman (Sasha, Emma’s onetime lover and

---

20 Max and Emma met in 1893 and gradually formed an intimate friendship. For Max’s short biography and his role and writings in Mother Earth, see Madden, “Home of Lost Dogs,” 136-193.
21 Moran, “Propaganda Work,” 24-93. John Coryell, one of Mother Earth’s founding members, had defined that a family “is a group of persons composed of parents and their offspring.” By this definition, Issak’s family/office did not counter the conventional notion of family. John R. Coryell, “The Family versus the Home,” Mother Earth 3:2 (Apr. 1908): 85-96.
lifelong comrade), Ben Reitman (Emma’s lover and *Mother Earth*’s business manager), and a few others came to live at 210 one after another.22

The replacement of hierarchy and a gendered division of labor with comradeship, solidarity, and equality among the cohabitants of 210 countered the normative values of a typical family. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, family represented the core of the private sphere, a (middle-class-oriented) feminized and reproductive space. In the anarchist household of *Mother Earth*, women not only joined men in productive labor, but also assumed the role of the breadwinner. Goldman and her inner circle used 210 in a way that led to the creation of their new counterfamily. In its space, the public-private divide vanished; political missions entangled with private relationships. Hobos mingled with professionals; immigrants associated with native born Americans. Biological family members mixed with comrades, (ex-)lovers, and friends for the common cause of popularizing anarchism. The daily life and propaganda work at 210 were experiments in living out the anarchist ideal of harmonizing individual freedom and social solidarity.

The members at 210 embodied the anarchist spirit of inclusion in their family and their nonconformist views of gender and space. In principle, Emma had the right to admit or turn away any certain member to her flat; but her generosity diminished her ability to demand privacy. Besides core members, the counterfamily at 210 constantly took in comrades, friends, strangers, and vagabonds. The nonexistence of personal space and privacy for women was striking. “I slept in a little alcove behind my bookcase,” Emma

---

22 Emma had explained in her autobiography that Becky had been arrested at one of their anarchist meetings, which led to her expulsion from high school. Emma invited her to 210 after knowing that Becky’s home conditions were desperately poor. Becky joined 210 in sometime around 1906. Goldman, *Living My Life*, Vol. I, 438.
recalled; “There was always someone sleeping in front, someone who had stayed too late and lived too far away or who was too shaky on his feet and needing cold compresses or who had no home to go to.”

Emma enjoyed her motherly role and the familial ambience of 210, where she received her “children” without discrimination. Her friend, the journalist Hutchins Hapgood, nicknamed 210 the “home of lost dogs.” In his autobiography, Hapgood once described a group of male and female anarchists who “naturally bunked up together at the most convenient places” after attending a ball and without means to go home,

so that men and women often found themselves sleeping together without any amorous intent. I being a member of the bourgeois class, had some difficulty in seeing this as perfectly natural; but it didn’t take me very long to discover that these anarchists felt a very sharp distinction between sleeping together designedly or by mere force of circumstances. They frequently got together because of their ideas or because of the normal temperamental accident; but they really did seem to be free from the sex convention which, because a man and a woman were together, made it necessary for them to embrace one another.

Hapgood’s account betrayed a bourgeois perception of anarchistic attitudes towards space, sex, and comrades. As much as Hapgood called himself an “intellectual anarchist,” he was aware of and confined by his Victorian moral values while living in the modern world.

He praised the inner circle for breaking convention in matters of sex and morality. They chose to act on their anarchist beliefs. His comments actually exposed his ignorance of the reality that poor men and women often slept together without sexual contact in their daily lives. From Hapgood’s bourgeois perspective, the anarchists in 210 were exercising a new sense of spatial freedom and gender solidarity. The spirit of fraternity and free expression

liberated these anarchists from the gender norms that drew spatial boundaries around the sexes. For Emma and her comrades, it would be immoral not to shelter those who needed help. Hapgood’s frequent visits to 210 probably led to his conclusion that “their [the anarchists’] morality seemed different and better than that of the ordinary man of the world.”

The counterfamily at 210 embraced the anarchistic vision of common property, comradely love, and teamwork. The material condition of 210 was far from comfortable; “there were no facilities for heating at 210, except the kitchen stove, and my room was farthest from it,” recalled Emma. These members, who were mostly working class and low-income radicals, were used to the scarcity of material comforts and the rhythms of sharing their resources. Everyone at 210 worked for *Mother Earth* and its propaganda in one way or another. Consequently, the income from the magazine—if there was any—provided for all who lived and labored at 210. Emma was the real provider, touring the country annually to promote *Mother Earth* and sustain the household. Four male core members, Max, Sasha, Harry Kelly, and Hippolyte Havel, were in charge of the office work. Their belief in the anarcho-communist principle of mutual aid prevailed at 210, turning outsiders into insiders. Bill Haywood, the labor union leader and militant socialist, felt at home in 210, where “he could read and rest to his heart’s content, or drink coffee” as Emma remembered.

The amicable atmosphere of *Mother Earth*’s office attracted visits from younger radicals, enabling constant recruitment of novices for the anarchist movement. There they found comradely warmth, intellectual enlightenment, and a sense of community. Many of

---

them came to read (there were a lot of books) and interact with others. They volunteered to help run office tasks and general logistics, regular activities, and impromptu campaigns.\textsuperscript{30} Russian Jewish immigrant Isidore Wisotsky was among them. “I was working in the [*Mother Earth*] office,” he recalled, “packing books to be shipped out.” “Many people used to come up to say hello,” he continued, “or to buy a book, or to pay their subscription.”\textsuperscript{31} Some mainstream newspapers captured certain literary elements in 210 when revealing to readers what the “living space” of anarchists (particularly Goldman) looked like. A reporter of the politically conservative New York *Sun* described 210 as such: “The place is bright and sunny, the book cases are filled with the newest output of advanced literature and there is a vase of pink roses in the middle of a table heaped promiscuously with manuscripts and letters.”\textsuperscript{32} Big dailies like the *New York Times* had similar observations. Quoting some other tenants in the same building, the reporter depicted 210 as “a ‘queer place’” and noticed two “unusual” things there. Namely “the group had an unusual number of books” and “there were an unusual number of persons coming and going to and from the flat.”\textsuperscript{33} The “queer” reputation of 210 even led gamblers in the neighborhood to come by asking for help with the belief that “the police may look for bombs, but never for chips” at Emma’s place.\textsuperscript{34}

*Mother Earth’s* office and textual space experienced changes after the arrival of Sasha (Alexander Berkman) in May 1906. Sasha was a Russian Jewish immigrant who

\textsuperscript{31} Isidore Wisotsky, *Such a Life*, Autobiographical typescript, Tamiment Library, New York University, 148.
became an anarchist after the Haymarket affair of 1886 just like Emma.\(^{35}\) Their close comradeship lasted from 1889 till Sasha committed suicide in 1936 out of painful illness. In 1892, Sasha made an attempt on the life of Henry Frick, the chairman of the Carnegie Steel Company, for his union-breaking tactics that led to the bloody suppression of steel strikers in Homestead, Pennsylvania.\(^{36}\) The attempt failed and Sasha served fourteen years of a twenty-two year prison term between 1892 and 1906. As Sasha’s secret accomplice, Emma carried a moral cross while growing into an anarchist leader during his absence.\(^{37}\) Her eagerness to help Sasha start his new life met with serious challenges. Sasha suffered from social anxiety after his long-term incarceration, and he found 210 to be an uncomfortable place. The non-anarchist visitors particularly irritated him, because he felt they turned 210 into “a sort of salon.”\(^{38}\) Emma’s resolve to look after Sasha, combined with his temporary inability to make a living, kept him at 210. In March 1907, Emma made Sasha the editor of *Mother Earth* to revive him.\(^{39}\) The gradually regenerated Sasha demonstrated his proficiency in editorial work.\(^{40}\) He also developed the printing of *Mother Earth* propaganda by founding the Mother Earth Publishing Association (MEPA). Sasha became more important to the magazine as time went on. In 1908, the *New York Times* labeled *Mother Earth*, “the organ of the Berkman-Goldman creed.”\(^{41}\)

\(^{35}\) Paul Avrich & Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 21-23.


\(^{39}\) Emma Goldman, “Notice,” *Mother Earth* 2:1 (Mar. 1907): 1. The front page of *Mother Earth*’s March 1908 issue presented Sasha as the co-publisher. But before the December 1908 issue showed his official title as the editor, he had been at helm of the magazine for more than one and a half year.


With his editor position and growing importance in the 210 household, Sasha transformed *Mother Earth* and the atmosphere of its headquarters in two important ways. First, he skewed the magazine’s early program of fusing politics and art to devote more attention to socioeconomic issues and labor strikes. Having failed to issue a revolutionary labor weekly in 1907, Sasha made *Mother Earth* an alternative voice to serve his militant project of social revolution. Second, Sasha initiated love affairs that complicated the workings of the *Mother Earth* family and strained the harmony at 210. He first developed an intergenerational relationship with Becky, who joined the 210 family around late 1907. Sasha shared a similar revolutionary affinity with Becky to the workers’ fights. He found Emma too bourgeois in her approach to spreading anarchism. Sasha’s intimacy with the teenage Becky upset Emma. She managed to put up with this romance when it grew within their shared communal space. Sasha, however, did not extend the same tolerance to Emma’s new lover Ben Reitman. A hobo and medical doctor from Chicago, Ben met and fell in love with Emma during her tour there in 1908. He followed her across the country, becoming her tour manager and, later,  

---

42 Sasha had in fact written to Emma in 1905, urging that it was imperative to “win for our ideas Americans of the intelligent middle class, rather than the masses.” Sasha did not dwell on that thought for too long. No sooner had he taken over *Mother Earth* than he found that his true calling was to fight for and with the workers. Alexander Berkman to Emma Goldman, March 12, 1905, cited from *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II*, 150-154.


Mother Earth’s business manager. Ben’s boastful, frivolous personality and lack of rebel spirit annoyed Emma’s anarchist comrades after he joined 210 in late 1908. Sasha judged Ben’s temperament unworthy of the anarchist title that Ben called himself and Emma’s love. Sasha felt justified in his romance with Becky because she was a devoted anarchist like himself. Sasha still worked with Ben, but they were reluctant colleagues rather than brotherly comrades.

When the atmosphere at 210 grew tense and unnerving, members escaped to a little farm, turning it into another productive space for creating anarchist texts. The farm near Ossining, thirty-five miles away from Manhattan, was a gift to Emma from her attorney friend Bolton Hall. The farm had no water supply and was “old and shaky” as Emma described, but she and her comrades enjoyed its idyllic surroundings and serenity. The farm served as core members’ temporary lodging, country getaway, and writing retreat. Ben aptly called the farm “the country club of the ‘210’ group.” The farm was Mother Earth’s rural headquarters, an extending space from its urban base. Sasha and Emma both used the farm to work on book drafts that would have been very hard to write in the crowded confines of 210. There, Emma also prepared many of her lectures and articles, often with Sasha’s help. Escaping to a secluded space like this farm helped the family members be productive and eased the tensions of their living situation.


50 Ben Reitman, “Following the Monkey,” 258.
51 Berkman had worked on his Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist (published in 1912) and Emma had worked on her Anarchism and Other Essays (1910) and The Social Significance of the Modern Drama (1914) in the farm.
52 Berkman’s diary entries offered an intriguing account of how the country atmosphere eased his mood: “I long for peace. And it seems so disharmonious to continue these petty quarrels on this idyllic peace. This time I feel no antagonistic toward Ben.” Alexander Berkman, Diary, Oct, 21, 1910.
Temporary retreat to the rural space, however, was not enough to solve 210’s overcrowding and increasing tensions between the members. After an attempt to separate the living and work space failed, Emma began to look for a new home. She found a ten-room house at 74 West 119th Street (referred to hereinafter as 74) with cheaper rent than that of 210. Located in Harlem, 74 had a parlor that could contain up to one hundred people, which made it ideal for small sessions and social gatherings. Its spacious basement served as Mother Earth’s office and a book shop that Ben wanted to start. The rooms on the upper floors offered the individual privacy that 210 lacked. The 74 household even had a phone (number Harlem, 6194) that helped expedite the magazine’s office work. In late September 1913, 74 replaced 210 as Mother Earth’s new headquarters. Four new members—Ben’s mother Ida Reitman, Emma’s nephew Saxe Commins, the new secretary Eleanor Fitzgerald (known as “Fitzi”), and the housekeeper Rhoda Smith—joined the old ones. Regrettably, love and politics continued to entangle the counterfamily. Fitzi, who was Ben’s ex-lover, became Sasha’s new love. Ida Reitman’s presence seriously strained the relationship between Emma and Ben. Ben ended up having an affair with Anna Martindale, a woman he met at the bookshop at 74, which resulted in Emma’s decision to end their romantic relationship.

The relocation of the “family” to Harlem opened up a new sphere of activity for Mother Earth’s members in Uptown Manhattan. (Map 1) Harlem was undergoing rapid

53 From January 1911 to September 1913, Mother Earth’s office and MEPA was moved to 55 West 28th Street with 210 remaining the core members’ living quarters. The office and MEPA would be merged again with the core members’ living quarters when they moved to 74 at October 1913.
56 The existing members in 210 included Emma, Sasha, Ben, Becky, and Stella.
57 For a biographical sketch of Eleanor Fitzgerald (1877-1955), see Paul Avrich & Karen Avrich, Sasha and Emma, 215-216.
transformation at the time. New water supply, lighting, improved sanitation, and transportation boosted the area’s growth. Once a rising and respectable white community, it became a “Negro ghetto” by the early 1900s. Though moving to Harlem seemed to provide an opportunity for core members to reach its African-American residents, their activities mainly took place in the Jewish and Italian sectors located in East Harlem (east of Fifth Avenue and bordered around 110th Street to the south). The black community spread further north and west of East Harlem. Still, *Mother Earth*’s local events brought anarchism to growing numbers of English- and Yiddish-speaking Harlemites. The inner circle welcomed the New Year of 1914 with a big party at 74. A house full of social rebels, men of letters and bohemians debated subjects like philosophy, art, sex, and social theories that typified *Mother Earth*’s repertoire of topics.

The magazine members closely associated with several other institutions in Harlem that disseminated radical and liberating ideas. The proximity of 74 to Columbia University helped the counterfamily make connections with students. Gray Wu, a Columbia student from Canton, China, was one of the newcomers to 74. Wu studied philosophy with John Dewey when he took an interest in anarchism and visited 74. He cooked Chinese food in the kitchen of 74 for *Mother Earth*’s parties.

---


62 John Dewey was a prominent American philosopher and exponent of progressive educational reform. He was a friend of Emma. For Gray Wu’s biological sketch and anecdotes, see Avrich, *Anarchist Voices*, 213, 230, 286; for Dewey, see 493 n163.
Emma’s drama lecture series and Sasha’s campaigns for the unemployed and anti-militarism in 1914 marked the Mother Earth family’s major events in the time they lived at 74. Emma’s lectures on European modern drama acquainted many (wo)men of arts and letters with anarchist ideas in Harlem, Midtown, and Lower Manhattan. During the surge of unemployment and labor strikes in early 1914, Sasha led numerous anti-capitalist campaigns through the propaganda of Mother Earth. Anarchist and labor’s intensified activism provoked severer capitalist counterattacks and government suppression. In April 1914, Sasha, Fitzi, Becky, and Leonard Abbott formed the Anti-Militarist League,

headquartered in 74, to protest the escalating violence against workers and a fever of jingoism against Mexico fed by the mainstream press.\textsuperscript{64}

While 74 functioned as a hub of anarchist activities, the counterfamily suffered from infiltration of government spies who challenged its open and trusting atmosphere. In 1914, a teenage anarchist spy Donald Vose came to 74 and betrayed two “family” friends. The police wanted to arrest labor activists Matthew Schmidt and David Caplan for their involvement in the 1910 bombing of the \textit{Los Angeles Times} building. Vose, whose mother Gertie was a longtime friend of Emma’s, grew up in Home Colony, WA, an anarchist community. Detective William J. Burns recruited the then-teenage Donald Vose to work as a spy for him.\textsuperscript{65} In 1914, Vose went to New York with a mission; he stayed at 74, where he encountered Schmidt and exposed the latter’s whereabouts to Burns.\textsuperscript{66} Emma inadvertently caused the arrest of Schmidt and Caplan by letting Vose stay at 74. She detailed this “betrayal” in \textit{Mother Earth} with great anger, denouncing Vose as a “liar, traitor, [and] spy.”\textsuperscript{67} The danger of infiltration by spies and informants threatened the security of \textit{Mother Earth} household.\textsuperscript{68} The looming menace of betrayal in turn strengthened the solidarity of its members against the authorities.

Within a year, the spacious household in 74 collapsed because of a financial crisis, Emma’s break up with Ben, and the unresolved tensions among her, Sasha, Fitzi, and

\textsuperscript{64} James McLane, “Anti-Militarist Activities in New York,” \textit{Mother Earth} 9:3 (May 1914): 82-85. For more discussion about the U.S.-Mexico relations, see Chapter 3; for more discussion about the Anti-Militarist League, see Chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{65} For the detailed account of Vose as a spy, see Paul Avrich & Karen Avrich, \textit{Sasha and Emma}, 244-251.
\textsuperscript{66} According to Jacques Rudome, a French immigrant who had frequented \textit{Mother Earth}’s offices and the Ferrer Center in Harlem, Schmidt worked as a carpenter “fixing up the offices of \textit{Mother Earth}” when he was in hiding in New York City. See Paul Avrich, \textit{Anarchist Voices}, 270-272.
\textsuperscript{68} Ferguson, \textit{Emma Goldman}, 119-120, note 54.
Becky.\textsuperscript{69} Government violence against labor strikers and the unemployed provoked Sasha and he plotted his revenge.\textsuperscript{70} Sasha felt it was legitimate to use \textit{Mother Earth}’s revenue for anti-authoritarian campaigns. But in so doing, he depleted the magazine’s funds. “The house in my absence had been turned into a free-for-all lodging- and feeding-place,” Emma described the messy condition of 74 after returning from her tour in September 1914.\textsuperscript{71} In October, she moved to a loft at 20 East 125th Street (referred to hereinafter as 20) and took over \textit{Mother Earth}’s editorship. Sasha and Fitzi soon left on a cross-country tour. In January 1916, they published a revolutionary labor weekly, \textit{The Blast}, in San Francisco.

The culture and make-up of \textit{Mother Earth}’s headquarters at 20, from October 1914 through June 1917, demonstrate that the counterfamily’s communal experiment was waning. 20 had two rooms, one for Emma’s bedroom and the other for \textit{Mother Earth}’s office.\textsuperscript{72} Emma lived alone except for her fellow tenant and old friend, Steward Kerr. The magazine’ heavy workload and its varied activities still brought numerous helpers streaming in and out of 20. Saxe, Max, and two new secretaries, Anna Baron and Pauline H. Turkel, were among them.\textsuperscript{73} Nonetheless, the commune that once comprised the core of the \textit{Mother Earth} counterfamily was essentially gone. Emma later admitted that “[R]eadjustment to the altered conditions involved many hardships.”\textsuperscript{74}


\textsuperscript{70} Paul Avrich & Karen Avrich, \textit{Sasha and Emma}, 217-236.


\textsuperscript{72} Emma Goldman to Ben Reitman, Sept. 25, 1914, in \textit{The Emma Goldman Papers}, reel 8.


\textsuperscript{74} Goldman, \textit{Living My Life, Vol. II}, 546.
hardships was her fading romance with Ben, though he continued to assist with the 
magazine’s work and her tours.

Paradoxically, although *Mother Earth*’s family commune ceased to exist, its 
non-anarchist public grew. Emma’s birth control campaign in 1915 led to an increasing 
demand for anarchist literature nationwide and heightened public support.\textsuperscript{75} The 
celebration of *Mother Earth*’s tenth anniversary in March 1915, along with the issuance of 
its “souvenir number” edition, was a momentous occasion for Emma. The homage 
liberals and radicals paid to the magazine exhibited its unique identity. Orthodox 
anarchists repudiated *Mother Earth* while many non-anarchist intellectuals appreciated it.\textsuperscript{76} Emma considered these tributes from supporters in America and abroad evidence of “the 
niche in people's hearts my child [*Mother Earth*] had made for itself.\textsuperscript{77}

During the period Goldman lived at 20, she focused on sex radicalism and, later on, 
various forms of anti-militarism. In late 1916, Emma reunited with Sasha and Fitzi, who 
moved the office of *The Blast* from San Francisco to the upper floor of 20 to continue 
their embattled propaganda work.\textsuperscript{78} Together, *Mother Earth* and *The Blast* defended 
labor activists held responsible for the Preparedness Day bombing in San Francisco on 
July 22, 1916 while fighting for free speech and against militarism. Soon after America 
entered the war in April 1917, Sasha and Emma organized a No-Conscription League. (See 
Chapter 5) On June 15, 1917, the U.S. Congress passed the Espionage Act. It allowed the 
U.S. Post Office to keep treasonous publications from circulating through the mail.

---

\textsuperscript{75} Wexler, *Emma Goldman*, 223.
\textsuperscript{78} The bomb explosion in the Preparedness Day parade in San Francisco in July 22, 1916 had led to a new 
wave of arresting and harassing anarchists in California, for which Sasha’s *The Blast* had suffered 
suppression. In May 1917, *The Blast* was issued from New York, which office address was 20, the same as *Mother Earth*. 
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Individuals who violated the Espionage Act could be punished with prison sentences ranging from two years to life, or a fine of up to $10,000, or both.\(^{79}\) That same day, federal authorities raided 20 without a warrant. They arrested Emma and Sasha and charged them with conspiring against the Draft Act. The trial, in which they defended themselves, began on June 27. On July 9, the jury declared both guilty and the judge issued each of them a two-year prison sentence and a $10,000 fine.\(^{80}\) After the trial, Fitzi, Stella, and Carl Newlander (a young Swedish anarchist) worked hard to sustain *Mother Earth*. Later in July, the landlord forced the remaining core members out of 20. They moved the office to 226 Lafayette Street in Lower Manhattan.

*Mother Earth* folded in September 1917 after the postal authorities denied its second-class mailing privileges. Yet Emma, who was out on bail pending the Supreme Court verdict of their appeal, had not given up on her magazine venture.\(^{81}\) The next month, Emma reincarnated the magazine as an eight-page circular, entitled the *Mother Earth Bulletin*. On the front page of the first issue, Emma called the *Mother Earth Bulletin* “the wee Babe of Mother Earth.” She appealed to the readers to support her new magazine as they did “its mother.”\(^{82}\) Emma and Sasha’s appeal failed in January 1918; they both started their two-year prison terms in February. The same month, Stella and Carl established the Mother Earth Book Shop at 4 Jones Street to circulate radical books.

---


\(^{80}\) For the proceedings of the trial, see *Trial and Speeches of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (New York: Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1917). Also see Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman*, 232-236.

\(^{81}\) Emma was released from prison on bail for appeal, Sasha was facing another indictment involving the bomb explosion on a Preparedness Day parade in San Francisco on July 22, 1916. Emma spared no effort to successfully prevent Sasha from being extradited to California. On November 14, 1917, Sasha was freed from the Tombs in New York City pending the Supreme Court verdict of their appeal. Wexler, *Emma Goldman*, 236-241; Paul Avrich & Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 278-281.

and pamphlets. The *Mother Earth Bulletin* folded in April because of government suppression. On May 16, 1918, the U.S. Congress passed the Sedition Act, as an extension of the Espionage Act, to suppress speech against the government or the war. Later those convicted (up to two thousand individuals) under these two Acts received heavier prison sentences, ranging from two to ten years, than Emma and Sasha had. Following the closure of the bookshop in July 1918, the twelve-year old *Mother Earth* venture came to an end.

By living and working together, the *Mother Earth* counterfamily featured an anarchist commune dedicating to the common cause of social revolution. The shared living constantly tested the compatibility of individual needs and collective goods. Uncongenial personalities or same-sex competition (like Sasha versus Ben and Emma versus Becky) challenged the family’s harmony. And yet, these distinct individuals helped each other and stood together against authorities at all times. Some of the young members cherished the security and fraternal love that they found there. Although Emma was torn between her craving for personal privacy and her motherly proclivity to look after people, she was proud to see her place become an oasis in the desert of many members’ lives. The inner circle lived out the principle of “all for one and one for all” in order to sustain the magazine. “MOTHER EARTH represents quite a family,” Goldman told its readers, “with each one demonstrating his kinship, we could easily weather the storm.”

The family members’ commitment to put anarchism into practice was the kinship Emma

---

referred to. Their counterpublic developed in multi-contextual spaces, which enabled people to circulate counter discourses and formulate identities that challenged existing institutions.  

**Forging Anarchist Solidarity: Mother Earth’s Family Events**

Emma referred to *Mother Earth* both as a child and as the mother of its supporters, which helped them to conceive of themselves, and relate to one another, as members of an extended family. She described her magazine as a “child” to appeal to fraternal love. “MOTHER EARTH is such a child,” she told the readers, “begotten by a great, intense love, the love for Freedom, for human Justice.” When welcoming the family members to join their reunion events, she utilized the magazine’s motherly image to “invite her children to joyous forgetfulness of the troubles of life.” *Mother Earth*’s “family events” consisted of its regular family reunions, anniversaries, and anarchist martyr memorial services. These events were predominantly anarchistic in spirit as opposed to other occasions, such as Goldman’s lectures and free-speech or birth-control campaigns, that were not designed exclusively for anarchists.

A diversified group of sympathizers from New York and its vicinity attended *Mother Earth*’s family events. As Map 2 shows, the core members hosted the family events at venues in the Lower East Side and East Harlem where they lived. Jewish and Italian immigrants were the main participants in audiences; but radicals and liberals of all shades also actively attended these events. A long list of social elites including attorney Gilbert Roe, journalist Hutchins Hapgood, reformer James G. Phelps Stokes, writer Ernest Crosby,  

---

90 “Advertisement: Mother Earth Masquerade Ball,” *Mother Earth* 1:9 (Nov. 1906).
Map 2: Locations of the “Mother Earth Family” Activities in New York City (1906-1917)

1. American Palace Hall
2. Everett Hall
3. Forward Hall
4. Grand Manhattan Hall
5. Lenox Casino
6. Lexington Hall
7. Manhattan Lyceum
8. Mt. Morris Hall
9. Progress Assembly rooms
10. Royal Lyceum
11. Terrace Lyceum
12. Webster Hall
artist Robert Henri, and socialist William English Walling connected to *Mother Earth* through Emma. They visited her place, attended *Mother Earth*’s family events, and contributed to the magazine in their own ways. Some of them were philosophical anarchists, susceptible to anarchist ideas while refraining themselves from any violent means for the ideal. Most of them subscribed to *Mother Earth* in support of free speech and radical thought. In the eyes of the mainstream press, their presence at *Mother Earth*’s events increased the gatherings’ respectability and lessened the possibility of violence.  

As a rule, core members chose the locations for their “family” events by the decency, cleanliness, and crowd capacity of the venues. The rapidly growing subway and railway system increased the members’ choices of venue across New York. Usually, Emma favored popular, big, and tastefully maintained halls to host the family events. Terrace Lyceum at 206 E. Broadway met these requirements. Located at the heart of the Lower East Side, it featured a dining room for up to 2,000 guests at the first floor and a dancing hall upstairs that could hold 1,000 people. Another one, Grand Manhattan Hall at 309-311 Grand Street, had an even larger capacity of up to 3,000 people. Lenox Casino at 102 West 116th Street, then owned by the Harlem Liberal Alliance, was also

---

91 Mabel Dodge’s description of Hutchins Hapgood’s “help” with his anarchist friends like Emma and Sasha was worth noting: “he [Hapgood] did a great deal to make their [Emma and Sasha’s] cause weaker, in a way, because, by writing sympathetically of them, he helped remove the terror of them from people’s minds. He was always bringing different kinds of people together and neutralizing their power.” Luhan, *Movers and Shakers*, 59.

92 Emma had made it clear that she could not stand dirty halls and prefer clean and respectable ones. See Emma Goldman, “On the Road (Continuation),” *Mother Earth* 2:3 (May 1907): 128-135.

93 Since the late 1870s, the north-south lines of elevated railways were built in the city of New York, reaching from the Battery Park down south to Harlem and even Bronx. In October 27, 1904, the first subway line in New York was open to the public. See New York Chamber of Commerce, *Rapid Transit in New York City and in Other Great Cities* (New York: New York Chamber of Commerce, 1906), 49-51. “Subway Opening To-day with Simple Ceremony,” *New York Times*, Oct. 27, 1904.


among Emma’s favorite venues.\textsuperscript{96} Built in 1905, Lenox Casino became one of the first pornographic movie theaters in Gotham in 1912.\textsuperscript{97} Emma liked the beautiful ballroom in the hall of Lenox Casino as it was well suited for hosting celebratory events.\textsuperscript{98} \textit{Mother Earth}’s “Red Revel” Ball in 1915 at Lenox Casino proved to be a phenomenal success.\textsuperscript{99} Its advertisement in \textit{Mother Earth} stressed that red, the symbolic color of anarchy, “will predominate in costume or any other form.”\textsuperscript{100} Emma noted after the ball that about eight hundred people turned out, “representing as many different languages as can only be found in New York City.” She was proud that “there were also to be found every profession from the dramatist, painter, composer, poet, actor, to the scavenger. All had a wonderful time.”\textsuperscript{101} Guido Bruno, a Greenwich Village figure and small press publisher, recorded that “many thousands of her [Emma’s] followers and admirers” attended the Red Revel, and he was among them. Bruno, in an attempt to vindicate the gathering’s legitimacy, noted that the guests “danced and laughed and were happy, and if anyone would want to call a gathering of young men and women like that dangerous, it wouldn’t be safe to attend an opera performance or to enter a subway train.”\textsuperscript{102}

\textit{Mother Earth}’s inner circle pioneered the use of Webster Hall among bohemian radicals in the 1910s. It was a leading public rental hall in East Greenwich Village. From

\textsuperscript{96} Lenox Casino had held \textit{Mother Earth}’s eight birthday concert, seasonal balls and festivals, anti-militarist gatherings, birth control meetings, and lectures of Emma and de Cleyre. Other \textit{Mother Earth}’s sponsored activities, like the Ferrer Center’s anniversary balls and fund-raising ball for \textit{The Blast}, also took place in Lenox Casino.

\textsuperscript{97} Carolyn D. Johnson and Valerie Jo Bradley, \textit{Harlem Travel Guide} (New York: Welcome to Harlem, 2010), 70.


\textsuperscript{100} “Advertisement: Mother Earth Ball: A Red Revel to Symbolize the International,” \textit{Mother Earth} 9:11 (Jan. 1915).


the 1880s, Webster Hall was the site of numerous leftist and union activities. Its owners were friendly to both immigrant workers and luminaries. The three-story building featured a saloon and restaurant on the first floor, a ballroom on the second, and a gallery and sitting rooms on the third.103 (Image 6) By the 1910s, the stream of bohemian guests from Greenwich Village made Webster Hall a unique place to frolic.104 The *Mother Earth* members’ use of this trendy space predated that of prominent Village groups like the writers of the socialist illustrated monthly *The Masses* (1911-1917) and the Liberal Club. *Mother Earth*’s first Masquerade Ball took place at Webster Hall on November 23, 1906.105 Core members hosted this ball to raise funds for *Mother Earth* and some recently arrested anarchists.106 Police interrupted the ball and forced the owner of Webster Hall to close the premises. Emma mocked that the police invasion of the ball “made everyone feel the Tzar’s atmosphere”: “What poor diplomats we anarchists are! Had we treated the police to free drinks and free lunch, the zeal of the law and ‘order’ guardians would have certainly been tempered by imbibing tolerance, and MOTHER EARTH’s exchequer would not now be in such deplorable condition.”107

105 “Advertisement: Mother Earth Masquerade Ball,” *Mother Earth* 1:9 (Nov. 1906).
106 In late October 1906, about a dozen young men and women, along with Emma, were clubbed and arrested by the police during two peaceful meetings in New York; the first one was about discussing whether Leon Czolgosz (the assassin who killed President McKinley) was an anarchist, and the second one was to protest against the arrest occurred in the first meeting. The sales and finance of *Mother Earth* was seriously affected, which called for the Masquerade Ball as a fund-raising event and the appeal from Emma and Berkman to comrades and friends for financial support. Emma Goldman, “Police Brutality,” *Mother Earth* 1:9 (Nov. 1906): 2-3.
Core members never admitted guests to *Mother Earth*’s balls for free because they could not afford to host free events. The ball at Webster Hall cost 35 cents per ticket; admission to Terrace Lyceum and Lenox Casino balls cost 25 cents. The average weekly earnings of male workers around 1905 were $11.79 and female workers earned $6.54. Spending 35 cents, or even 25 cents, for a meal was a luxury to them, but *Mother Earth*’s family events included much more than food. The admission fee gave the labor attendees access to a congenial, carefree environment where they could leave the drudgery of work behind for just a moment. Furthermore, these events were not only a feast of sensory pleasures, but also an occasion to seek kindred spirits and solidarity.

These “family” events included artistic performances and cosmopolitan elements in a lavishly decorated environment. Usually taking the form of concerts and balls, the events included speeches in languages like “English, German, Jewish, Russian, Italian, Spanish,

---


Dancing, music, singing, and spirits were features of these events to guarantee a relaxing enjoyment. Young volunteers often took charge of the preparatory work for the events, from decorating the space to preparing music, food (buffet), drinks, and literature for sale. Isidore Wisotsky’s reminiscence captured some of the essence of *Mother Earth*’s annual ball:

The hall was well lit, gaily decorated, and filled with spirited, happy, dancing young people. The sound of lively music swept through the rooms. Revolutionary and workers’ songs could be heard from all corners. Such leaders of our movement as Alexander Berkman, Harry Kelly, Leonard D. Abbot[t], Max Baginsk[y], Hippolyte Havel, and sympathizers like Big Bill Haywood, Bolton Hall, [Elizabeth] G[i]rley Flynn, Carlo Tres[k]a and others—moved through the crowds, talked to the guests, and seemed to derive pleasure from watching the dancing and singing youth. From time to time, they went to the buffet table and treated themselves to food and spirits for which they paid as part of the income for *Mother Earth*. Tall, broad-shouldered Ben Reitman…was busy harnessing subscriptions for the publication as well as selling anarchist literature…Emma Goldman, elegantly dressed, and beaming like a proud and happy mother on the wedding day of her youngest daughter, circulated among the crowd and greeted everyone with her warm words and soft smile.¹¹¹

Isidore also mentioned that young people like him gaily “danced all kinds of dance” at the ball. Even the middle-aged Emma could not resist joining in on a sher, an Eastern European Jewish folk dance. Propaganda work (garnering subscriptions, selling literature, and soliciting donations) regularly blended in with personal amusement and social gaiety on such occasions. *Mother Earth*’s editorial highlighted the merry and fraternal air of their balls to boost the morale of its family.¹¹²

Core members continued to unite revolutionary ideas and artistic expression in their family reunions in a similar way that Emma initially designed for the magazine.¹¹³

editor’s accounts of the events underscored artistic effects and fundraising results of the reunions. In 1913, Sasha wrote that, “The annual reunion of the MOTHER EARTH family has grown to be the most unique and interesting event of its kind in the radical circles of New York City.” According to him, the guests did not forget to donate to their campaigns while enjoying “joyous good-fellowship.”

As much joyful and genial ambience as Mother Earth’s family reunions exuded, they at times included arguments that cast a shadow over the lighter moments of harmony. “Because of a sad incident,” Isidore recalled, “I shall never forget one of the affairs.” It took place late at night, when most of the guests had left, only a small group of friends and core members remained to clean and pack up. Hippolite (“as usual, was drunk”) started to complain about Mother Earth not being (proletarian) revolutionary enough and hurled abuse at Emma. “We were astounded! Emma paled!” recorded Isidore, “She rose from her chair and, without saying a word, she walked directly up to Hippolite and slapped his face. Then she returned to her place, sat down, buried her face in her hands, and wept bitterly.” Episodes like this uncovered the rifts that existed within the inner circle. Their common anarchist cause did not prevent them from clashing over their differences. Hippolite criticized Emma’s catering to a bourgeois audience as a weakness in her revolutionary efforts. For Emma, however, introducing middle-class intellectuals to anarchist ideas was vital to advancing the prospect of social revolution. Despite disagreements over their approach, these anarchists worked closely to propagate their common ideal of anarchy. The forty-page biographic sketch that Hippolite wrote for

117 Madden, ““Home of Lost Dogs,”” 260-314.
Emma in her first essay collection, *Anarchism and Other Essays* (1910), fully demonstrated how he appreciated the significance of her anarchist endeavors.  

The interplay of *Mother Earth*’s family events and their narratives produced a conscious, politically-driven identity for the anarchist counterfamily. This family was “counter” to the extent that it gave its members a social vision that contravened not only conventional family governance but also all hierarchical institutions. Core members’ mutual use of actual event space and textual space gave rise to an ever-growing counterpublic. Through its publication, events and campaigns, the inner circle created a considerable cohort of counterfamily that supported it through thick and thin. Additionally, *Mother Earth*’s inner circle used friendly spaces to advance the growth of anarchist propaganda. The individual and/or collective acts of *Mother Earth* members in these anarchist-friendly spaces gave them a chance to communicate with a responsive, though ideologically diversifed, public.

**Spreading Anarchist Messages: *Mother Earth*’s Friendly Places**

*Mother Earth*’s “friendly places” included spaces in which anarchist ideas, while not predominant, were at best embraced and at worst permitted. The groups that headquartered in these places sold copies of *Mother Earth* and its publications. In these places, core members befriended non-anarchist intellectuals and turned many of them into *Mother Earth* supporters. No particular ideology stood out to exclude others in these spaces, which left the anarchists room to reach a new audience. *Mother Earth*’s “friendly places” in New York included the Ferrer Center, the Liberal Club, the Harlem Liberal Alliance, the Sunrise Club, the Brooklyn Philosophical Society, and the Women’s Trade

---

Union League (WTUL), among others. These groups included various left-wing liberals and radicals who greeted anarchism as an inspiring and inclusive philosophy for political change, social transformation, and personal expression. Their spaces made *Mother Earth*’s anarchist ideas accessible and communicable. Geographically, these places radiated from the Lower East Side and Harlem to incorporate Midtown, Brooklyn, Bronx, and Greenwich Village. (Map 3)

Greenwich Village, the classic American Bohemia, typified avant-garde iconoclasm and unconventional lifestyles that made it a fertile ground for anarchist ideas. Similarly to Paris, the homes of bohemian artists tended to be open to anarchists and their defiant ideas.\(^{119}\) The new Villagers of both sexes from the provinces and abroad were largely college educated, white Anglo-Saxon Protestants in their twenties and thirties.\(^{120}\) They rebelled against the materialistic values and prudish moralism of the middle classes from which most of them came.\(^{121}\) Radical change for self-realization and social progress became their common ideal. The bohemians tended to be ideologically eclectic. They sought intellectual stimulation and social change from assorted radical and progressive theories. Journalist Dorothy Day revealed her rebellious younger days in prewar Greenwich Village before converting to Catholicism. “I was only eighteen,” she wrote, “so I wavered between my allegiance to Socialism, Syndicalism (the I. W. W.’s), and Anarchism.”\(^{122}\) Greenwich Village was the nexus of Gotham’s radical culture; there

---

\(^{119}\) According to Richard D. Sonn, the northern Parisian neighborhood of Montmartre, the city’s Bohemian Quarter, featured a lively anarchist cultural life. To a large degree, Greenwich Village in New York was also welcome to anarchists and their rebellious thoughts. Richard D. Sonn, *Anarchism and Cultural Politics in Fin de Siècle France* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 7.


Map 3: Locations of the “Mother Earth’s friendly places” in New York City (1906-1917)

1. Brooklyn Philosophical Society  
6. Harlem Liberal Alliance  
9. The Liberal Club  
12. Women’s Trade Union League

2. Bronx Liberal Alliance  
7. Hugh O. Pentecost’s Sunday lectures  
10. Progressive Library  
11. The Sunrise Club  
3. 4. 5. Ferrer Center  
8. Liberal Art Society

----

123 Some of the societies or institutions have moved over time, so the numbers of the locations are marked according to the chronological order. For example, Ferrer Center had three addresses: 6 St. Mark's Place; 104 East 12th Street (Oct. 1911-1912); 62 E. 107th St. (after 1912). On the map, these three locations are marked as 2, 3, 4 respectively.

124 Hugh O. Pentecost (1848-1907) was a radical American minister, lecturer, and one-time anarchist. After his death in 1907, Mother Earth had paid tribute to him and carried his article on anarchism. See “Observations and Comments,” Mother Earth 1:12 (Feb. 1907): 4; Voltairine de Cleyre, “Hugh O. Pentecost,” Mother Earth 2:1 (Mar. 1907): 11-16; Hugh O. Pentecost, “Anarchism,” Mother Earth 2:2 (April 1907): 100-106. Mother Earth was for sale in Pentecost’s lectures according to its advertisement.
anarchism influenced numerous socially conscious intellectuals.\textsuperscript{125}

Core members of \textit{Mother Earth} utilized the Ferrer Center, located first in Greenwich Village and later in Harlem, as an innovative setting for the anarchist movements in America. Emma and Sasha were central to the founding of the Ferrer Center to commemorate the executed Spanish anarchist educator, Francisco Ferrer.\textsuperscript{126} American anarchists, especially those of \textit{Mother Earth}, strove to carry on Ferrer’s legacy by creating an experimental and coeducational modern school.\textsuperscript{127} They founded the Francisco Ferrer Association on June 3, 1910.\textsuperscript{128} Sasha and Harry had started the first secular Sunday school in New York with other comrades.\textsuperscript{129} Then came the Ferrer School, which opened in January 1911 at the headquarters of the Ferrer Association at 6 St. Marks Place. The school was originally an adult center, offering evening lectures on a daily basis and weekend lectures on all kinds of social issues. The founders opened a Day School for children in October and, along with the adult Ferrer Center, it moved to 104 E. 12th Street. A year later, they relocated the Ferrer Center/School to 63 East 107th Street in Harlem, close to \textit{Mother Earth}’s office.\textsuperscript{130} The building of the Ferrer Center was a three-story

\textsuperscript{125} Richwine, “The Liberal Club,” 82-83, 175.
\textsuperscript{126} Ferrer was arrested and tried by his government for inciting Catalanian general strike and executed by the Spanish government in October 13, 1909. Before his death, Ferrer had opened his first Escuela Moderna (Modern School) in Barcelona in September, 1901. Being coeducational in the sense of the students’ sex and social position, modern school championed a free-thinking, noncompetitive, and non-dogmatic way of learning. The liberal schooling challenged the conventional and doctrinal education in Spain dominated by the Catholic Church, which accused Ferrer’s modern school a hotbed for rebellious thoughts. Hippolyte Havel, “The Social Struggle in Spain,” \textit{Mother Earth} 4:10 (Dec 1909): 314-321. Harry Kelly recalled that “Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were tireless in pushing our program forward.” Harry Kelly, \textit{Roll Back the Years}, Ch. XIX, 11.
\textsuperscript{128} The founding members of the Francisco Ferrer Association largely came from the \textit{Mother Earth} cast, including Emma, Sasha, Harry Kelly, Leonard Abbott, and Voltairine de Cleyre. \textit{Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III}, 683, 692-693.
\textsuperscript{129} Harry Kelly, \textit{Roll Back the Years}, Ch. XIX, 13-14.
old-style brownstone and “had a basement with a tea room, a first floor for lectures, a large yard in back, a second floor for the school, and a third floor with rooms for rent,” recalled former student Maurice Hollo.

Harry described the Ferrer Center from 1912 to 1915 as “a live and vital place,” whose members were “most thoroughly cosmopolitan.”

The creation of the Ferrer Center revolutionized the concept of anarchist space by providing a permanent public venue where the school’s teachers could introduce anarchism comprehensively. *Mother Earth*’s articles attested to its core members’ advocacy for modern school education. They believed that modern education would nurture a free individuality and self-reliant humanity. In an essay in November 1910, Sasha argued for the importance of liberal, rational education as preparation for a new social life.

The Ferrer Center provided Sasha’s ideal education to a certain extent. It offered an exciting variety of lectures on social, political, or literary topics, along with theatrical plays, music concerts, and poetry recitals. Its members, from teaching faculty and staffs to lecturers, guest speakers, and students came from diverse backgrounds. Margaret Sanger, the birth control advocate, sent her kids to the Ferrer School, an indication that not just immigrant working-class children attended there.

Anarchism was not an orthodox doctrine in the Ferrer Center/School. The anti-authoritarian and free spirit of anarchism, however, permeated its whole environment. Its mission was not to tutor

---

132 “Numerically the Jews predominated;” Kelly wrote, “but there were Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Spaniards, Englishmen, Irishmen, Russians, Roumanians, Negroes, Asiatics, and visitors from various other ethnic groups, in addition to native-born Americans.” Kelly, *Roll Back the Years*, Ch. XXI, 1-2.
133 “Just in the proportion that the young generation grows more enlightened and libertarian,” Sasha claimed, “will we approach a freer society.” Berkman, “The Need of Translating Ideals Into Life.”
134 Margaret and her architect husband William Sanger moved to New York in 1911. Sanger’s three children, Stuart, Grant, and Peggy Sanger all went to the Ferrer School; the latter two went to the removed Ferrer School at Stelton, New Jersey after 1915. Avrich, *The Modern School Movement*, 84-85, 95.
anarchists, as opposed to the Rand School of Social Science (on 15th Street), which goal was to train socialists. Some pupils who attended both schools found the Ferrer School to be much freer, opener, and more intellectually stimulating than the Rand School. The Ferrer Center/School soon blossomed into an animated hub of radicalism and activism. Kelly rejoiced as he witnessed a legion of young people growing “toward a broader, freer, and more humane social attitude” there.

Many attendees and former students testified to the intimate ties between the Ferrer Center and the *Mother Earth* family. These veteran social rebels reminisced about their collective past in prewar New York in Paul Avrich’s oral history, *Anarchist Voices*. They fully enjoyed their young and exciting years associated with the Ferrer Center and *Mother Earth*. Both poor immigrants and middle-class native speakers found freedom to think and express themselves in the two spaces. *Mother Earth*’s inner circle introduced their readers to the Ferrer Center. Frequenting *Mother Earth*’s office to help, to read, or to socialize became a regular praxis for many pupils of the Ferrer School. While they typically stressed the strong ties, one male ex-pupil hinted about “a certain rivalry” existing between the two organizations. He was mainly expressing his discontent with Emma’s

---

135 For the comprehensive research on the Rand School, see Frederic Cornell, “A History of the Rand School of Social Science—1906 to 1956” (PhD diss., Columbia University Teachers College, 1976).
137 Kelly, *Roll Back the Years*, Ch. XXI, 2.
138 Moritz Jagendorf, an Austrian immigrant, came to know the Ferrer Center through *Mother Earth*. “While an undergraduate at Columbia,” he recalled, “I came across *Mother Earth*. Impressed, I wrote to Emma Goldman, who replied by advising me to come to the Ferrer Center. That was in 1911 or 1912.” Avrich, *Anarchist Voices*, 220.
139 Charles Plunkett, a native New Yorker and associate of the Ferrer Center who later married Becky Edelsohn, often visited *Mother Earth*’s office. Henry Fruchter from Spain frequented the Center and *Mother Earth* with his sister Pauline Turkel, who later became the magazine’s secretary. Jacques Dubois, a French immigrant, said that he “went to see Emma Goldman at the *Mother Earth* office, attended the Ferrer Center, and took part in a protest for Kotoku at the Japanese consulate.” Avrich, *Anarchist Voices*, 214-219, 260-261. For the protest on behalf of Kotoku (Shūsui), see the discussion in Chapter 3.
140 Most of the Ferrer School’s ex-pupils indicated the congeniality between the members of the Ferrer Center/School and *Mother Earth*. Maurice Hollod, for example, emphasized that “Not that there was any
decision to behave as if she controlled the Ferrer Center, rather than indicating an ideological competition between two groups.

The tie between *Mother Earth* and the Ferrer School jeopardized the School’s existence and ultimately resulted in its removal from New York and its political turmoil. The School’s anarchist affinity and the overlapping membership of the two groups led them to cooperate in various campaigns against the authorities. The middle-aged, seasoned Sasha orchestrated most of their collective actions. In mid-1914, Sasha and three young rebels (Arthur Caron, Carl Hanson, and Charles Berg) met upstairs at the Ferrer Center where they developed an assassination plot.\(^{141}\) They intended to blow up the mansion of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., whom they held responsible for the mass killing of mine strikers and their families in Ludlow, Colorado in April 1914.\(^ {142}\) The bomb accidentally exploded on July 4 at a six-story tenement on 1626 Lexington Avenue, killing Caron, Hanson, Berg, and a female tenant while injuring dozens of others. Sasha publicly declared that the tragic accident was a police conspiracy to annihilate anarchists. By doing so he made the three deceased comrades into martyrs for the anarchist cause of social revolution. The rivalry between the two places. On the contrary, they were complementary, and both Emma and Sasha were strong supporters of the school.” Manuel Komroff, on the other hand, indicated “a certain rivalry” existed between the Ferrer Center and *Mother Earth*. Komroff had drawn a cover for *Mother Earth*. In the context of his interview, he grouped Leonard Abbott, Harry Kelly, Jewish anarchist Joseph Cohen, Scottish-born anarchist Stewart Kerr, and him as that of “the Ferrer Center,” “as opposed to the *Mother Earth* office nearby.” Komroff was mainly criticizing Emma who, according to him, “thought she owned anarchism and that we—The Ferrer Center—were poaching on her preserve.” Despite his criticism, he still praised that Emma “did wonderful things.” Avrich, *Anarchist Voices*, 201, 204-209.

\(^141\) Caron, Hanson, and Berg were members of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) with anarchist leanings. Avrich, *Anarchist Voices*, 206-207; Avrich, *The Modern School Movement*, 203-226.

\(^{142}\) The mass killing of mine strikers and their families in Ludlow by the Colorado National Guard and the Rockefeller-family owned Colorado Fuel & Iron Company provoked great protests across America. Sasha, his comrades, and many associates of the Ferrer Center/School participated in the public demonstrations, which developed from Manhattan to the mansion of Rockefeller, Jr. in Tarrytown, about thirty miles north of Manhattan. The police violently suppressed the free speech of the protestors, among them the bomb plotters Carl Hanson, Charles Berg, Arthur Caron. For details of the happenings, see Paul Avrich & Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 223-236; Thai Jones, *More Powerful Than Dynamite: Radicals, Plutocrats, progressives, and New York’s Year of Anarchy* (New York: Walker & Company, 2012), 234-240.
accident, which revived the public’s anti-anarchist hysteria, had severe repercussions for the Ferrer Center.\textsuperscript{143} In May 1915, the Ferrer School moved out of Manhattan and settled in Stelton, New Jersey in order to stay away from political disturbances. The Ferrer Center remained in the same site at Harlem as a center of radical ideas until April 1918.\textsuperscript{144}

Mother Earth’s members also found a similarly open ambiance in Greenwich Village’s Liberal Club. The Liberal Club was founded in 1869 as a weekly lecture society to promote the principle of free thought.\textsuperscript{145} The president, Reverend Stickney Grant, typified a progressive mind of the old Club with an outlook of Victorian gentility and humanitarianism.\textsuperscript{146} Younger club members consisted of writers, artists, social workers and feminists, who grew in numbers and eagerness for radical ideas in the 1910s. Two generations’ ideological chasm resulted in the junior group’s takeover of the Club in 1913.\textsuperscript{147} The new Liberal Club relocated to 137 MacDougal Street and transformed itself into the socio-cultural center of Greenwich Village bohemia. Incidentally, the Club shared a building with a restaurant owned by Polly Holliday, an anarchist from Illinois. Polly’s restaurant had “four wooden trestle tables with long benches always well filled,” according to journalist Bernardine Kielty Scherman.\textsuperscript{148} With cheap meals and a friendly atmosphere, Polly’s became an instant hit among the Village bohemians. Her lover, the maverick

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{143} In order to keep the normal function of the Ferrer School, the revolutionary element of the Center (represented by Sasha) agreed to stop meeting there for political agitation. But the Ferrer School still decided to move to the country. The Ferrer Center ultimately drove it out of business. Reid Friedson, “Radical Educators in New York City, 1909-1915,” accessed Jan. 20, 2016, http://recollectionbooks.com/siml/library/reidRadicalEducatorsNYC/reidRadicalEducatorsInNewYorkCity.htm.
\item \textsuperscript{144} Avrich, The Modern School Movement, 233-235.
\item \textsuperscript{145} The New York’s Liberal Club was also known as the Manhattan Liberal Club. In 1906, Mother Earth’s advertisement stated the meeting time and location of the Liberal Club as: “Manhattan Liberal Club. Meets every Friday, 8 P.M., at German Masonic Hall, 220 East 15th Street.”
\item \textsuperscript{146} Richwine, “The Liberal Club,” 89-103.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III, 749-750.
\item \textsuperscript{148} Bernardine Kielty Scherman, Girl from Fitchburg (New York: Random House, 1964), 64.
\end{itemize}
Hippolyte Havel, served there as the cook and waiter. Ben Reitman wrote that Hippolyte “thought in German, spoke in English, swore in Bohemian and drank in all languages.”

Hippolyte’s erudite and eccentric demeanor made him an intriguing anarchist figure in Greenwich Village. While he waited tables he cursed the “Bourgeois Pigs!” Bohemian spectators were rather amused by and tolerant of his anarchistic outbursts. (Images 7 & 8) Hippolyte, Polly, bohemian regulars, and the Liberal Club members jointly turned 137 MacDougal Street into a site congenial to anarchism.

Image 7 (left) & Image 8 (right): The scenes in Polly’s Restaurant

Emma built friendships with members of both the old and the new Liberal Clubs, though the new Club was more willing to disseminate Mother Earth’s messages. Emma began attending the weekly meetings of the old Liberal Club in 1894. She recorded that she “often participated in the discussions, and was known by everybody” there. Most senior members, however, were hostile to anarchism and called Emma “a murderess” in the wake

---

149 Reitman, “Following the Monkey,” 252.
of President McKinley’s assassination. Hutchins Hapgood resigned his charter member position in the old Club after its sectarian members blackballed his bid to have Emma added as a member. By contrast, the new Liberal Club showed more warmth to Mother Earth’s anarchists and their anarchism. Its organizers—Henrietta Rodman, Ernest Holcombe, Polly, Hippolyte, and Grace Potter—were all Emma’s friends. Becky and Stella of the Mother Earth commune were also members of the new Liberal Club.

(Image 9)

Image 9: A Session of the Liberal Club in 1914 Drawn by Herb Roth

The inner circle of Mother Earth availed themselves of the spaces on both floors of 137 MacDougal Street to encourage liberated ideas and lifestyles. The poster for the Liberal Club’s Ball, the modernist paintings, the warm conversations, and the genial interactions (Images 7 to 9) gave life to the sociable and artistic characters who met in

---

154 Hapgood, A Victorian in the Modern World, 277. According to Hapgood’s autobiography, other charter members included the famous muckraking journalist Lincoln Steffens, Gilbert Roe, and Theodore Schroeder. The latter two were all contributors to Mother Earth and rather close to Emma. Hence, the vote against Emma’s membership very likely came from Steffens.
155 Richwine, “The Liberal Club,” 117-118; Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III, 750. The new Liberal Club members who were also Mother Earth’s “family members” included Anna Strunsky, Harry Weinberger, Upton Sinclair, Teddy Ballantine, Horace Traubel, among others. They were Mother Earth’s contributors and/or friends.
156 The Source of image: Albert Parry, Garrets and Pretenders, 425. The woman at the front right corner was Becky Edelsohn.
these spaces. Every avant-garde topic—free love, free speech, free verse, free union, birth control, Freudianism, anarchism, socialism, and syndicalism, to name a few—was welcome there. Emma was a frequent guest lecturer and she discussed many of the aforementioned themes. The Liberal Club also invited Sasha to share his prison experience and his views of anarchism. According to historian Keith Norton Richwine, anarchist philosophy “had more influence on the new bohemians than any of the various socialist stances.” He juxtaposed Mother Earth and the Liberal Club as the two platforms from which Emma brought forth her stance on sex radicalism.

Several other socially notable sites joined the Ferrer Center and the Liberal Club to show interest in and sympathy to anarchist ideas. The Brooklyn Philosophical Society and the Sunrise Club, for instance, invited Emma to speak. She gladly accepted the invitations with the hope, in her words, “to reach the native intelligentsia, to enlighten it as to what anarchism really means.” The members of these associations, mostly native-born professionals, endorsed freethought and welcomed anarchist philosophy. Many of them were associated with the Liberal Club, the Ferrer Center, and the Mother Earth family. Edwin C. Walker, the founder of the Sunrise Club, was an anarcho-individualist and agent for Mother Earth. The reputable status of these societies prevented the police from harassing and arresting Emma when she spoke in their clubs. Nevertheless, even these “friendly” places had their limits when it came to accepting the violence-inclined

---

158 Richwine, “The Liberal Club,” 156-157. For detailed discussion of Emma’s thoughts of sex radicalism, see Chapter 4.
anarchists. Walker, for example, did not invite Sasha to the Sunrise Club because he believed that Sasha was a dangerous activist rather than a lecturer like Emma.\footnote{I thank Dr. Barry Pateman, veteran anarchist and associate editor of the Emma Goldman Papers Project, for providing me with this information.}  

New York’s Women’s Trades Union League (WTUL), close to midtown, put the *Mother Earth* anarchists into contact with female social reformers, workers, and labor organizers. In 1903, the WTUL’s founders created the union to organize women workers into trade unions by following the principle of craft unionism laid out by the American Federation of Labor (AFL).\footnote{For the history of WTUL, see Alice Henry, *The Trade Union Woman* (New York: D. Appleton Company, 1915), 59-88; Nancy Schrom Dye, *As Equals and As Sisters: Feminism, the Labor Movement, and the Women’s Trade Union League of New York* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1980).} *Mother Earth*’s editorials criticized the AFL’s exclusion of unskilled laborers, lack of industrial unity, and compromise with capitalists.\footnote{“Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 5:6 (Aug. 1910): 177-184; “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 12:3 (May 1917): 67-68.} But Emma and Sasha approved of the WTUL’s objectives of economic autonomy, labor solidarity, and gender equality. The WTUL’s meeting hall at 43 E. 22nd Street since 1909 was one of *Mother Earth*’s friendly places.\footnote{“New Home for Women Unionists,” *New York Times*, June 20, 1909.} From 1909 to 1911, Emma gave a lecture series at the WTUL’s Hall, with tickets priced at 15 and 25 cents.\footnote{“Advertisement: The National Women’s Trade Union League of America Fifth Biennial Convention,” *The Survey* XXXIV:9 (May 29, 1915): 230.} She spoke about anarchism, art and revolution, socialism, maternity and birth control, Christianity, and sexuality, topics that would interest the WTUL members.\footnote{Emma Goldman, “Lectures,” *Mother Earth* 5:9 (Nov. 1910): 285; “Advertisement: Lectures by Emma Goldman,” *Mother Earth* 6:8 (Oct. 1911): 225; “Lectures by Emma Goldman,” *Mother Earth* 6:9 (Nov. 1911).} In early 1913, the WTUL offered its hall for the weekly Anarchist Forum, a follow-up discussion group for Emma’s lectures to cultivate anarchist thought.\footnote{“The FORUM,” *Mother Earth*’s editor declared, “is organized for the purpose of discussing the events of the day—social, economic, political, literary, and artistic—and illuminating them from the Anarchist viewpoint.” “Anarchist Activity,” *Mother Earth* 8:1 (Mar. 1913): 26-28.} The WTUL very likely endorsed the Forum’s principles since they...
allowed the Forum to take place in their hall. Sasha, Hippolyte, Harry, and Leonard Abbott had been speakers there; the discussion topics of the Forum were sometimes as general as “What Life Means to Me.”\textsuperscript{169}

Far away from Lower to Mid-Manhattan, the Harlem Liberal Alliance spread \textit{Mother Earth}’s anarchist messages, though without gaining much support from black residents. Leonard Abbott and free-speech advocate Theodore Schroeder, who wrote for the magazine, were the driving force behind the Harlem Liberal Alliance.\textsuperscript{170} The Alliance donated to \textit{Mother Earth} and offered its meeting site (the Lenox Casino) for the magazine’s family events. Through the Alliance, \textit{Mother Earth}’s members came to know Hubert Harrison, a prominent West Indian-American writer and pioneer of Harlem radicalism. Harrison taught comparative religion at the Ferrer School in 1914 and 1915, acquainting himself with Leonard, Harry, Sasha, Ben, and other \textit{Mother Earth} members.\textsuperscript{171} Sasha’s diary also indicated that he had some interactions with Negroes in Harlem.\textsuperscript{172} Nevertheless, the racial problems that occupied black radical circles were not the main agenda for \textit{Mother Earth}’s members. The magazine did occasionally criticize lynching in the South.\textsuperscript{173} But Emma and Sasha tended to fold black oppression “into the universal wage slavery of the masses” as Kathy Ferguson stated.\textsuperscript{174} The articles in \textit{Mother Earth} underscored class as an acquired status under the exploited and unjust system of

\textsuperscript{169} “Anarchist Activity.”
\textsuperscript{171} Jeffrey Babcock Perry, \textit{Hubert Harrison}, 234-237.
\textsuperscript{172} Alexander Berkman, Diary, Oct. 21, 1916.
\textsuperscript{174} Ferguson, \textit{Emma Goldman}, 15, 211-247.
capitalism that should be abolished. The members’ choice to subordinate issues of race to the problem of class did not attract a considerable black audience.\textsuperscript{175}

\textit{Mother Earth’s} friendly places in New York City gave native-born intellectuals a space to experiment with anarchism. Young bohemians welcomed Emma’s assertion that anarchism was not just about socioeconomic reorganization but was also about sexuo-ethical and artistic regeneration.\textsuperscript{176} These intellectuals (either respectable or rebellious) typically appreciated the anti-authoritarian messages of its propaganda. They adopted a hybrid style of receiving anarchism to suit their own—often non-anarchist—sociopolitical imaginaries. It became popular among these intellectuals to endorse anarchism as a philosophy, but not as a valid political initiative. These \textit{Mother Earth} friends were afraid to use force to start a social revolution but that did not change the inner circle’s commitment to using violence if necessary. The anarchists’ exchange of ideas with middle-class intellectuals did not weaken the former’s revolutionary resolve to abolish the state and capitalism.

The reception of \textit{Mother Earth’s} version of anarchism was more complex in the spaces occupied by people who espoused incompatible ideologies. Goldman, for one, was not contented to confine anarchist messages within the space friendly to anarchism. She continued to push the (immigrant and proletarian) boundary of anarchist propaganda to challenge people’s existing opinions about it. As we shall see, \textit{Mother Earth’s} members managed to broaden its public by competing with other radical groups in various spaces.

\textbf{Ideologically Contested Spaces: Winning a Non-Anarchist Public}

\textsuperscript{175} For example, an editorial of \textit{Mother Earth} declared: “The modern wage slave himself, be he black, red, or white, making common cause, can alone successfully break the fetters of his capitalist bondage.” “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 4:4 (June 1909): 98-99.

\textsuperscript{176} For the sexuo-ethical regeneration promoted by the \textit{Mother Earth} members, see my chapter 4.
While members of *Mother Earth* strove to gain ground among thinking people, they had to vie against other social theories to win a wider audience. Various socioeconomic problems since the late nineteenth century resulted in a surge of extensive reforms. Middle-class reformers mostly looked to the government to regulate corporate monopolies and make government more efficient and accountable. Yet many intellectuals’ anti-authoritarian sentiments intensified thanks to unresolved social problems; in the process they took interest in certain radical ideologies like anarchism or socialism. Diverse schools of radicalism that criticized the government and capitalism but proposed different sociopolitical solutions competed for new members with *Mother Earth* in a number of socially respectable sites. (Map 4)

People at these sites did not sell *Mother Earth* issues and literature (unless its members brought them there) as the proprietors of its friendly places regularly did. Though anarchism had a voice in these competing sites, it was neither dominant nor always welcome. Six different examples discussed below illustrate how *Mother Earth*’s members engaged with non-anarchist radicals. Events in these sites—Mabel Dodge’s salon, *The Masses* Group, the Heterodoxy Club, Carnegie Hall, Berkeley Theatre, and Union Square—revealed the anarchist’ tactics of, and others’ resistance to, anarchist propaganda.
Map 4: Locations of the “Mother Earth’s competing sites” in New York City (1906-1917)

Mabel Dodge invited Emma and her anarchist “bunch” to her salon in Greenwich Village on 23 Fifth Avenue with reservations. The wealthy art patron lived in an old-style brownstone, two blocks north of Washington Square, when she returned to New York in 1912 after a seven-year stay in Florence, Italy. Her new good friend Hutchins

177 Dodge used “Emma and her bunch” to distinguish from “Bill Haywood and his bunch,” and so on. Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 59. The name of Mabel Dodge (Luhan) appeared in almost all writings about Greenwich Village Bohemia. Emma’s name itself appeared on the list of guests in Mabel’s salon, which sat on 23 Fifth Avenue. For examples, see Wetzsteon, Republic of Dreams, 17; Rebecca Zurier et al., Metropolitan Lives: The Ashcan Artists and Their New York (Washington, DC: National Museum of American Art, 1995), 44; Flannery Burke, From Greenwich Village to Taos: Primitivism and Place at Mabel Dodge Luhan’s (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008), 13; Roy Kotynek and John Cohassey, American Cultural Rebels: Avant-Garde and Bohemian Artists, Writers and Musicians from the 1850s through the 1960s (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., 2008), 74. Often, the name of Alexander Berkman would be mentioned in the guest list of Dodge’s salons.
Hapgood introduced her to a circle of talented artists and writers. Lincoln Steffens, the famous muckraker, suggested that she host evenings of open communication at her home. From 1913 to 1915, Dodge’s salon blossomed into a celebrated site for unconventional ideas in the Village. (Images 10 & 11) Through Hapgood, Dodge befriended several Mother Earth members, such as Emma, Sasha, and Havel. Havel, in his bohemian-anarchist style, fondly called Dodge “my little goddam bourgeois capitalist sister!”

Image 10 & Image 11: Mabel Dodge’s Apartment and an Evening in Her Salon

The drawing room of Dodge’s white-painted, two story house attracted people of all political persuasions, with anarchism represented by Mother Earth’s members. Dodge entertained her guests with thematic lectures, artistic performances, lively debates, and abundant luncheons. Steffens recorded that “all sorts of guests came to Mabel Dodge’s salons, poor and rich, labor skates, scabs, strikers and the unemployed, painters, musicians,

178 Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 74-95.
179 Dodge held her salon variously on Wednesday and Thursday evenings, at times on more than one night a week. Lois Palken Rudnick, Mabel Dodge Luhan: New Woman, New Worlds (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1984), 74.
180 Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 90.
reporters, editors, swells; it was the only successful salon I have ever seen in America.”

Dodge claimed that she wanted to know the “Heads of all kinds of groups of people.”

Emma, and at times Sasha, as the “heads” of anarchism in New York, became Dodge’s guests. Steffens credited the success of Dodge’s salon to her ability to “start the talk going with a living theme.” For example, Dodge invited Emma to talk about anarchism when the anarchists appeared in the news and then began the evening’s discussion.

Dodge recounted the scene of a debate between anarchists and socialists on “direct action” versus “political action”—a familiar debate topic during Emma’s cross-country tour—in her salon:

One night Bill Haywood, Emma Goldman, and English Walling, aided by their followers, arranged to tell each other what they thought. Now this meant that Emma and Bill and Alexander Berkman would try to convince the socialists that Direct Action was more effective than propaganda or legislation. They believed in killing, they advocated it when it was possible, and they had done it, some of them openly.

Dodge might have promoted mutual understanding between people with conflicting opinions in her salon; but her memoirs reveal her detachment from the ideologies with which she did not identify, such as anarchist communism. Dodge admired Hapgood’s self-identity as an intellectual anarchist, but regarded Emma and Sasha’s anarchism as dangerous though powerful. In Dodge’s first visit to Emma’s 210, she had the impression that, “They were the kind that counted. They had authority. Their judgment was somehow true. One did not want their scorn (italics original).” Despite the mutual acquaintances in their living and social spaces, Dodge “always felt a reserve there [towards Emma and
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183 Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 84.
185 Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 88.
186 Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 57-59.
her bunch] that was never broken through.”

Her fear of Emma who, in her view, endorsed the use of bombs always tempered her admiration of Emma’s fight for human freedom. Dodge expressed extra alarm when Sasha attempted to kiss her in a taxi. Her comment that “This [attempted kiss] scared me more than murder would have done” revealed her underlying fear of Sasha, who had spent time in prison for assassination. Mother Earth’s inner circle, whom Dodge called the “group of earnest naive anarchists,” was a dynamic yet marginalized group in her realm.

Although socio-ethnic boundary-breaking took place in Dodge’s salon, ideological lines were also explicit there. Dodge gave anarchism a voice in her living/social space, but no endorsement. While the anarchists easily gained access to people and spaces of the Liberal Club and the Ferrer Center, they had to win their bourgeois audiences in Dodge’s salon. More or less, Dodge saw it as a favor to invite the anarchists to her salon. Anarchism was not the mainstream there. Journalist Bernardine Kielty Scherman recalled that “the only ones who really ‘belonged’ in Mabel Dodge’s salon were the socialists.” According to Scherman, Dodge favored the renowned members of the intelligentsia and older guests over the younger, poorer bohemian radicals who were familiar faces of the Liberal Club. Scherman also wrote about her affinity for the inner circle of Mother Earth. She believed that anarchism had a strong influence on younger bohemian members.

187 Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 59.
188 Regardless of Dodge’s praise of Emma (“What Willpower!”) and Sasha (“had a good brain”), her intuition that “they had [bloody] Plans” drove her to maintain distance. Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 57-59, 88-90.
189 Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 58.
190 “Each of these ‘leaders’ brought his or her group along, for they had heard about the Evenings,” Dodge proudly wrote, “and they all wanted to come.” Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 58-59.
191 Scherman, Girl from Fitchburg, 68-69.
Scherman’s depiction of Sasha (“for all his sinister reputation, was mild and quiet-spoken”) was an interesting contrast to Dodge’s description.\textsuperscript{192}

*The Masses*, whose members also frequented Dodge’s salon, was *Mother Earth*’s major rival journal in Greenwich Village. The socialist orthodox version of *the Masses* ended in financial failure in August 1912 after eighteen months of publication. Three months later, a new editorial board reorganized the magazine and invited Max Eastman, a philosophy post graduate from Columbia, to be editor in chief.\textsuperscript{193} Eastman and a group of avant-garde artists and writers, later joined by Floyd Dell as managing editor, transfigured *The Masses* “from a drab peddler of a single nostrum to a buoyant, colorful, bohemian champion of socialism and the arts” as Leslie Fishbein notes.\textsuperscript{194} Eastman specified that *The Masses*, while being “a Socialist magazine,” was “hospitable to free and spirited expressions of every kind.”\textsuperscript{195} With his announcement to appeal to “both Socialist and non-Socialists,” the reissued *Masses* competed with *Mother Earth* to win a similar (socially conscious intellectuals) readership. The new appeal of *The Masses* boosted its monthly circulation; it rose to 15,000 on the eve of WWI.\textsuperscript{196} Compared with other less radical journals, *The Masses*’ libertarian look and its promotion of advanced social ideas came closer to the defiant spirit of *Mother Earth*’s anarchism.\textsuperscript{197} The two magazines even promoted

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{192} Scherman, *Girl from Fitchburg*, 68-69.
\textsuperscript{194} Fishbein, *Rebels in Bohemia*, 18.
\textsuperscript{197} Eastman emphasized that “We shall have no further part in the factional disputes within the Socialist Party: we are opposed to the dogmatic spirit which creates and sustains these disputes.” “Editorial Notice,” *The Masses* 4:3 (Dec. 1912): 3.
\end{flushleft}
co-subscription in 1916 to help them each compete with other commercial periodicals. Yet essentially, *The Masses* and *Mother Earth* upheld distinct social visions and revolutionary tactics from each other.

Despite the frequent interactions between the two groups, *The Masses*’ editorials were critical of anarchism, if not specifically of *Mother Earth*. "The state-of-mind propagated by Anarchists," Eastman remarked in 1914, "is negative and therefore uncompelling." For Eastman, anarchism was not only short of positive dynamics for social endeavors, but it was also archaically "reactionary both in doctrine and method." Like other socialists, he censored the anarchists’ violent retaliation against the state and corporate powers. He sympathetized with, yet disapproved of, the bomb plot that caused the aforementioned Lexington Avenue explosion. His proposed solution to corporate violence against labor was “revolutionary unionism” and “united class-conscious voting,” a political action opposed by anarchists.

Notwithstanding its editorial criticism, *The Masses* made textual and physical space for *Mother Earth* and its members. In 1915, *The Masses* sold several publications by the

---

198 “Advertisement: The Masses,” *Mother Earth* 11:2 (Apr. 1916). To be sure, *The Masses* very often promoted such co-subscription with other progressive or commercial magazines (for example, *Ladies World & Housekeeper; Good Housekeeping; Cosmopolitan; Pearsons; Hearst’s; Metropolitan*). See “Advertisement: Grab This Chance: Read This Special Offer,” *The Masses* 4:7 (Apr. 1913): 19.

199 Quite a few artists and writers of *The Masses* including writer Floyd Dell and John Reed and artists Robert Minor, Robert Henri, George Bellows, Boardman Robinson, John Sloan, and Art Young, among others, befriended Emma, Sasha, Hippolyte, and other *Mother Earth* family members. These artists and writers had either contributed to *Mother Earth* or supported its anti-authoritarian campaigns. Several of them taught art classes in the Ferrer Center, for which *Mother Earth* had advertised. See, for example, “To Art Students,” *Mother Earth* 10:10 (Dec. 1915): 352. Emma’s autobiography had related her friendship with some members of *The Masses* group. See Goldman, *Living My Life*, Vol. II, 528-529, 567-572.


MEPA at its Book Store. The Masses’ editors welcomed Mother Earth’s core members like Hippolyte to attend their monthly editorial meetings. Hippolyte, in one of the meetings, had a fit of temper protesting the editors’ vote on poetry. He simply could not understand how the editors could judge poems, coming from the soul, through a voting process. He proudly described Mother Earth’s anarchistic editorial style in reply to Dell’s inquiry. “We anarchists make decisions,” Hippolyte answered; “but we don’t abide by them.”

Generally, most of The Masses’ staffs were genial to the inner circle of Mother Earth. While the two groups tried to outstrip each other within the radical circle, their anti-authoritarian campaigns often found them facing the public together.

In fact, a Milwaukee socialist editor charged The Masses with drifting “towards the bogs of dilet[ta]nte, intellectual anarchism.” Orthodox socialist comments like this indicated both The Masses’ ambiguous ideological identity to outsiders and the national effect of anarchism. Even as Eastman distanced the stance of The Masses from anarchism (especially its violent methods), other socialists observed the intellectual affinity of its writers for anarchism. The ideological tension between The Masses and Mother Earth

---


205 This anecdote had appeared in many scholarly works. For examples, see Susan Herbst, Politics at the Margin: Historical Studies of Public Expression outside the Mainstream (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 102; Fishbein, Rebels in Bohemia, 18; Avrich, The Anarchist Voices, 242.

206 There were exceptions. For instance, Max Eastman refused to preside at a Carnegie Hall meeting to welcome Emma’s release from prison (for the charge of disseminating birth control information) if Ben Reitman was allowed to speak. See Goldman, Living My Life, Vol. II, 571-572.


208 “A Rose between Two Thorns,” The Masses 4:11 (Aug. 1913): 2. The letter was written by the editor of Social Democratic Herald (1901-1913) in Milwaukee. Milwaukee was one of the strongholds of the Socialist Party of America and Social Democratic Herald was its main English-language organ.
faded when compared to other dogmatic and less radical schools in the wide spectrum of political theory. Additionally, *The Masses* editors’ alleged identity as “intellectual anarchists” implied that the anarchists had a growing influence, at least as a philosophy, among the American Left. During the teens, the label “intellectual anarchism” was applicable to a variety of radicalism in the eyes of the non-anarchist press. A radical socialist press like *The Masses* unwittingly spread certain anarchistic messages that *Mother Earth* would endorse.

The extensive sphere of *Mother Earth*’s anarchist philosophy also brought its core members into contact with Greenwich Village’s Heterodoxy Club. Unitarian minister and suffragist Marie Jenney Howe organized Heterodoxy, a luncheon club, in 1912. It started with twenty-five members whose opinions could be anything but orthodox. Under the broad characterization of feminism, Heterodoxy encouraged diverse discussions that would enrich, benefit, and inspire women.209 Its members met every two weeks on Saturday at Polly’s Restaurant. Heterodoxy soon recruited younger affiliates, whose feminist vision embraced a worldview much more daring than their predecessors. Stella and Fitzi were two junior Heterodites from the *Mother Earth* inner circle. Emma, though not a Heterodite, had participated in Heterodoxy’s meetings as an outside speaker. Senior Heterodites, such as Charlotte Perkins Gilman, did not favor Emma’s advocacy of free love. Younger club members, on the contrary, warmed to Emma’s emphasis on sexual freedom and inner regeneration to emancipate women. For them, free love, free union, and free (hetero/homo)sexuality were not theories but daily practices. (See Chapter 4) The Heterodites’ suffragist feminism, however, leaned more towards progressivism that sought

---

greater government efficiency than toward anti-state anarchism. Despite the two groups’ interactions, particularly between young female members, there was limited space in Heterodoxy for anarchism to develop.

Away from the bohemian and avant-garde intellectuals in Greenwich Village, *Mother Earth*’s core members worked to repair anarchism’s reputation beyond radical circles in Midtown Manhattan. In a 1914 essay, “Intellectual Proletarians,” Emma attempted to associate Progressive professionals with the working class in order to convince them to form a united front against capitalists. She argued that the capitalist tyranny deprived and degraded all those who worked for their living with their hands or their brains. She insisted that intellectual professionals suffered more than wage laborers from the degradation of their individuality.  

Emma Goldman, “Intellectual Proletarians.”

Paradoxically, Emma seemed to harbor the notion that vindicating anarchism in respectable spaces would help the anarchist cause. At Berkeley Theatre and Carnegie Hall, she strove to leave a positive anarchist imprint on bourgeois society. These two sites symbolized the reputable spaces for white middle-class socio-cultural events in Midtown.

---

212 Goldman, “Intellectual Proletarians.”
Emma considered Berkeley Lyceum (Theatre) at 23 W. 44th Street to be the right place to stage her modern drama lectures. The Lyceum, which opened in 1888, had a theatre on the ground floor and a gymnasium, concert, music rooms, and offices for rent. The *New York Times* portrayed the Lyceum as “one of the most popular and interesting little theatres in New York City.” Berkley Theatre could accommodate a 500-person audience; a capacity suited to Emma’s ambitions. A fundraising drama performance in Berkley Theatre in January 1906 helped fund the creation of *Mother Earth*. In early 1914, Emma gave a three-month, well-received Sunday lecture series on modern drama at the same venue. The dramas by (mostly European) modernist playwrights, such as Henrik Ibsen, August Strindberg, Gerhart Hauptmann, August Strindberg, and George Bernard Shaw, among others, represented “the social iconoclasts of our time,” Goldman wrote. For her, modern drama “mirrors the complex struggle of life,” appealing to universal emotions by its “roots in the depth of human nature and social environment.” Via modern drama, Emma intended to rouse American intellectuals’ sympathies for the exploited laborers and their support for “the fatality of our Puritanic hypocrisy.” She had previously delivered her drama lectures, both in English and in Yiddish, across the Lower East Side and Harlem. In Midtown, she targeted a bourgeois elite audience to expand the propaganda effect of *Mother Earth*’s anarchism. In her magazine, Emma asked her New York readers

---

214 The performance was staged by the troupe led by the Russian actor Pavel Orleneff, who wanted to help with Emma’s publishing dream as a token of his appreciation for her assistance of his tour in the US. The performance yielded 250 dollars, which was served as the capital of *Mother Earth*. Goldman, *Living My Life*, Vol. I, 377-378.
to help her, “take some theatre or large hall, more centrally located” and “to place our message [of anarchism] before thinking people.” 218

Emma’s attempt to cultivate a non-anarchist public through modern drama developed alongside her theater-going habit and her status as a recognized drama critic.219 Her efforts bore fruit through the success of her drama lectures at Berkeley Theatre. Many members of the literary and cultural elite in New York showed up with moral and material support. Playwrights, drama critics, noted actors and actress, suffragists, and liberal intellectuals visited them. Emma, in her reminiscence, expressed gratitude to these cultural elites for making her feel that her endeavors “had brought some of the American intelligentsia into closer rapport with the struggle of the masses.”220 The audience responded to her appeals for the jobless and Mother Earth’s campaigns with generous donations.221 They also showed intense interest in the anarchist literature circulated and sold during the lecture series.222 Emma’s drafts for the Berkeley Theatre lectures became the basis of her book, entitled The Modern Drama: Its Social and Revolutionary Significance, published in 1914.223

223 The original title of the book published by Mother Earth Publishing Association was The Modern Drama: Its Social and Revolutionary Significance; soon it was renamed into The Social Significance of the Modern Drama and published by Richard G. Badger in Boston at the same year. “Advertisement: Just Out. Ready for Delivery: The Modern Drama” Its Social and Revolutionary Significance,” Mother Earth 9:3 (May 1914); Goldman, Living My Life, Vol. II, 527-528
Mother Earth-sponsored gatherings at Carnegie Hall at 881 7th Ave are also evidence that its core members used classy venues to build publicity and win an intellectual public for anarchism. Carnegie Hall was New York City’s legendary concert hall and renowned public forum.\footnote{For the history of Carnegie Hall, see “Carnegie Hall: Then and Now,” accessed Aug. 31, 2015, http://www.carnegiehall.org/uploadedFiles/Resources_and_Components/PDF/Content/CarnegieHall_Then_and_Now_revised%281%29.pdf.} Ben Reitman targeted Carnegie Hall as the proper venue when a socialist invited Emma to engage in debate. Ben underscored that using socially respectable sites helped to promote her image. The debate took place at Carnegie Hall in February 1912; Emma seized the chance to raise funds for the Lawrence, MA strikers. The audience contributed more than 500 dollars to her fundraiser.\footnote{“The Power of the Ideal,” Mother Earth 7:1 (Mar. 1912): 27.} Sasha reported in Mother Earth that the pan-radical celebration of anarchist leader Peter Kropotkin’s seventieth birthday at Carnegie Hall in December 1912 was “the most inspiring event” among similar celebrations held around the world.\footnote{“Observations and Comments,” Mother Earth, 7:11 (Jan. 1913): 367. On December 7, 1912, Mother Earth and Freie Arbeiter Stimme (a Yiddish-language anarchist newspaper) together celebrated Peter Kropotkin’s seventieth birthday at Carnegie Hall. Emma, Sasha, Harry joined socialist William English Walling, Anna Strunsky, and others as speakers.} Two assemblies at Carnegie Hall about Emma’s birth control campaign, for which she received a prison sentence, featured a mixed cohort of prominent people and labor supporters.\footnote{Goldman, Living My Life, Vol. II, 569-572.}

Notably, when core members organized events at Carnegie Hall, the agendas were not exclusively anarchist. Such events included mass meetings advocating free speech, birth control, and the modern school. In Carnegie Hall, anarchists had to compete against other participating groups for the right to spread their political messages. Maurice Hollod, an alumnus of the Ferrer Center, recalled an episode that described Emma’s tactics:

One night, she [Emma] was to speak at an antiwar rally in Carnegie Hall, a united front of anarchists, socialists, and other radicals. I was in the Mother Earth office
that afternoon, and she said to me, “The socialists will have literature there. I’m going to give you a bundle of literature to distribute for us.” It was a cold night. I had the bundle under my coat. When I got to the balcony, two detectives from the Red Squad grabbed me and frisked me. Emma rushed over and hit one square in the face. “You dirty dog,” she said, “leave the child alone. If we have any killing to do we’ll do it ourselves and not ask children to do it.” These things are fresh in my mind—I’m reliving them.228

Hollod’s reminiscence disclosed how Emma planned to outmatch the socialists’ attempt to spread propaganda and how she outwitted the police. Police harassment materialized much less frequently when Mother Earth organized events at upscale Midtown venues. Events in spaces like Carnegie Hall and Berkeley Theatre fostered solidarity among radical ranks against the authorities. Emma particularly rejoiced at creating spaces across class and ethnic lines, where native-born cultural elites mingled with immigrant workers. For her, occasions like this allowed anarchists to mobilize the “intellectual proletarians” to join labor’s social revolution. Though these spaces were far from anarchist exclusive, they furthered the anti-authoritarian causes that anarchism advocated.

By contrast, Union Square epitomized the kind of spaces where Mother Earth’s members asserted their outdoor militancy to appeal to labor. Contrary to the cozy, respectable indoor spaces where Emma cultivated intellectual supporters, Union Square gave Sasha access to the orthodox anarchist groups with whom he felt most comfortable. Union Square was the heart of Lower Manhattan’s outdoor activism venues close to Greenwich Village and the Lower East Side.229 Its history as a center of public protest and gathering dated back to the 1850s.230 Union Square’s crowds were mixed compared with Rutgers Square, the predominant Jewish rallying point on the Lower East Side.

228 Avrich, Anarchist Voices, 206.
229 Union Square was located north of the Lower East Side and Greenwich Village, where Broadway met Fourth Avenue and crossed 14th and 17th Streets.
Liberal elites, socialists, anarchists, trade unionists, labor unions, and suffragists often competed or collaborated with one another in the open space of Union Square. *Mother Earth*’s major outdoor rallies took place in Union Square, not in Rutgers Square, for the sake of soliciting more support beyond (Jewish) immigrant circles. *Mother Earth*’s closest ally for labor radicalism was the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), a Chicago-based labor union founded in 1905. Like *Mother Earth*, the IWW advocated similar tactics of direct action and sabotage to struggle against capitalists.\(^{231}\) Several IWW leaders, such as Bill Haywood, Carlo Tresca (an Italian anarchist), and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn befriended *Mother Earth* members. Many young, militant anarchists—mostly immigrant labor—joined the IWW’s protests and activism against capital. These young militant workers tended to consider Emma pro-bourgeois and were closer to Sasha. But *Mother Earth*’s editorials, either by Sasha or Emma, were adamantly pro-labor, although they had criticized some of the IWW’s policies for being too centralized and not revolutionary enough. (See Chapter 5)

The experienced Sasha knew how to attract attention for the anarchists in joint labor protests with the Wobblies, who always outnumbered them. Tresca recalled that, “The Anarchists managed to keep in the limelight” when assembling in Union Square.\(^{232}\) Sasha displayed his leadership and tactics at the mass memorial service for the three anarchists who died in the Lexington Avenue explosion. He denied that the explosion was an anarchist plot altogether and instead accused the police’s frame-up of anarchists.\(^{233}\) Marie Ganz, a Russian Jewish anarchist, found Sasha’s tactic of transforming the incident

---


into martyrdom repulsive. Her memoir, written after she renounced her anarchist beliefs, rebuked Sasha for exploiting the death of their three comrades for the sake of anarchist propaganda. Sasha, who always prioritized social revolution over individual interests, wanted to channel the crowds’ grief into strength against corporal violence that crushed labor strikes. He had a special urn made for the ashes of the late comrades and displayed it during the public funeral. The urn had a pyramid shape and featured a clenched fist emerging from its top. More than five thousand people crowded into Union Square for the funeral memorial in July 1914. About eight hundred policemen stood guard nearby. Sasha, Carlo, Leonard, Becky, Flynn, and another anarchist, Charles Plunkett, took turns addressing the crowd in English, Yiddish, and Italian. The tone of their speeches was fierce, but no violence of any sort occurred. *Mother Earth* documented the whole ceremony in its July 1914 issue, with the portrait of the urn as its cover image.

(Images 12 & 13)

---


235 Different records showed quite discrepant numbers of the attendants of the Union Square mass memorial. *Mother Earth* stated the largest number of the participants (“eighteen or twenty thousand people participated.”). Paul Avrich and Karen Avrich’s book said “more than 10,000 people assembled.” The *New York Times* reported the least amount of participants of 5,000. See “The Lexington Explosion,” *Mother Earth*, Vol. 9, No. 5, July 1914, p. 136; Paul Avrich & Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 235; “5,000 At Memorial to Anarchist Dead,” *New York Times*, July 12, 1914.

Anarchists were only a segment of the crowd at the mass memorial in Union Square; however, Sasha managed to infuse the whole event with anarchist spirit. Even if the unsympathetic New York Times’ observation (“less than one-third of the crowd present believed in anarchy”) was true, the numbers of anarchist sympathizers were still impressive. Sasha kept the memorial within legal bounds, demonstrating to the public, as he said, that “the only violence that ever occurs at these meetings is caused by the police themselves.” In its constant struggle with the police, Mother Earth’s members won the battle at Union Square that afternoon. The forging of anarchist solidarity continued from Union Square to the Mother Earth office. Sasha moved the ash urn to the

---

238 The organizations of the Union Square mass memorial included Anti-Militarist League, Mother Earth Publishing Association, and up to nine other groups. “The Lexington Explosion,” Mother Earth 9:5 (July 1914): 136-137.
239 Based on the news report, “[T]he anarchists could be distinguished by the fact that at the mention of the names of Caron, Berg, and Hanson they always removed their hats, and at no time were any heads bared except in the crowd directly in front of the stand.” “5,000 At Memorial to Anarchist Dead,” New York Times, July 12, 1914.
240 “5,000 At Memorial to Anarchist Dead.”
back garden of 74 to function as a public memorial of the three fallen anarchists. He reported in *Mother Earth* that several thousand sympathizers came to pay their tribute.²⁴¹

**Conclusion**

Thanks to *Mother Earth*, anarchism as a philosophy of life made remarkable headway in prewar New York. Its new supporters adopted radical ideas and sympathized with anti-authoritarian actions. The inner circle used the magazine and their extensive activities to make anarchism more intelligible and appealing to native-born intellectuals. The city’s pan-socialist, bohemian milieu greatly facilitated young intellectuals’ reception of anarchist ideas. For many iconoclastic minds, the *Mother Earth* members’ version of anarchism was more liberating than the materialistic principles of socialism. The inner circle urged their supporters to direct action; but they did not drive their audience to specific acts of revolution. Instead they defended every suppressed, persecuted, and underprivileged individual or group—though they subordinated race problems to class problems—and won admiration from other leftists. The fraternal ambience in *Mother Earth*’s headquarters particularly attracted young rebels. Bernardine Kielty Scherman described *Mother Earth*’s anarchists as “surprisingly gentle folk.” “Of all the political groups which I have ever come up against,” she noted, “I felt easiest with these—the anarchists.”²⁴² Scherman’s comment was revealing, since she was simultaneously affiliated with the Liberal Club, Heterodoxy Club, and *The Masses*. Many intelligent members of the avant-garde adopted (intellectual) anarchism because it was in keeping with their desire for free expression and self-realization as they advocated social


change. A short piece of The Masses artist Robert Henri in Mother Earth’s tenth anniversary special issue was exemplary. Henri’s re-conceived understanding of anarchism started, like many others, from attending Emma’s lectures. He pointed out how Emma provoked thought and appealed to reason and fact. “I cannot see as a result of her inspirations the adherence to any ism,” Henri concluded, “but I do see an incentive for each one to become a free and constructive thinker.”

Robert Henri’s remark revealed both Mother Earth’s intellectual contribution to the radical politics and the dilemma with its members’ inclusive approach in the Progressive Era. In a nutshell, its anarchism made people think; but it seldom transformed them into anarchist communists. The title of “philosophic(al) anarchists” with which a growing number of intellectuals identified was a handy disavowal of a commitment to anarcho-communism that recognized the inevitable use of violence to carry out social revolution. Emma deprecated the label of “philosophical anarchist” as just “an apology for cowardice that craves to appear interesting.” She was, however, pleased to have admirers of her philosophy, even if their versions of anarchism did not propel them to fight with the masses. Her persuasion, though, created an impressive non-anarchist public. It diffused rather than consolidated the dynamic strands of anarchism. The partial convergence of Mother Earth’s non-anarchist public with other radical publics gave birth

---

246 Emma Goldman, “Light and Shadows in the Life of an Avant-Guard,” Mother Earth 4:12 (Feb. 1910): 383-391. Goldman had constantly spoken little of philosophical anarchists. In another occasion, this time a press interview, she said: “There is no such thing as scientific anarchy or philosophic anarchy—cowardly phrases that men have invented to hide behind. These persons are theorists idealists and shrink from the practical results of their vaunted beliefs. No, if you believe in anarchism you must believe in revolution, for only revolution can bring about anarchism.” “Just Give Emma A Chance!” The Kansas City Star 31:195 (Mar. 31, 1911): 3.
to a hybrid counterpublic. While its core members won increasing numbers of philosophical adherents, their new supporters primarily favored other political solutions over stateless anarchy.

All in all, *Mother Earth* members fully mobilized modern technology, immigrant subculture, bohemian radicalism, and labor activism in Gotham to expand their anarchist sphere. Radiating from New York, the magazine’s ever-broadening anarchist sphere reached nationwide and worldwide audiences. The synergy of *Mother Earth*, its core members’ lecture tours, local events, and printed literature sustained a distribution of anarchist ideas and encouraged various anarchist activities across America. The next chapter will map out how *Mother Earth* connected with Americans beyond New York. As they continued to compete with other radical camps, *Mother Earth* managed to stake out a wider territory for anarchism in the Progressive Era.
CHAPTER 2
Creating a National Audience:
Multiform Propaganda

The inner circle of *Mother Earth* developed multiform propaganda as a mechanism to popularize anarchist ideas across America. Anarchist papers had been vital in nurturing comradeship, attracting sympathizers, and facilitating activism for the U.S. anarchist movement. None of them, however, were free from financial crises, particularly for anarcho-communist newspapers that authorities and general public condemned as devices for inciting violent terrorism. The draconian anti-anarchist laws that followed the 1901 assassination of President McKinley crippled anarchist activities. In 1905, Berkman wrote Goldman from prison, urging for a reformed propaganda for anarchism, which would combine “touring the country” with “organizing anarchist groups.” Berkman also stressed the need to develop a “higher class periodicals-route,” which targeted middle-class intellectuals in order to exert a “more real & lasting influence in the long run.” Goldman agreed with Berkman’s strategy and designed a range of techniques to widely propagate anarchism, including annual lecture tours, publications, and debates, among other activities. Through the mechanism of *Mother Earth*, they fostered an intellectual enlightenment, if not a political awakening, to anarchism among a multiclass and multiethnic public nationwide.

Following the discussion of New York in Chapter 1, this chapter charts the national effects of core members’ spoken, printed, and activist propaganda efforts to promote anarchism. Goldman and her comrades operated what I call *Mother Earth’s* “propaganda
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quartet”—the magazine, the lecture tours, the local events, and the MEPA literature—to create multi-(con)textual spaces for anarchist discourse. Proceeds from Goldman’s annual cross-country tour critically sustained *Mother Earth*. These tours allowed core members to distribute the magazine and pamphlets to give audiences and local radical groups key texts to study. Local events, such as debates with non-anarchists, often boosted anarchist morale despite potential backlash from other publications. Other core members (like Berkman) also toured to promote the magazine. Before the post office denied its second-class mailing privileges in September 1917, *Mother Earth* survived several financial crises. The cultural productions of the propaganda quartet maintained *Mother Earth* as an organization, while bringing anarchism to a growing audience. Anarchist solidarity grew within *Mother Earth’s* extended counterfamily, who constantly recruited new members during Goldman’s annual tours. Anarchist followers, even converts, emerged from coast to coast. Their multiform propaganda diversified the spaces in which anarchist messages were spread to include trains, churches, and bourgeois sympathizers’ barns, to name a few. Ironically, the suppression from local authorities compelled the anarchists into contact with new audiences when looking for alternative venues to share their messages.

*Mother Earth’s* national operations featured new cultural forms, genres, and rhetoric that core members used to render discourses about anarchism. They recycled their oral testimonies and printed propaganda into travelogues and tour reviews in *Mother Earth*. Uniquely and controversially, Goldman introduced modern drama as a new cultural form in her lectures and essays to help her audiences engage with social problems and discuss her anarchist solutions. She viewed every revolt against conventional life in the modern
realistic plays as a gesture to anarchism. *Mother Earth’s* regional members also
popularized debates as another form of propaganda. These novel genres and cultural
forms for anarchist propaganda went hand in hand with innovative rhetoric. Goldman
mobilized dichotomous rhetoric (Russia/America, Jews/Whites, and the East/West Coasts)
in her travelogues to highlight her criticism of conventionality, bigotry, and
narrow-mindedness among the American public.

Goldman’s intention to spread her anarchist gospel out of existing anarchist circles
was evident in her replacement of correspondence column with travelogues and tour
reviews in *Mother Earth*. Editors of previous anarchist papers used the correspondence
column to communicate with “insiders,” such as anarchist comrades and likeminded
radicals. By contrast, Goldman wanted her magazine to attract “outsiders” and publicize
its philosophy to the unconverted. She made these editorial choices so her publication
would transcend the boundaries of anarchist propaganda that targeted labor and focuses on
socioeconomic issues. Travelogues and reviews of the tours aimed at attracting
non-anarchists’ interests in anarchism with events taking place in or out of their cities.

Goldman’s choice to adopt multiple propaganda formats contributed to anarchism’s
rising cultural-intellectual influence at the time. It also, however, revealed the distance that
the American general public, particularly middle-class elites, kept from anarchy. In a letter
to Goldman, Berkman commented, “Anarchism & Anarchy are two different things. By

2 For the importance of the reader-editor correspondence to the earlier English-speaking anarchist papers in America, see Koenig, “American Anarchism,” 23-27.
3 Another proof is that, Goldman and Berkman infrequently discussed other anarchist publications in *Mother Earth*; especially compared with how frequently they promoted some non-anarchist papers. *Mother Earth* usually only mentioned other anarchist papers in the advertisement column, such as *The Demonstrator, The Emancipator, (Ross Winn’s) Firebrand, The Free Comrades, Revolt*, among others. Meanwhile, the editors of *Mother Earth* had introduced and recommended several radical journals that could not be strictly named as anarchist papers, such as *The Masses, The Little Review*, and *The Woman Rebel*, to name a few.
An-ism I mean the philosophy, while Anarchy, to me, means a social status. None of us are ready for Anarchy, though many are for Anarchism.” His definition of anarchism and anarchy, later fully elaborated in *Mother Earth*, anticipated its audiences’ reception of anarchism. Most of them perceived or received anarchism as a personal philosophy despite the ardent advocacy of stateless anarchy in *Mother Earth*. Goldman and her comrades’ exposition of anarchism as an inclusive philosophy that could affect every aspect of life opened up unlimited ways for readers to practice it. Tour reviews in *Mother Earth* conveyed the (non-anarchist) writers’ intellectual appreciation of Goldman and her anarchism. Still, intellectual sympathizers disclosed their doubts about the feasibility of anarchy as a system for organizing society. They exercised their anarchistic ideas (if any) in their art, literature, journalism, social work, or in their private lives. Essentially, audiences’ intellectual tendencies and sociopolitical imageries determined their response to anarchism. *Mother Earth*’s version of anarchism inspired their resistance to conventions and the Establishment. But, their anarchist practices (free love, antimilitarism, modern school, etc.) did not lead to a social revolution.

The following sections explicate the national operation of the propaganda quartet in light of government suppression, local resistance, or socialist competition. My comparative analysis of different genres in *Mother Earth* and coverage of Goldman’s touring events in other non-anarchist presses examines the diverse representations and receptions of anarchism by the American public. Core members’ lecture tours significantly expanded anarchist geography. Regular attendees of various backgrounds developed a sense of counterpublic solidarity on the pages of *Mother Earth*. As Goldman and Reitman’s
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travelogues chronicled the happenings on the road, the attendees’ tour reviews, appearing as testimonials, help us understand the “Goldman Phenomenon.” Reports in non-anarchist newspapers and magazines fueled the public’s voyeuristic curiosity about the anarchist queen while introducing them to her broadened interpretation of anarchism. The MEPA publications, showcasing its members’ ideological reach, aimed at extending the intellectual effect of the lectures. The diverse, mutually supportive forms of propaganda carried *Mother Earth* through during twelve years of struggles. Although this propaganda quartet did not sell political anarchism well, it created a counterculture with an exciting intellectual vision for its growing, heterogeneous audiences.

**The Power of Touring the Country: Performance and Narratives**

Goldman’s promotional tours helped rekindle anarchist morale nationwide and sustain her organization at once to an extent unseen in American anarchist culture. Her “invading the country,” as she called her annual tours from 1906 to 1917, demonstrated the power of oratory to efficiently popularize anarchism.\(^5\) An army of Goldman’s biographers have provided rich accounts of her eventful experiences on the road. They outlined how her lectures inspired her audiences while provoking reactions and suppressions.\(^6\) But they have not yet systematically examined the synergy of *Mother Earth* and Goldman’s lecture tours. An assessment of the effect of Goldman or *Mother Earth*’s propaganda would not be complete without studying its multiform productions. Christine Stansell, for instance, hinted at the limited political effect of Goldman’s anarchism lectures: “far more of Goldman’s listeners shivered with transgression at the lecture and

---

\(^6\) Alice Wexler, for example, cited several witnesses from the intellectual audiences to conclude that, “By all accounts, Goldman’s propaganda tours were a great success.” Wexler, *Emma Goldman*, 165-167.
then returned to their regular lives.” Yet Stansell’s sketch underestimates the potentially more enduring effect that selling the magazine and distributing pamphlets nationwide may have had. The fourfold effect of the tours, the magazine, the local events, and the literature sparked anti-authoritarian tendencies among thinking people. Their tendencies toward personal defiance of the authorities became alternative, albeit unorthodox, anarchist practices.

Goldman’s repeated statement that she toured to support *Mother Earth* “exclusively” spoke to the inseparability of the tours from the magazine. She reiterated in 1912 that, but for the proceeds from her lectures, *Mother Earth* “would have long ago ceased to be.”

She only stressed half the truth; the other half was that keeping the magazine afloat offered a reason for her to tour regularly. The nature of Goldman’s lecture-centered propaganda work before 1906 was relatively contingent and rootless without her own literature to distribute. After the birth of her “baby” magazine, she established a national supply chain of spoken and printed propaganda for anarchism. She hit the road up to six months out of a year, rain or shine, bonding with old friends while making new ones. Goldman’s English lectures reached native speakers and English-speaking immigrants while her occasional Yiddish and German lectures continued to build on her ethnic-cultural ties. Her resolve to provide for her counterfamily surpassed her fatigue from constant travel year after year. The result was a record-breaking tour performance

10 Goldman’s previous tours were properly characterized by Berkman as a “useless disturbance, because merely temporary, of the sleeping zoo.” Alexander Berkman to Emma Goldman, March 12, 1905.
11 Emma Goldman to Alexander Berkman, March 17, 1907, cited from *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II*, 218. At times, Goldman was discouraged by the inertia or inability of comrades in arranging local events for her tours. It had been constant stress and endless challenges to travel with “lack of privacy, constant visitors, lectures every night, a large correspondence, two bodyguards
for anarchism in its intensity, diversity, and influence. (Maps 5 and 6) She routinely circuited from New England to the Midwest and reached the West coast, at times even the Southwest. She visited more than a hundred cities, towns, and rural areas in the U.S. year after year. The power of Goldman’s oratory, coupled with other productions of *Mother Earth*, drove federal authorities to react by revoking her U.S. citizenship. Goldman obtained her citizenship in 1887 through a short-term marriage to a fellow immigrant worker Jacob A. Kershner. The District Court in Buffalo annulled Kershner and Goldman’s citizenship on April 8, 1909 on the grounds that he had obtained his citizenship using false information. Goldman reluctantly gave up her international travel and tour plans for fear that the government would not allow her to re-enter the U.S. if she went abroad.
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12 Goldman was married to Jacob A. Kershner, a Russian Jew and fellow factory worker, at the age of 18 in Rochester. According to her account, Kershner’s impotence and their distance in values and interests led her to divorce him after nine months of marriage. She was forced to get back together with Kershner for a short while because of his pleas and family pressure. But soon she decided to live her new life and left for New York. Goldman, *Living My Life, Vol. I*, 18-25. Kershner was charged with committing “fraud and perjury” on his citizenship application. Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 112-120.

Map 5: Locations of Goldman’s U.S. lecture tours before the publication of *Mother Earth* (1890s-1905)

Map 6: Locations of Goldman’s U.S. lecture tours during the publication of *Mother Earth* (1906-1917)

The related data are collected from the “Chronology” in three volumes of *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years*. Southwestern cities like El Paso, Fort Worth, San Antonio, and Houston were foreign to anarchist orators until Goldman’s visit in 1909. Regarding the strength/frequency of Goldman’s tours, “Strong” is referred to more than 20 times of visits/lectures; “medium” means between 10 and 20 times; “mild” means fewer than 10 times.
Before radio or television broadcasting were available, speeches could only be publicly transmitted through print media. Articles in *Mother Earth* maximized the tours’ promotional effect and its intellectual influence on the public. As a rule, Goldman set her tours in motion by issuing advance notices in *Mother Earth* and scheduling lectures in different cities.\(^{15}\) She produced a series of travelogues, which ran from April 1907 until January 1917.\(^{16}\) Reitman debuted his first travelogue in May 1911.\(^{17}\) Routinely, travelogues included factual specifics (time, place, theme), opinions (on local culture, authorities, press, audiences, comrades), and self-evaluations (the result and influence) of the tours. Beginning in July 1907, tour reviews appeared in *Mother Earth* as another genre to recycle the material from the tour and engage (inter)national readers. Local anarchists, Goldman’s friends, and intellectual sympathizers wrote the tour reviews. They added seemingly objective comments on the influence of Goldman’s lectures and the validity of her ideas. The genre of tour review in *Mother Earth* became a substitute for the one-on-one editor-reader correspondence column featured in other anarchist papers. The reviewers felt that their contributions to the magazine were the best promotions for the anarchist activities in their cities. It was therefore mutually beneficial for tour reviewers and *Mother Earth* to highlight the achievements of the tours. Together, travelogues and tour reviews helped conjure up a counterpublic collective and a sense of imagined community among *Mother Earth*’s readers.

\(^{15}\) Anarchists countrywide responded to her notices with invitations and offers of support for her. Emma Goldman, “Anent My Lecture Tour,” *Mother Earth* 2:11 (Jan. 1908): 534-535.

\(^{16}\) She changed the title of the travelogue series on an annual basis to hold readers’ interest. These titles, in timely order, were “On the Road,” “The Joys of Touring,” “En Route,” “The End of the Odyssey,” “Adventures in the Desert of American Liberty,” “Light and Shadows in the Life of an Avant-Guard,” “On the Trail,” “The Power of the Ideal,” “The Ups and Downs of an Anarchist Propagandist,” “Agitation En Voyage,” and “Stray Thoughts.”

Travelogues outlined the pattern of lecture tours, allowing readers to empathize with the ups and downs Goldman and Reitman experienced on the road. Prior to 1908, the result of her tours was rather conditional on local comrades’ organizing abilities. Once Reitman joined the tours, he became the single advance force, securing venues ahead of Goldman. He would distribute handbills and visit the offices of local newspapers to advertise the lectures. Upon arrival, Goldman would offer speeches, host private gatherings, and participate in local anarchist events or labor rallies. Civic groups and congregations often invited her to debate with them or to give talks. Goldman solicited her comrades, friends and new acquaintances to become local agents and subscribers for *Mother Earth*. (Appendix 1) The sale of *Mother Earth* and the MEPA’s literature took place at all of the events. Goldman and Reitman also worked to organize study groups, clubs, and libraries for the people attending the lectures. Goldman was glad to add new cities or towns to the originally scheduled tour route upon request. She enjoyed returning to cities from earlier visits in the tour where audiences had earnestly asked her to give more lectures after completing their scheduled tour dates. The typically positive responses to the lectures recorded in the travelogues gave readers a sense of mutual connection. Goldman’s portrait of the beautiful “human brotherhood” that she experienced in Houston, for example, was imaginable by readers elsewhere only through the pages of *Mother Earth*.

Thanks to the travelogues, readers of *Mother Earth* could visualize the mobile, diverse, provisional, and combative spaces where its core members delivered anarchist messages. Goldman optimized the functionality of her travels by relying on trains. She utilized her time on the train to plan her strategy and write speeches as she traveled from

---

one city to another. The train, she wrote in early 1909, was her favorite retreat. On one occasion, Goldman delivered a lecture and sold a lot of literature, “not in the hall, but in the Pullman sleeper,” after fellow passengers identified her. Though trains gave Goldman a sense of refuge, train stations were the space where she started battling with local police and angry citizens. Her sarcasm about how the police “escorted” her from the train station to her lodging place or the lecture hall indicated the difficult conditions she experienced on tour. Securing lecture venues was a constant stress during the tours. On better occasions, Goldman lectured in trade council halls, trade building temples, labor halls, various rental halls, and even in leading theatres; some venues were as good as those in New York City. On other occasions her lectures suffered interference from local governments, police, socialist leaders, non-anarchist press, patriotic citizens, businessmen, and sometimes trade unions. Groups who opposed her work blocked her access to speaking venues, which led to contract cancellations and financial losses. Goldman and Reitman often had to locate alternative sites to host her speeches. Some new friends and even strangers, mostly members of the bourgeoisie, provided them with new meeting venues. Goldman lectured everywhere from churches and the back rooms of saloons to private homes, country cabins, barns, vacant lots, and open air tents.

---

20 “I don’t know how I could possibly weather the storm and stress of meetings, discussions, and debates, were it not for the occasional respite in my only place of refuge—the train,” confessed Goldman. Emma Goldman, “The Joys of Touring,” *Mother Earth* 3:11 (Jan. 1909): 370-379.
21 Emma Goldman, “On the Road (Continuation),” *Mother Earth* 2:3 (May 1907): 128-135
24 Realistically, only individuals with means could offer alternative lecture spaces when the scheduled ones were not accessible. When labor unions declined to let Goldman use their halls, some local liberal-minded
As a rule, travelogues highlighted the tours’ “most wonderful variety of audiences,” as Reitman claimed, who were curious about or open to anarchism. No other anarchist lectures, not even Goldman’s before 1906, had attracted such a diverse, largely non-anarchist public. Reitman observed “many professional men and women” among the audience. Goldman expressed her joy in seeing “workingmen, tramps, hoboes, lawyers, judges, doctors, men of letters, women of society, teachers, students—in short, everybody” congregated in her lectures. Other special audiences included senators, members of the legislature, governors, mayors, city officials, drama critics, farmers, firemen, and soldiers. Policemen or detectives showed up at almost all of Goldman’s public speeches, paying admission fees to attend the lectures. At times they even outnumbered the regular audience members. Immigrants of a dozen ethnicities, such as German, Jewish, Italian, Japanese, Chinese, Danish, and Finnish, also attended the lectures. Goldman and Reitman generally charged admission fees (usually 10 to 25 cents; later 35 to 50 cents) to intellectuals lent a helping hand. Her travelogues introduced these middle-class intellectuals as *Mother Earth*’s new friends and paid tribute to their assistance. To be fair, she also expressed gratitude when she received aid from labor unions or working-class groups. These proletarians, however, were “nameless” in her travelogues. By contrast, her choice to credit “named” members of the middle classes left *Mother Earth*’s readers with a sense that she more highly valued the publication’s bourgeois friends. For examples, see Emma Goldman, “On the Trail,” *Mother Earth* 5:12 (Feb. 1911): 386-391; Emma Goldman, “The Power of the Ideal,” *Mother Earth* 7:5 (July 1912): 164-168.


26 B. Reitman, “Three Years: Report of the Manager.”


support *Mother Earth’s* sustaining fund. But they welcomed the unemployed, the Wobblies, and soldiers to listen for free.\(^{31}\)

Goldman’s lecture themes, listed in her travelogues and *Mother Earth’s* advertisements, ran the gamut of the social sciences and the arts. She hoped to attract a variety of audiences by using diverse topics. Candace Falk noted that Goldman was adept at “strategically calibrating her lectures to her audiences’ ability to accept her message.”\(^{32}\) The topics, contents and tones of her lectures were all parts of her performance to sell her version of anarchism. With almost a hundred different titles for her propaganda lectures, she generally rendered anarchism as a life philosophy. (Appendix 2) Goldman infused anarchist ideas into her political, socioeconomic, sexuo-ethical, psychological, literary, dramatic and sociological criticisms of the labor, sex, and woman problems. On the road, she also worked to rally support for labor activists and social revolutionaries whenever they suffered government persecution.\(^{33}\)

The particular set of lectures that set Goldman apart from other anarchist orators were her lectures on the realistic modern drama.\(^{34}\) (Appendix 3) She defended her drama lectures on the tour in response to some anarchists’ criticism of her deflection from socioeconomic imperatives. The radical messages in the modern drama, Goldman argued,

\(^{31}\) B. Reitman, “Three Years: Report of the Manager.”
\(^{32}\) Falk, “Raising Her Voice,” 79.
\(^{33}\) Some of Goldman’s speeches discussed the 1912 Lawrence textile strike, the 1913 Patterson silk strike, and the 1914 Ludlow miner strike. She sought support for the revolutionaries waging the 1905 and 1917 Russian Revolutions and the 1910 Mexican Revolution. Goldman also raised funds for several victimized dissenters, anarchists, and labor leaders during her tours. They included William Buwalda, an American soldier who was court-martialed for shaking Goldman’s hand after attending her lecture in 1908; Francisco Ferrer, a Spanish anarchist educator who was arrested and executed by the Spanish government in 1909; Denjirō (Shūsui) Kōtoku, a Japanese anarchist arrested and executed by the Japanese government in 1911; brothers John J. and James B. McNamara, American labor activists who were indicted for the *Los Angeles Times* bombing in 1911; and Ricardo Flores Magón and his brother Enrique Flores Magón, two Mexican anarchist agitators. For more discussions, see Chapter 3 and 5.
\(^{34}\) The earliest audience for Goldman’s drama lecture in 1897 was actually a group of miners. But she gradually saw the modern drama as an apt medium to translate the revolutionary, anarchistic spirit to her bourgeois audiences. Goldman, *Living My Life*, Vol. I, 493; Vol. II, 526-527.
“may become more dangerous to the present fabric of society than the loudest harangue of the soap-box speaker.”35 Die Weber (The Weavers) by Gerhardt Hauptmann, for example, allowed her to address “the brutal background of poverty” and condemned “the deaf ears of self-satisfied society.”36 John Galsworthy’s Strife provided an entry for her anarchist analysis of prison and punishment. Henrik Ibsen’s plays, from A Doll’s House to An Enemy of Society, enabled Goldman to attack conventionality and social evils. All in all, the themes of Goldman’s propaganda lectures and drama lectures set the tune for Mother Earth’s anarchist philosophy and agenda.37

Reitman’s unpublished autobiography revealed what Goldman’s travelogue did not (want to) mention about his opening of the lectures with vaudeville-like entertainment. Reitman detailed his routine performance, his sales pitch for anarchist literature, as the host of Goldman’s lectures:

I would come out in front of the audience and say, “Friends, Miss Goldman will be ready to speak to you in ten minutes. While she is getting ready I want to tell you about a few books I have. Here is a pamphlet on anarchist morality that sells for ten cents. You think that if you don’t have the law and the church people will not be decent and behave themselves, and respect your rights and your property. This book describes the life people will live in a free society without government and without churches. When you get home tonight your old woman is going to ask where you have been. When you tell her you have been at an anarchist meeting she will bawl you out. But after she has read this pamphlet she will come with you tomorrow night.”38

This account exhibits Reitman’s marketing persuasion tactics, the important role of the literature, and a tinge of plebeian taste that he added to the lecture. Reitman’s showmanship style, while contrary to the refined manner Goldman adopted, was welcome among labor audiences. He did not mind if these working-class audiences (often

35 Emma Goldman, “The Ups and Downs of an Anarchist Propagandist.”
36 Goldman, The Social Significance of the Modern Drama, 87-117; Goldman, “The Modern Drama.”
37 The categorization/distinction of “propaganda lectures” and “drama lectures” were made by Goldman and known by other Mother Earth members, her friends, and adherents.
men in the above-quoted context) came to the lectures just for entertainment, as long as they paid the admission and bought some pamphlets. Unlike Goldman, Reitman used frivolous jokes and dramatic overstatements to entice the audience into purchasing their literature. He was proud of the large number of pamphlets and books that he sold before, during, and after the lectures “as a means of spreading the gospel of Anarchism.”39 He also recorded Goldman’s pushing *Mother Earth* subscriptions to her audiences as a post-lecture must do:

> after each meeting she [Goldman] would make a special appeal for [*Mother Earth*’s] subscriptions. She would say, “Friends, I am glad to have been with you, and have you come to my lectures, but in a few days I’ll be gone. If you would like to keep in touch with me and see how I am treated and if the police lock me up, if you want to keep abreast with the revolutionary and radical movement; and if you care anything about good literature, and if you want to make me feel that my work is worth while you will subscribe to my magazine. It is only one dollar a year. I am making a special offer of *Mother Earth*, my pamphlet on Free Love and Ibsen’s drama for $1.50.”40

As the last section will discuss further, Goldman promoted all sorts of combined sales to increase the circulation and earnings of *Mother Earth*.

> Goldman’s travelogues included a local analysis to explain the reception of her lectures in each city, sketching the gradual development of an expanding anarchist public. Musician George Edwards noted that Goldman’s tours made these cities “define themselves in order that the rest of us may catch a glimpse of their souls.”41 Cleveland and Los Angeles scored high in Goldman’s estimation as *Mother Earth*’s “faithful friends” outside of New York.42 The open-minded mayors in Lynn, MA, Sioux City, IA and

---

40 Reitman, “Following the Monkey,” 244.
Cleveland treated Goldman and the anarchists in a fair manner.\textsuperscript{43} Severe suppression from local authorities took place in Philadelphia, Chicago, Columbus (OH), Detroit, Worcester, MA, Indianapolis, Everett, WA and San Francisco, to name a few.\textsuperscript{44} Conservative residents and the local press in cities like Burlington, VT, Reno, NV, Seattle, Butte, MT, and St. Paul, MN had given Goldman and her supporters a hard time.\textsuperscript{45} A score of cities witnessed the arrests of Goldman and/or Reitman.\textsuperscript{46} Meanwhile, several others where anarchists initially suffered persecution, such as Rochester, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, and Columbus, had a growing number of supporters for anarchism.\textsuperscript{47}

Denver stood out in Goldman’s travelogues as the city where she cultivated the largest number of adherents, projecting hopes for the anarchist propaganda.\textsuperscript{48} Goldman did not enjoy the city itself (“Denver is not unlike a prison.”); but she valued her growing audiences and friends there. She was glad to learn that three Denver newspapers “devot[ed] columns to \textit{verbatim} reports (italic original)” of her anarchist lectures in

\textsuperscript{46} These cities included San Diego, Bellingham, WA, Portland, Seattle, San Francisco, Chicago, and Cleveland.
Two years later, the mainstream *Denver Post* invited her to write a series of articles on the subject of “Growing Social Unrest.” She accepted the invitation, describing it a “miracle.” During a thirteen-day stay in Denver, she held fourteen meetings and published five articles in the *Post*. Many audiences coming from “school, office, or university” attended her drama lectures “every day from 5 to 6.30” and listened with intense interest. Notably, Goldman’s Denver drama lectures convinced her that drama was “a splendid vehicle for social thought,” and “an educator of the professional class.” She recruited some of her new Denver friends, such as high school teachers Gertrude Nafe and Ellen Kennan, to write for *Mother Earth*. Goldman’s appreciation of her Denver experience was explicit in her remark that “If the Denver venture would serve as an inspiration for other places, there might in time be born a vital intellectual and radical movement that would prepare the soil for bigger and more far-reaching things.”

Various statistical figures in the travelogues quantified the rising propaganda effect of Goldman’s tours. A typical “resumé,” as she called it, recounted in July 1910 that on the six-month tour she “visited 37 different cities in 25 States, delivering 120 lectures, before a total audience of 40,000, 25,000 of which paid admission, the balance—being unemployed—were, as usual, admitted free. Nearly 10,000 pieces of literature were sold, and five thousand distributed free.” Reitman concluded in May 1911 that over the three years he had been her tour manager they held about 500 meetings, “and there were no

---

two alike,” he boasted. They had distributed about half a million cards to advertise the lectures. He estimated that, “from 50 to 500 books and pamphlets are disposed of at each gathering.” He also believed that “as much as 1,000 different Anarchist publications have been left in a city after a series of lectures.” In the year of 1915, they held 321 meetings across the country. In October 1916, he reported that this year’s lecture tours was “by far more important and accomplished greater results” than the last one. The increasing numbers of the audiences indicated a responsive public to anarchist messages—though not anarchist exclusive, such as birth control or antiwar—even after the outbreak of WWI.

Besides showcasing the numerical data, Goldman’s travelogues also employed dichotomies of race, ethnicity and region to criticize non-anarchist publications and praise radical thinkers. Her rhetoric polarized the East and the West coast, Russia and the U.S., and white Americans and Jews. She favored the radical activist sentiment of the West Coast, commenting that her comrades there were “less dogmatic and authoritarian” than their East Coast counterparts. Her 1907 tour to San Francisco confirmed her preference for some West-Coast socialists, who showed more nonsectarian support for her than those on the East Coast. She concluded that her lectures yielded good results on the Pacific

56 B. Reitman, “Three Years: Report of the Manager.”
57 B. Reitman, “Three Years: Report of the Manager.”
60 Emma Goldman, “On the Road (conclusion),” Mother Earth 2:5 (July 1907): 215-222; Emma Goldman, “En Route,” Mother Earth 3:10 (Dec. 1908): 351-355. Kathy Ferguson notes that “There was a certain ‘wild west’ air in U.S. law enforcement, allowing Goldman and others to evade or contest the suppression of written and spoken words.” Ferguson, Emma Goldman, 26. This in part helps to explain the reason that Goldman enjoyed her tours in the West Coast among other factors, such as the hospitable comradeship, beautiful climate and environment, welcoming audiences, to name a few.
Coast.\(^{61}\) Next, Goldman drew extensive comparisons between American and European cultures, particularly the Russian manner of receiving radical ideas. She contrasted her fellow Russians’ fights against their autocratic regime with the Americans’ general complacency with their plutocratic government.\(^{62}\) After the Chicago police suppressed her lectures in 1908, Goldman satirically likened the work of the Russian Tsar to the American “Tsars.” “The Russian Tsar stands for free speech, which means *his right* to say what he pleases. So do also the American Tsars: they have *their rights* of free speech (italics original).”\(^{63}\) Moreover, she weighed American Jews against white Americans to underscore how the former energized U.S. radicalism. She commented in 1908 that “the bulk of our American radicals would positively die of inertia and anemia, were it not for the Jews constantly infusing new blood into their system.”\(^{64}\) When Goldman stressed that “the Jewish Anarchists are acquainting Americans with Anarchism,” she was also promoting the value of her own propaganda work.\(^{65}\)

While travelogues set the scene for the tour, tour reviews represented a fascinating image of Goldman; writers for both genres collaboratively staged unprecedented anarchist theatricality.\(^{66}\) Compared with travelogues’ overview of the people, places, and events in city after city, tour reviews mainly evaluated the performance and effects of Goldman’s lectures. Historian Susan Glenn credited Goldman as “the most self-consciously dramatic”

---


\(^{62}\) “Would, to goodness,” Goldman once reflected on her lectures in Columbus in 1907, “that America’s daughters should follow the example of their Russian sisters! Then, and not till then, will Columbus stand erect and the voice of Liberty be heard even in Columbus, Ohio.” Emma Goldman, “On the Road,” *Mother Earth* 2:2 (Apr. 1907): 65-71.


\(^{66}\) Here I draw on Susan Glenn’s remark on “being theatrical,” which was referred to “scene-setting” and “image-making.” Susan A. Glenn, *Female Spectacle: The Theatrical Roots of Modern Feminism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 132.
amid pre-WWI female leftist orators. Glenn likened Goldman’s speech-making style to “the professional strategies of the female stars of vaudeville,” stressing her “self-dramatizing personality” without providing much proof of it.67 Alice Wexler quoted Goldman’s own words that “it is more important to do propaganda with one’s personality, than with words” to show the way she fashioned herself into a role model for her audiences.68 Present-day scholars’ generalizations about Goldman’s stage presence as “by all accounts mesmerizing” (Christine Stansell’s words) could have used the more nuanced evidence available in the tour reviews in Mother Earth.69 Although they featured Goldman’s spectacular presentations, the reviewers made their critiques of the tours part of the lecture performance in print. Their portraits of what Goldman said and how she interacted with her audiences created an image of theatrical Emma.

Collectively, tour reviewers emphasized the androgynous virtue of Goldman’s oratory. They helped readers focus on the intellectual content of her performances instead of on her appearance, which was the focus of many mainstream accounts of her speeches. Although Goldman prioritized personality over words in doing propaganda, her reviewers observed and valued both. While male reviewers appreciated the masculine style of Goldman’s eloquence, female authors hinted at the feminine traits in her speech. William C. Owen, an Anglo-American anarchist, praised Goldman for relying on “proved facts” rather than “unproved theories” when tackling the present-day problems.70 Owen underlined the efficacy of her plain language with indisputable truths and data. Alexander Horr, a Hungarian-born Jewish anarchist, observed Goldman’s “calm, almost

67 Glenn, Female Spectacle, 127.
68 Wexler, Emma Goldman, 198. For Wexler’s quote, see Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Apr. 7, 1906, cited from Emma Goldman Papers, reel 2.
69 Stansell, American Moderns, 132.
unimpassioned delivery came in rounded periods and with sledge-hammer force.” Such force, he remarked, “possessed many of the qualities that the precision of logical formula assures in bringing about a telling climax.” Owen and Horr’s comments pointed to Goldman’s masculine methods of her delivery, which appealed to reason in a logical and forceful manner. On another occasion, Owen elaborated on the power of Goldman’s oratory:

If Emma Goldman had no other weapon in her armory, she wields one that will always work havoc with convention—that of directness. However one may differ, one knows what she is driving at, and there is no dilly-dallying with the outskirts of the question in hand. The result is applause, violent dissension, oftentimes the indignant rustle of skirts, and afterwards a buzz of excited conversation that fills the air with electricity and makes it difficult to clear the hall. In a word, one comes away with conviction that there has been thought in the making.

Owen captured the fierce storm—mentally, if nothing else—stirred by Goldman’s sharp, powerful attack on the Establishment and her skillful repartee that he compared to a superb fencer. From a gender-normative perspective, her choice to adopt masculine behavior as she lectured was itself dramatic. Alternatively, female reviewers focused on the feminine aspects of Goldman’s lectures while praising her strong performance. Washington DC based anarchist Lillian Kisliuk commented that Goldman’s “earnestness, sincerity and enthusiasm awakened a corresponding spark of fire in her hearers to be up and doing, they are taken by storm.” Louise Bryant, a feminist journalist, likened Goldman to “the warm, sweet, healing incense of the Spring.” The descriptions of her “armory,” and “storm” sounded rather masculine, but describing her effect as being like

72 For similar analysis of Goldman’s masculine rhetorical oratory, see Christine Stansell, American Moderns, 132.
the “Spring,” “sweet,” and “healing” seemed more feminine. In combination, her tour reviewers presented an androgynous Emma that reified her theatricality. Besides, the metaphors comparing Goldman to various natural forces that regularly occurred—like the spring, rain, breeze, and storm—imply that she was reviving the dull and shackled minds of the public.

Many tour reviews also highlighted the post-lecture question sessions to showcase Goldman’s persuasive presence when interacting with an engaged audience. Goldman’s provocative topics, from the psychology of violence to the intermediate sex, invited challenging queries from people with strong opinions.76 Goldman’s replies, mixing rebuttal, wit, and sarcasm, explained “any matters that might be in doubt,” as one reviewer said.77 Sometimes, Goldman directed one audience’s response against another’s criticism of her to strengthen her points.78 Reitman would help build up the momentum for Goldman by challenging the audience to debate with her.79 Margaret Anderson, an avant-garde publisher and editor of The Little Review, portrayed Goldman’s capacity for persuasion:

All of which brings me to the very amusing attitude of the pedagogues towards Miss Goldman. They say “let her give us more hard thinking and we’ll be more sympathetic.” But I have rarely seen one who has taken the trouble to talk to her after a lecture—to argue out a point of disagreement—who hasn’t left her with a feeling of capitulation.80

76 Reitman summed up their audiences’ most frequent questions, including “Was Czolgosz an Anarchist? What is the Anarchist’s position in regard to violence? What is the difference between Anarchism and Socialism? Is not drink responsible for a great deal of harm? How can we live without law? Do you practice free love?” B. Reitman, “Three Years: Report of the Manager.”
Such a “feeling of capitulation” did not necessarily mean commitment to (Goldman’s) anarchism. Anderson’s portrait of Goldman’s lecture on anarchism and literature to the Chicago Press Club displayed a classic reception of her work by anti-anarchists. “The majority of men there,” Anderson noted, “like the one who sat next to me, said the typical thing: ‘Of course [what Goldman said] it’s all true, but I can’t agree with her.’”81

Strategically, Goldman distinguished her drama lectures from other “propaganda lectures” to cater to a non-anarchist bourgeois audience; the approach was controversial but productive. To many militant anarchists, drama and sexuality were secondary issues as opposed to labor problems. “We resented her [Goldman] dwelling on such things as theater,” said Kate Wolfson, a Russian immigrant anarchist and a Ferrer School student.82 But many tour reviewers saw her drama lectures, though not dramatic in their content, as a secret weapon that garnered attention from “respectable” audiences who would have otherwise shunned anarchism.83 Socialist Claude Riddle recorded that several leading dramatic critics in Los Angeles attended Goldman’s drama lectures “and were loud in their praise of Miss Goldman as a dramatic scholar.”84 In late 1915, Ben Mandell thought highly of Goldman’s Chicago lectures; nine out of the sixteen speeches were given in the Fine Arts Theatre. Mandell believed that Goldman had “won her way into the hearts and minds of the thinking people, against their own will, as it were.”85 Even some non-anarchist

81 Margaret C. Anderson, “Emma Goldman in Chicago.”
82 Paul Avrich, Anarchist Voices, 74.
83 For example, Los Angeles-based anarchist Perry E. McCullough remarked that Goldman’s drama lectures “attract[ed] a class of people who would not attend the other lectures and who thus come into contact with real thought through their interest in the drama. Half-baked they may be, but close contact with the fire of great ideas will temper them when all else fails.” Perry E. McCullough, “Los Angeles Impressions,” Mother Earth 9:6 (Aug. 1914): 203-204.
periodicals referred to Goldman’s opinions when introducing the problem plays; an indicator to the influence of her drama critique. 86

As tour reviewers had shown, Goldman’s lectures contributed to an intellectual enlightenment—rather than a political awakening or ideological conversion—for her audiences. Rhetorically, these reviewers fashioned a quasi-cult of Goldman to impress readers with her performance. But they rarely went so far as to proclaim that her lectures converted audiences into anarchists. Instead, they explained how her denunciation of the existing order and her logical reasoning propelled audiences to question their deep-rooted assumptions, discover their true selves, and connect with like-minded people.

Commenting on Goldman’s factual arguments, Owen wrote, “Everybody present immediately recognizes these statements as true; a profound impression is made; the audience goes away restless with discontent, and privilege scents danger.” 87 These tour reviewers judged audiences’ unease as Goldman’s major success: she intellectually sabotaged the Establishment in her lectures. They described her lectures as an “intellectual feast,” a “mental bomb,” “intellectual vibrations,” and “educational in the truest sense of the word.” 88 Many of them claimed that many audiences’ thoughts were not the same after listening to Goldman. David Leigh spoke for the San Francisco audiences in Goldman’s lecture on feminism: “Somehow the opinions that went out of the hall were different from those which came in.” 89 Anna W. in Washington, D.C., pointed out similar

87 Owen, “Proper Methods of Propaganda.”
changes amid audiences after hearing Goldman’s discussion on homosexuality. Some of the reviewers argued that Goldman’s inspiring lectures simply revealed the audiences’ true nature to themselves. Lillian Kisliuk of Washington, D. C. quoted a female audience member as follows, “If Emma Goldman is an Anarchist, if the thoughts which she expressed stand for Anarchism, then I am and have been an Anarchist without knowing it.” For these reviewers, the thought-provoking, mind-stirring effects of Goldman’s lectures were no less dramatic than her performances.

Reviewers cited the impressive sale of anarchist literature and the organizing of local radical groups to prove their assessments of Goldman’s tours. Owen reported in July 1907 from Los Angeles that, “One most gratifying feature of all these meetings was the sale of literature, which was extremely large.” By late 1915, Lillian Kisliuk asserted that the enthusiasm displayed by the audiences “was not merely curiosity, but deep interest, [as] is shown by the amount of literature that was sold and the fact that Miss Goldman has been invited to return to this city in January to give a series of seven lectures on drama, over one hundred persons having already subscribed.”

In contrast to Mother Earth’s intellectual image-making, other newspapers entertained their readers with colorful and provocative portraits of Goldman and her lectures. To Mother Earth’s tour reviewers, Goldman’s dramatic element lay in the mental thrill that she stirred in her audiences. Other newspapers encouraged readers to

---

90 W. “Emma Goldman in Washington.”
91 Kisliuk, “The Deadly Placidity of Washington Aroused.”
92 Owen, “Los Angeles (Report).”
93 Kisliuk, “The Deadly Placidity of Washington Aroused.”
visualize the excitement of her stage presence as if she was performing a vaudeville show. Kathy Ferguson identified three “discourse networks”—law and order; media; and science and medicine—which “converged to articulate Goldman as a dangerous individual.”

The import of “danger” that Ferguson analyzed was inseparable from the reporters’ intentional gaze being directed at a notorious Jewish immigrant woman anarchist. Numerous non-anarchist press reports examined her appearance, attire, and tone that was absent in _Mother Earth_’s texts. Reporters used terms like “neat,” “entirely inoffensive,” “youthful gait,” and “no mannerism” to contrast Goldman’s mild demeanor with the ferocious image of anarchists familiar to the public. A narrative from _The Evening Times_ at Grand Forks, ND in 1908 described Goldman on stage in a manner usually used for a leading actress:

> At 37 the [anarchist] “queen” still is a well preserved woman. She is only five feet three inches in height and weighs about 132 pounds. Her youthful gait and carriage give a strong impression of nervous energy and determination. This astonishing woman's voice is low and pleasant, and the impression one gets of her, despite the firm chin, is of mildness and gentleness, even when she is speaking in public. On the platform she makes no gestures, but walks back and forth as she talks in a low, tense voice.

From Goldman’s age, height, figure, deportment, and voice, to her performance, this account led readers to picture her stage presentation in their mind’s eye. This press coverage complemented _Mother Earth_’s tour reviews in presenting Goldman as a prima donna. The difference is that, while the tour reviews highlighted her leading influence as intellectual enlightenment, some non-anarchist press reports showcased her talent for promoting anarchism as a prime performer. A report from the _Baltimore American_ in 1910,

---

95 Ferguson, _Emma Goldman_, 21-33.
97 “EMMA GOLDMAN,” _The Evening Times_.
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commenting on her lectures, noted that she “proved to be a most entertaining talker, and one who is well posted on the affairs of the day.”

Greenwich Village celebrity Guido Bruno also wrote that “Emma Goldman has a national reputation…She is doing it [lecture tours] year in and year out, like an actress playing the big circuit.” Narratives in mainstream press of how Reitman peddled anarchist literature and how Goldman ended her lectures by promoting *Mother Earth* and her upcoming lectures showed that her “performances” had a commercial air to them.

The non-anarchist newspapers’ coverage of Goldman’s tours led to her changing public image from a fierce agitator to a popular promoter for anarchism. To be clear, mainstream media still tended to be hostile towards Goldman and anarchism. The *Independent and the Weekly Review* in New York depicted Goldman in 1912 as “a preacher of violence and anarchy, one of the kind why by law should not be admitted to the country.” Nonetheless, a number of newspapers started to review Goldman in a rather positive manner. The changing tone of the *Anaconda Standard* (Anaconda, MT) in its description of Goldman over the years was telling. One of its short editorials in 1908 noted,

---

103 Various news reports about local reactions against some religious or academic figures’ amicable gestures to Goldman reflected some of the public’s unchanged hostility to anarchism. For examples, see “Anarchists' Leader In The City,” *The Evening Telegram* [Salt Lake City, UT], Apr. 11, 1908): 1, 7; “Says Anarchism Means Freedom,” *Morning Oregonian* [Portland, OR], May 24, 1908, p. 10; “Woman Well Called Queen of Anarchists,” *The Sedan Lance* [Sedan, KS], June 19, 1908, p. 6; “Miss Emma Goldman Says That All Anarchists Are Socialists Though All Socialists Are Not Anarchists,” *Belleville News-Democrat* [Belleville, IL] 56:55 (Mar. 4, 1911): 1.
“It would be a distinct gain to society, if Emma Goldman could be induced to abandon the lecture platform for the dishpan and the broom.”

By 1914, a news report of *Anaconda Standard* praised Goldman as “the greatest and loudest knocker, or, more refined and gently, the most consistent and aggressive iconoclast in the country.” The same report continued:

Emma Goldman is still at her old business of throwing bombs, but the dynamite and aldro-glycerine elements exist in the imaginations of the Manhattan policemen only. Her bombs are now what they probably always have been—intellectual ones, composed entirely of advanced thinking and an irrepressible love of freedom that defy more chemical analysis.

Clinging to the provocative term “bombs,” the reporter turned Goldman’s dynamite-throwing business from a destructive exercise into a constructive, intellectual one. As *The Kansas City Star* in 1913 remarked, Goldman’s “reputation as a lecturer is now equal to her former reputation as an Anarchist.”

While Goldman’s image as a threat lingered in the news, the entertainment and educational value of her lectures helped popularize her version of anarchism. On December 21, 1908, Portland’s *Morning Oregonian* stated that “Miss Goldman is no longer the fiery priestess of years ago.” The article continued, “Whether this change is due to the collisions she formerly encountered with the police, or whether the mellowing which comes with age has taught her she was in error, is not known.”

The changing public perception of Goldman and her anarchism was supposedly conducive to her propaganda work. Goldman herself rejected the idea that she had become a moderate. “Lest our

---

104 “(No title),” *Anaconda Standard* [Anaconda, MT], Mar. 6, 1908, p. 6.
friends fear that I am in danger of becoming respectable,” she declared sarcastically in *Mother Earth*, “I wish to inform them that I am still under the protective wing of the police.”108 And yet, Goldman’s middle-age, stout figure, and her reliance on persuasion rather than agitation for social change nourished the public’s new perception of her. The huge crowds pouring into or packing the halls, as illustrated in Images 14 and 15, made going to her lectures feel like going to a show (though under police surveillance).


Intriguingly, Goldman’s changing image in the non-anarchist press played into the hands of some fellow anarchists, who were critical of her bourgeois, commercialized lecture style. Voltairine de Cleyre, for one, challenged Goldman’s techniques in *Mother Earth*. Quiet, simple, and ascetic, de Cleyre was very distinct from the expressive, grand, and passionate Emma. De Cleyre adhered to orthodox anarchist focuses on socioeconomic

---

issues and encouraged labor to revolt. She disapproved of Goldman’s indulgence in costly lodgings and meals during her tours. Maintaining a closer friendship with Berkman, de Cleyre contributed many writings to *Mother Earth* upon his request. She toured in several cities in New England and the Midwest from 1910 to 1911. Her experiences on tour drove her to write a travelogue for *Mother Earth*, entitled “Tour Impressions,” in which she described her lecture tour approach. De Cleyre deprecated the choice of pursuing bourgeois audiences and seeking after respectability. That kind of tour, in her view, only induced audiences to offer “a lot of shallow flattery” to the speaker. De Cleyre argued that most of these audiences had no serious intent to grasp anarchism. “Comrades, we have gone upon a wrong road,” she exclaimed; “our work should be chiefly among the poor, the ignorant, the brutal, the disinherited.” While de Cleyre did not mention her by name, the essay was clearly an attack on Goldman’s work. De Cleyre’s conclusion that “our present propaganda (if there is any) is a woeful mistake,” was most probably jarring to Goldman.

Goldman’s immediate response, “A Rejoinder,” refuted de Cleyre’s charges and appealed to the need for inclusive, nonsectarian anarchist propaganda. Goldman tried to gain the upper hand by underlining her two decades of lecture experience and her anarchist

---

110 Paul Avrich’s biography of de Cleyre offered vivid comparisons between de Cleyre and Goldman with regard to their personalities, physical appearance, speech and writing styles, as well as their relationship with also attitude towards each other. His description of de Cleyre’s lecture tours from October 1910 to 1911 provided a detailed context for my discussion of de Cleyre’s criticism of the approaches and audiences of Goldman’s lecture tour, to which his book did not address. See Paul Avrich, *An American Anarchist: The Life of Voltairine de Cleyre* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978), 213-225.


114 Voltairine de Cleyre, “Tour Impressions.”
activities with the workers. She asserted that anarchist propaganda that targeted laborers had made little headway since the 1886 Haymarket affair. She further cited cases in Russia, Germany, England, and even America to stress that new and liberating ideas usually emanated from the so-called respectable classes. To include them into the range of anarchist propaganda did not mean to exclude the underprivileged, she argued. Goldman closed by encouraging an anarchist spirit that would allow each person to “choose his or her own manner of activity.”

The different attitudes of de Cleyre and Goldman toward lecture tours revealed two distinct approaches to anarchist propaganda within the inner circle. While one group emphasized fighting for the workers, the other group emphasized fighting with the workers. Goldman insisted that they had to convince all ranks of society to adopt anarchism in order to generate a social revolution. Her goal was to persuade intellectuals to join the fight for the proletarians. Max Baginski and Sadakichi Hartmann supported Goldman’s use of literature and drama as a means of anarchist propaganda. Hartmann lectured on the relationship between anarchism and artistic and literary topics.

Berkman, siding with de Cleyre, represented the orthodox approach that departed from Goldman’s inclusive style. Although Berkman recognized the importance of gaining financial and social support from the middle class, he did not feel comfortable using art and literature to discuss anarchism. He and de Cleyre intended to use political education to mobilize the working classes. Berkman lamented in his diary that Goldman’s propaganda methods drifted away from “the fountain head of Anarchist ideals,” namely to fight with

---

the underprivileged. He quarreled with Goldman over what he deemed “the futility of her propaganda” and “her bourgeois leanings.” He refused to publish some of the travelogues Reitman drafted in *Mother Earth* for similar reasons.

Berkman devoted himself to editing and lecturing for *Mother Earth* despite his disagreements with Goldman, adding some revolutionary proletarian elements to its promotional tours. He toured within the circuit routes of Goldman’s lectures, mainly to the cities in New England. Berkman’s tours obtained proceeds that helped support *Mother Earth*, though not as much as Goldman’s tours did. In 1915, he traveled west of Chicago and all the way to the Pacific Coast for the first time. His speeches focused on the significance of anarchism, crime and punishment, the causes and consequences of war, sex in prison, and homosexuality. Berkman’s travelogue indicated that he had a strong labor- and ethnic Jewish-oriented agenda that was absent from Goldman’s work. He wrote that wherever he toured, he visited the local branch of the Workmen’s Circle, a laborer’s mutual-aid group formed by Jewish immigrants. Berkman’s three female tour

---

119 Reitman’s braggart rhetoric in his essays occasionally distorted the intention of the lecture tours to the extent that Berkman had to reject some of the travelogues that Reitman wrote for *Mother Earth*. Anarchism, in Berkman’s view, involved philosophical ideals and realistic strategies. Falk, *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman*, 186-187.
120 Berkman emphasized that he toured “for the benefit of *Mother Earth*” and divided his time between giving lectures and doing the magazine’s office work. “Lectures,” *Mother Earth* 3:1 (Mar. 1908): 57.
reviewers unanimously paid tribute to his great personality while praising his appeals to directness and reason. Denver teacher Gertrude Nafe noted that “we had not been hearing a lecture, we had been meeting our own souls through one, great enough to interpret us to ourselves” after listening Berkman’s talk on “Crime and Punishment.”

“Billie” McCullough, a Los Angeles-based anarchist, remarked that Berkman communicated with audience through reason and “gives you something that you can take away.” Reb. Raney, an anarchist and nurse, praised Berkman for making his points “so tellingly, effectively, [and] completely.”

Realizing Berkman’s points expressed in 1905, Goldman engaged in “touring the country” and “organizing anarchist groups” to maximize the effect of anarchist propaganda. While on the road, Goldman and Berkman organized local anarchists for educational and political causes. Berkman focused on federating existing anarchist groups and orchestrated anti-militarist leagues in many cities that he toured. He gathered the militant and revolutionary elements among the working class to hold mass meetings during his tours in Kansas City, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Chicago. Within two days in Denver, he organized the (David) Caplan-(Matthew) Schmidt Defense League and raised funds for the two persecuted labor leaders. Goldman encouraged a much wider public to take on various post-tour activities. As she told a reporter from the Morning Oregonian in 1908, her mission was assisting people to develop “a right conception of the advanced ideas and principles of anarchism.” She helped to start local organizations.

such as Social Science Clubs, Social Alliance Clubs, Social Educational Clubs, Free Speech Leagues, and libraries from coast to coast. Goldman expected these organizations to “carry on regular propaganda work” for anarchism and *Mother Earth*. Most of these groups, joined by many non-anarchist members, continued to circulate *Mother Earth* and its anarchist literature.

Goldman’s lecture tours also opened the door for recurring English-language debates with socialists and other non-anarchists across the nation. In her spoken debates Goldman echoed *Mother Earth*’s principles against the state-socialist ideology and understanding of political action. Debating with socialists attracted local audiences’ attention in a way that was not necessarily beneficial to the anarchists. While these debates reaffirmed core members’ anarchist philosophy and tactics, they opened anarchism to attacks from the socialist party.

**Debate to Define: “Anarchism, What It Really Stands For”**

Goldman’s lecture tours produced a space for anarchists to debate their ideological opponents; it was a mixed blessing for anarchist propaganda. Goldman primarily debated socialists in order to clarify misconceptions about anarchism and broaden public support for it. On the pages of *Mother Earth*, core members waged similar battles to

---


134 Goldman had also debated with democrats, liberals, and suffragists; but mostly, her main opponents came from socialist ranks. While topics like woman suffrage, sex question, and free love had appeared, the primary debate subject of Goldman and socialists were the resolution of anarchism/direct action versus socialism/political action. The typical debate topics of Goldman with the socialists included “Direct Action
distinguish anarchism from socialism. These debates—in words and in print—framed anarchism and socialism as dichotomous philosophies. They also disclosed local governments’ harsher treatment of anarchists than to socialists. The analysis of the debates in this section illustrates their double-edged effect on anarchist propaganda. On the one hand, core members seized the chance to clarify their anarchist philosophy and economic tactics. Local anarchists especially expected that Goldman’s eloquence could boost anarchist morale and attract followers. On the other hand, though drawing large crowds, debates risked deepening the public’s negative perception of anarchism. Socialists, who were relatively free from the terrorist image that plagued anarchists, utilized the polemics of violence to stigmatize anarchism.

The competition between anarchists and socialists in the U.S. worsened because of heightened antagonism between the Socialist Party of America (SPA) and anarchist groups. In theory, anarchists and socialists shared the same arch-enemy, capitalism, and demanded its abolition. Peter Kropotkin considered anarchism “the no-government system of socialism.” Anarchists’ conviction of the need to overthrow the state and the church differentiated them from American socialists, who recognized the role of government and had a general tolerance of religion. The Bakunin-Marx split at the First International Workingmen’s Association in 1872 ended their prior collaboration under the

---

versus Political Action;” “Resolved, that socialism, and not anarchism, will solve the social problem;” “the question of ‘Socialism versus Anarchism;’” “Socialism against Anarchy;” “socialism against the philosophy of anarchism;” “Social Revolution vs. Social Reform.” Examples of Goldman’s other debating themes with Socialists included “Free love without collective regulation is the only guarantee of a healthy race;” “woman Suffrage;” “resolved that socialism and not anarchy will solve the social problem;” “Resolved that collective regulation, and not free love, is a guarantee for a healthy race.” See Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years II, 475-506; Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III, 619-682.

socialist umbrella.\textsuperscript{136} Followers of Bakunin and Marx battled one another in America while vying for the loyalty of the same groups of constituents. \textit{Mother Earth}’s writers explicitly distinguished anarchism from state socialism promoted by the SPA.\textsuperscript{137} Founded in 1901, the SPA became the largest and most representative socialist organization in the U.S.\textsuperscript{138} The party worked to abolish wage slavery and to transform America into a cooperative commonwealth via electoral politics.\textsuperscript{139} It endorsed parliamentarism and step-by-step reform. The SPA’s indirect political action conflicted with the direct economic action championed by anarchists to resist or sabotage the existing order.\textsuperscript{140} The SPA’s revulsion against anarchism grew when some of its militant members, who were also affiliated with the IWW, adopted anarchistic methods.\textsuperscript{141} Leaders of the SPA such as Victor L. Berger and Eugene V. Debs classified the Wobblies as anarchistic, dangerous, and illegal.\textsuperscript{142}


\textsuperscript{137} Socialists generally detested being identified as “anarchists,” though not vice versa. Goldman claimed in 1911 that “All Anarchists are Socialists, but not all Socialists are Anarchists. Anarchism is the higher form of Socialism.” “Miss Emma Goldman Says That All Anarchists Are Socialists Though All Socialists Are Not Anarchists,” \textit{Belleville News-Democrat} [Belleville, IL] 56:55 (Mar. 4, 1911): 1.

\textsuperscript{138} For the history of the Socialist Party of America, see Jack Ross, \textit{Socialist Party of America: A Complete History}.

\textsuperscript{139} David A. Shannon, \textit{The Socialist Party of America: A History}, 4-8; Ira Kipnis, \textit{The American Socialist Movement 1897-1912}, 335-369.

\textsuperscript{140} “DIRECTION ACTION,” \textit{Mother Earth} 7:3 (May 1912): 78.

\textsuperscript{141} The IWW gathered radical socialists, industrial unionists, anarchists, miners, and rebel workers to fight against capitalists. They organized native-born, immigrant, women, and Negro workers to employ economic methods (direct action, sabotage, and the general strike) in asserting workers’ rights. The IWW’s direct action tactics greatly upset the electorally-oriented SPA members, whose anti-anarchistic voice prevailed in the SPA’s 1912 National Convention in passing an amendment of its constitution to expel members resorting to violence and sabotage as a weapon for the labor movement. “The National Socialist Convention of 1912,” \textit{The International Socialist Review} XII:12 (June 1912): 807-828. For more discussion of IWW and the \textit{Mother Earth} members’ attitude towards it, see Ch. 5.

\textsuperscript{142} “Debs and Seidel Chosen by Socialists to Head Their National Ticket Successful Candidate for President,” \textit{The Duluth News Tribune} [Duluth, MN] 44: 9 (May 18, 1912): 1; Eugene V. Debs, “Sound
Debate served as an alternative form of *Mother Earth’s* propaganda to journal discourses, lectures, and printed literature. Goldman’s reputation as a speaker gave local anarchists important leverage against socialists in their debates. Without the support of a political party, anarchist groups were outnumbered and often outmaneuvered by the SPA members. Frequently, local socialists refused to rent or lend their labor halls to Goldman. They had even threatened other hall owners if the latter did not follow suit.143 The SPA also prohibited its members from attending Goldman’s lectures and punished whoever aided anarchist activities.144 With few exceptions, socialist periodicals either ignored or, worse, misrepresented Goldman’s lectures and anarchist activities.145 Challenging socialists to debate with Goldman became the anarchists’ tactic to get even, or gain the upper hand in their rivalries.146 The socialists accepted the invitations with the intention of deepening the general public’s negative impression of anarchism. On occasion, they actively invited Goldman to debate. According to the local press, Seattle socialist Dr. Herman F. Titus initiated a debate with Goldman in 1908 “with the purpose of counteracting the injurious effects of her [Goldman’s] teachings.”147

*Mother Earth* reviewers praised Goldman for encouraging anarchists to stand their ground when she debated socialists on tour. Some reviewers criticized socialist debaters for using slander tactics. Alexander Horr described Goldman’s debate with socialist

---

143 B. Reitman, “Three Years: Report of the Manager.”
145 An anarchist A. H., for example, reported from Seattle that the local *Saturday Evening Tribune* published an article by Socialist vilifying Anarchism as “a program of destruction.” He instead argued that Anarchism “assures individual purity, disinterested motives and a revolutionary spirit.” A. H., “Seattle Report,” *Mother Earth* 2:5 (July 1907): 222-225.
146 *Mother Earth*’s tour reviews showed that the anarchists in different cities “challenged” local socialists to debate them. A. H., “Seattle Report;” Alexander Horr, “In ‘Frisco.”
Nathan L. Griest as “one-sided and intellectually unsatisfactory (the intellectual bankruptcy of Socialist orators and publicists is a common-place by this time)”\textsuperscript{148} W. P. Lawson described how Goldman rebutted Dr. Hermon F. Titus’s “honey-tongue tactic” to make him show his true colors:

Emma Goldman was confident—nay, even brusque—when she next appealed to the audience. Every argument went home. She told of the conditions in France; the treachery of Millerand; the trying affairs among the Germans; the ineffectuality of the three millions votes there. All of this had marked effect; she held her audience to a man. There was little to refute or dispute with her opponent; so she told of her literature and gave some of the fundamental tenets of Anarchism.\textsuperscript{149}

Goldman echoed Lawson’s comment and added her criticism of Titus in her travelogue:

“The Doctor [Titus] does not even know his Socialism. Else he would not have made himself ridiculous by telling the audience that Socialists do not bother about the future, [and] that they deal only with the present.”\textsuperscript{150} With Goldman as their debater, anarchists everywhere felt confident in challenging their socialist opponents when she was in town. Anarchists enjoyed the silence among socialist audiences when Reitman challenged them to debate Goldman after her lecture sessions.\textsuperscript{151} They cheered when Goldman seemed to convert socialist Dr. Claude Riddle to anarchism after their debate in 1907. Riddle, representing the SPA, admitted his defeat and later arranged several lectures for Goldman in southern California and wrote a tour review for Mother Earth.\textsuperscript{152} His pro-anarchist actions cost him his SPA membership. Goldman called him “comrade” and praised his “skillful management” of her meetings in a travelogue.\textsuperscript{153}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[153] Emma Goldman, “The End of the Odyssey,” Mother Earth 4:2 (Apr. 1909): 47-51. After Dr. Claude Riddle passed away, his friend Charles T. Sprading wrote in Mother Earth, claiming that Riddle “resigned
\end{footnotes}
While anarchist reviewers commended Goldman’s debating success in *Mother Earth*, their socialist counterparts continued their public denigration of anarchists. Socialists typically likened anarchism to terrorism. They used ad hominem attacks to discredit the older anarchists who Goldman identified as martyrs or mentors. During a debate with Goldman, Dr. Denslow Lewis of Chicago argued, “Needless to say, the Anarchists…are nothing but a pack of lunatics; as to Kropotkin, he is just foolish.” Goldman wrote that “Mr. Lewis’s favorite stock phrases” for defaming anarchists were, “‘insanity, madness, idiocy, and stupidity’.”

W. P. Lawson recorded this comment from Herman Titus: “Anarchists were ordinary assassins, their philosophy directly taught it, [and] it would inevitably lead to two definite ends, dreamland or bloody murder.” *The Seattle Star*, affirming Lawson’s account, reported that Titus argued that anarchy taught assassination. Judging by the general censure of anarchism in the socialist press, *Mother Earth*’s reports did not misquote the socialist debaters. The black activist leader Hubert Harrison’s general remark was poignant: “if you want to silence a man call him an Anarchist.” While socialists did not silence anarchists, their rhetorical tactics probably convinced some audiences to distance themselves from anarchism politically.

The anarchist-socialist battle extended from local debates to press coverage. *Mother Earth*’s writers claimed that Goldman was winning debates while socialist papers’ reports declared that the opposite was the case. The Los Angeles-based Socialist paper *Common Sense* clearly favored its editor Kasper Bauer, who debated with Goldman. E. E. B.’s


132
review on this debate, held on May 2, 1908, asserted that Bauer’s “scientific argument” prevailed over Goldman’s “purely idealistic position.” “It is to be hoped that the many socialists who have been flirting with anarchy,” E. E. B. wrote, “heard this debate in which Miss Goldman showed herself either unconscious of modern economic development or else choose to ignore it and evade it at every turn until her listeners felt inclined to designate her as ‘the artful dodger.’” William Owen refuted E. E. B.’s criticism on behalf of Goldman and anarchism. He argued that the debate only revealed in the “cruelest way” that “Socialism meant discipline and the relentless crack of the whip.” Owen was referring to the SPA’s suspension of Dr. Claude Riddle’s membership for being an advance agent for Goldman’s meetings in Los Angeles. Owen censured the SPA’s dogmatic authority over its members’ free will and action. Goldman’s debates with socialist Maynard Shipley in 1913 first in San Francisco and then in Everett, WA was another instance. Goldman belittled Shipley by saying that his debate performance verified the truism that “retrogression [of Socialism] in principle is always followed by a decline in mentality.” She went so far as to say that “the ignorance of Prof. Maynard Shipley as to Socialism beats anything I have ever encountered before. O, Socialism, what sins are committed in thy name!” Shipley’s suffragist wife Miriam Allen de Ford thought the contrary. In her biography of her husband, de Ford recorded that Goldman failed to meet Shipley’s arguments “on a logical basis.” De Ford even argued that the applause of the audience (largely anarchists) indicated that Shipley won the debate.

159 W. C. Owen, “Los Angeles (Report).”
On their second debate in Everett, Goldman simply noted that Shipley “was as uninteresting as he had been in San Francisco.” The local socialist newspaper *Commonwealth*, in contrast, implied its hope that the debate would reveal the violent tactics of anarchists while showcasing a promotional advertisement. (Image 16) News coverage from (pro-)socialist papers were not necessarily more reliable than the narratives of tour reviews in *Mother Earth*; but they do show the other side of the story.

Image 16: Advertisement for the debate between Goldman and Maynard Shipley in The *Commonwealth.*

Accounts from multiple sources showed that anarchists’ gains from debating with socialists were more uncertain than the sanguine affirmations expressed by *Mother Earth*’s reviewers. Goldman and her comrades rejoiced over the huge crowds drawn by debates as an indication of the rising support for anarchism. The huge crowds, however,

---

165 William C. Owen estimated that at least 1,000 persons were “unable to get into the already crowded hall” for Goldman’s debate with socialist Claude Riddle in Los Angeles in 1907. Wm. C. Owen, “Los
were by no means all (potential) anarchist supporters. Many people probably came for mere amusement; plus, socialist audiences generally outnumbered anarchist sympathizers. Local governments, to anarchists’ disadvantage, sometimes only allowed socialists to speak during the debates. Debate also opened anarchists to socialists’ mudslinging. Goldman may have outshone her socialist opponents as a debater, but they could freely accuse her of encouraging assassination and violence. Paradoxically, Goldman’s debates could trigger bias against anarchism.

While debates with non-anarchists did not consistently produce new support for anarchism, they forced the inner circle to clarify the tenets of anarchism for their audiences. The anti-SPA narratives in *Mother Earth* featured a Europe-US comparison and past-present rhetoric. They used failed European experiences of social democracy to emphasize the futility of the SPA’s political ideal.

---

166 The *Morning Oregonian*’s advertisement of Goldman’s lectures and debates under the column of “amusements” implied how some people saw these lecture/debate activities as entertainment.

167 For examples, see “Emma Goldman Stopped,” *The Evening Telegram* [Salt Lake City, UT], June 25, 1908, p. 2; “Won't Let Emma Speak,” *The Grand Forks Daily Herald* [Grand Forks, ND], XXVII: 205, June 26, 1908, p. 9.

rhetoric contrasted the deteriorated present-day socialists with their utopian precursors.169

Strengthened by their anti-SPA criticisms, *Mother Earth’s* writers insisted on the importance of inviolable individual freedom from all forms of governments and hierarchies. Their opposition to SPA-led political action also reinforced their tactics of direct action. Berkman’s 1912 August editorial asserted that: “We wage war against private ownership, the State, and the Church.” “The means to this end are propaganda, direct action, the general strike, and finally, the mental and material social revolution—a general uprising of labor, of the real wealth producers of the world.”170 The magazine crystallized its core concepts— anarchism, anarchy, anarchist, free communism, and direct action—into several slogans that repeatedly appeared in the magazine.171

Even though Goldman’s debates with socialists were not entirely successful, they did yield donations for various campaigns and follow-up activities that could boost anarchist morale.172 These debates also helped generate the tour’s income through the sale of anarchist literature. Through a variety of publications, Goldman and Berkman


171 “ANARCHY,” *Mother Earth* 7:5 (July 1912): 155; 7:10 (Dec. 1912): 357. The content of these concepts are as follows: ANARCHISM—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.” “ANARCHY—Absence of government; disbelief in, and disregard of, invasion and authority based on coercion and force; a condition of society regulated by voluntary agreement instead of government.” “ANARCHIST—A believer in Anarchism; one opposed to all forms of coercive government and invasive authority; an advocate of Anarchy, or absence of government, as the ideal of political liberty and social harmony.” “FREE COMMUNISM—Voluntary economic co-operation of all towards the needs of each. A social arrangement based on the principles: To each according to his needs; from each according to his ability.” “DIRECT ACTION—Conscious individual or collective effort to protest against, or remedy, social conditions through the systematic assertion of the economic power of the workers.”

hoped to expand the sphere of anarchist philosophy and strengthened audiences’ interest in anarchism sparked by the lecture tours.

A Galaxy of Radical Minds: *Mother Earth*’s Literature

Goldman and Berkman operated the MEPA in order to introduce the non-anarchist public to a galaxy of radical minds and further their intellectual enlightenment in the process. Goldman’s experience taught her the limitations of “the wonder worker, the spoken word.” In the preface of her first book, *Anarchism and Other Essays* (1910), she explained why she had transcribed twelve of her well-received speeches into a collection of essays. After enumerating some flaws in the speeches, she argued that writing facilitated a more intimate relation between writers and their readers. She believed that a book engaged a reader more fully than a lecture could because live audiences were usually seeking entertainment instead of enlightenment. Written expression, she concluded, was a superior format for conveying ideas. Yet she carried on annual long-term tours as a financial imperative and an irreplaceable means to expand her network. Over the years, she optimized the effects of her propaganda through an evolutionary process of using diverse modes of expression. Her cultural productions—from public speeches to various journal and publication genres—broadened the intellectual, if not the political, effect of the *Mother Earth* variety of anarchism.

*Mother Earth* became “the depot for anarchist literature in America” by setting up an impressive English-language “Mother Earth Library.” Goldman and Berkman

---

173 For Goldman, the spoken words “leaves no lasting impression” and, “in meetings the audience is distracted by a thousand non-essentials,” for which the lecturers “cannot escape the restlessness of the crowd, with inevitable result that he will fail to strike root.” Emma Goldman, “Preface,” in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, by Emma Goldman (New York: Dover Publication, Inc., 1969), 41-45.

issued the first “Mother Earth Library,” modeled on its precursor the “Free Society Library,” in 1911.\textsuperscript{175} It aimed to distribute the extensive literature of anarchism to all thinking people.\textsuperscript{176} The Mother Earth Library included MEPA publications and non-MEPA issued literature. The MEPA publications were categorized as the “Mother Earth Series.” (Appendix 5) The magazine sold non-MEPA literature under the categories of “to be had through” or “for sale by.” (Appendices 6 to 15) The Mother Earth Library surpassed previous anarchist library publications in its format, subject diversity, and propaganda mechanism. Earlier anarchist libraries primarily published pamphlets, including first run, reprints and translations by Euro-American anarchist writers. The “Mother Earth Series” featured various genres like speeches, essay collections, anthologies, and memoirs by its core members. Its themes included birth control, homosexuality, modern schools, prison narratives, and modern dramas, to name a few. Other non-MEPA issued literature built on the range of topics addressed in Mother Earth and during its promotional tours.

The “Mother Earth Series” featured four different production processes, which utilized various propaganda forms for creating new volumes to boost the circulation of anarchist ideas. The first one recycled lecture drafts into essays in Mother Earth. The essays were later excerpted and made into pamphlets or anthologies by the MEPA. The second one turned rough lecture drafts into pamphlet publications that did not appear in


\textsuperscript{176} “Advertisement: Mother Earth Library of Anarchism,” Mother Earth 6:1 (Mar. 1911). The advertisement stated: “The literature of Anarchism is very extensive. Numerous books and pamphlets have been written, treating of the various phases of Anarchist thought, and various publications, both here and abroad, are devoted to this philosophy of life. No well-informed man or woman can afford to ignore this vital subject. Your library is not complete unless it includes works on Anarchism.” Also see “Advertisement: Mother Earth Series,” Mother Earth 6:2 (Apr. 1911).
Mother Earth. Goldman’s publications mostly fell into these two types of productions.\(^{177}\)

The posthumous Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre (1914) similarly included several pieces of de Cleyre’s writings and speech drafts that had debuted in Mother Earth.\(^{178}\) The third production process involved publishing essays by radicals of all stripes and some liberals that first appeared in Mother Earth.\(^{179}\) The fourth one came out directly from the MEPA without preliminary spoken drafts or journal essay forms. Berkman’s Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist (1912) and the reprinted European writers’ works belonged to this category. Together, the “Mother Earth Series” reinforced the magazine’s interpretative strength of considering anarchism from philosophical, sociological, literary, sexual, dramatic, and scientific perspectives.\(^{180}\)

While the “Mother Earth Series” expanded the magazine’s motifs, the non-MEPA literature in the Mother Earth Library ran the intellectual gamut of anarchism. The books

---

\(^{177}\) From 1907 to 1910, MEPA issued five pamphlets for Goldman; each cost five cents. They were The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation (1907), Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty (1908), What I Believe (1908), A New Declaration of Independence (1909), and The White Slave Traffic (1910). Among them, What I Believe made its debut in New York World in July 19, 1908. Four essays from her Anarchism and Other Essays were reissued later as single volumes, priced from 5 to 10 cents. They included Anarchism: What It Really Stands For (1911), The Psychology of Political Violence (1911), Marriage and Love (1911), and The Drama: A Powerful Disseminator of Radical Thought (1914). Besides, the MEPA continued to issue Goldman’s revised lectures as single pamphlets, including Victims of Morality and the Failure of Christianity (1913), Syndicalism: The Modern Menace to Capitalism (1913), Preparedness: The Road to Universal Slaughter (1916), and Philosophy of Atheism and the Failure of Christianity (1916). They had appeared firstly in Mother Earth before reissued as pamphlets.


\(^{179}\) These pamphlets included the first edition of American writers and reprint or translation of European writers. Theodore Schroeder’s The Criminal Anarchy Law and On Suppressing the Advocacy of Crime (1907), C. L. James’s Anarchism and Malthus (1910), Jay Fox’s Trade Unionism and Anarchism: A Letter to a Brother Unionist (1907) and Voltairine de Cleyre’s The Mexican Revolt (1911), C. D. Light’s Crime and Punishment (1910), Edwin James Kuh’s The Right To Disbelieve (1910), and Adeline Champney’s What is Worthwhile? (1911) were the examples of the American elements. Peter Kropotkin’s Modern Science and Anarchism (1908) and Anarchist Morality (1917) and Maxim Gorky’s The Masters of Life: an Interview (1907) exemplified the reprint and translation of European writers.

\(^{180}\) Goldman’s Anarchism and Other Essays, for example, interpreted anarchism via various themes. One of the book’s advertisements in Mother Earth claimed that it gave “a comprehensive view of the author’s opinions on matters education, sexual, economical, political, and social.” “Advertisement: Now Ready! Anarchism and Other Essays,” Mother Earth 5:10 (Dec. 1910).
“to be had through” *Mother Earth* presented a unique caliber of iconoclastic minds to the American public. Ideologically heterogeneous works by progressive or provocative thinkers like Herbert Spencer, Henry D. Thoreau, Thomas Paine, Walt Whitman, Edward Carpenter, Oscar Wilde, and Leo Tolstoy were listed alongside anarchist classics by P. J. Proudhon, Peter Kropotkin, and Errico Malatesta. Besides, *Mother Earth* promoted several “series of books” that included the works of individual authors or certain themes, such as birth control, sex, and anti-militarism. Ernest Crosby, Bolton Hall, Friedrich Nietzsche, Henrik Ibsen, Peter Kropotkin, and August Strindberg were among the authors whose works could be purchased through *Mother Earth*. The potential ideological contradictions among the aforesaid authors did not bother Goldman and Berkman. They believed that individuals should exercise free choice once they had been exposed to various liberating ideas. In fact, every act of rebellion against authorities and conventionalities was to them anarchistic. This principle led them to embrace works by non-anarchists that contained glimmers of radical thought. These works were also more likely to attract non-anarchist readers than orthodox anarchist classics.

The “Mother Earth Series” also aimed to circulate anarchist ideas beyond the geographical range of Goldman’s lecture tours to across the Atlantic and the Pacific.\(^{181}\)

Goldman’s pamphlet *The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation* had German and Japanese translations soon after the MEPA first issued it in English. More non-Western language translations, including Japanese and Chinese versions, of Goldman’s writings surfaced during and after the 1910s following the publication of *Anarchism and Other Essays*. The

---

\(^{181}\) In my correspondence with Dr. Barry Pateman, dated Dec. 14, 2015, he stated that “We should note the role ME [*Mother Earth*] played as a distributing house. Partnering with *Freedom* in London it distributed pamphlets from England and elsewhere allowing Americans exposure to all sorts of contemporary anarchist thinking. Also- ME pamphlets travelled all over the world, helping the growth of EG’s [Goldman] international stature.”
MEPA literature crucially extended the intellectual influence of *Mother Earth*’s anarchism to non-Western countries. (See Chapter 4)

Huge costs incurred by the “Mother Earth Series” obliged Goldman and her comrades to adopt various kinds of marketing strategies to increase its sales and spread anarchist propaganda. The cost for printing the first edition of Kropotkin’s *Modern Science and Anarchism* was $155 dollars; other pamphlets were not cheaper to print.182 The magazine was particularly short of capital for publishing book-length publications. *Mother Earth* suffered financial crises whenever the police arrested Goldman or prohibited her lectures. She had stated in late 1906 that *Mother Earth* largely relied on the sale of single copies at various radical and liberal meetings. At the time, those sales earned about 80 dollars per month. Police harassment, Goldman wrote, caused some liberals to stop selling *Mother Earth* in their meetings.183 The result was an immediate loss of revenue for the magazine. Goldman developed alternative financial strategies to salvage the magazine and its printing venture. In order to issue *Anarchism and Other Essays*, she asked for credit from the printer to cover the printing cost. After the release of the book, she managed to sell enough copies on tour to pay back the full cost of printing the pamphlet.184 In 1912, Goldman solicited 700 dollars from her bourgeois friends through a manuscript-reading event to create a publishing fund for Berkman’s lengthy *Prison Memoirs*.185 The inner circle used readers’ donations to publish *The

Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre in 1914. Wherever Goldman or Berkman lectured, they left behind a sizeable amount of literature and copies of Mother Earth for intellectual stimulation and to promote activism.

Goldman worked to disseminate anarchist literature even after the Post Office stopped delivering Mother Earth. The Mother Earth Bulletin, first issued in October 1917, included advertisements for the MEPA publications. Goldman issued an appeal as the last advertisement for the MEPA in Mother Earth Bulletin in January 1918: “Will you help maintain the BULLETIN while we are in prison, and at the same time aid the propaganda?” Her determination to carry on disseminating anarchist propaganda even from prison resulted in the founding of the Mother Earth Book Shop in Greenwich Village. With Stella Comyn and Carl Newlander serving as her proxies, Goldman had the Book Shop issue her last pamphlet, The Truth about the Boylsheviki, in February 1918. The Book Shop succeeded the MEPA as “a rendezvous for radicals” and catered to readers with books on all radical topics including art, drama, science, education, and literature. Ideally, the Book Shop and Mother Earth Bulletin were designed to be mutually reinforcing entities. The changing political climate after the U.S. entered WWI, however, crushed the feasibility of distributing anarchist literature. The government’s continuous harassment finally brought the Mother Earth Bulletin to an end in April 1918. Two

187 The Mother Earth Series and copies of Mother Earth became the most available, also valuable assets of anarchist literature during the lecture tours. Hippolyte Havel, “Biographic Sketch,” Anarchism and Other Essays, 37.
months later, Stella published a single-issue newsletter, *Instead of A Magazine*, informing the subscribers of *Mother Earth Bulletin* that it would no longer be published. 191

In the prewar decade, *Mother Earth*’s propaganda quartet generated a surge of interest in anarchism in the face of strong opposition from the police, the mainstream press, and socialists. The last section of this chapter makes sense of the magazine’s survival and its challenges as its authors struggled to make anarchism intelligible to the public over its twelve-year existence. Numerous middle-class intellectuals’ accounts attested to their philosophical, if not political, reception of Goldman and *Mother Earth*’s anarchism. This study demonstrates that instead of waning after the outbreak of WWI, popular support for anarchist messages grew.

**Against All Odds: Challenges, Struggles, and Effects**

The fact that *Mother Earth* folded because of government suppression, rather than financial troubles, implies that readers supported its ongoing operation. To be sure, even anarchists admitted that the term anarchism “to many still means nothing but destruction and violence” by 1915, especially because an assassination by an anarchist helped trigger WWI. 192 Yet it is equally true that more writers from the non-anarchist press spoke of Goldman and her work in sympathetic terms. She was known not only as the “queen of Anarchy” as before, but also as “the most misrepresented woman in America.” 193

nuanced descriptions of Goldman indicated a partial vindication of her name and her version of anarchism in the mainstream press.

*Mother Earth*’s propaganda quartet advanced a more diversified understanding and somewhat more favorable opinion of anarchism, particularly among the intellectual public in America. Core members weathered a number of storms while striving to persevere in their mission to spread anarchist messages. They had encountered external obstacles such as police obstruction, mail service suspension, socialist antagonism, scorching weather, and the distraction of electoral politics. Some internal factors, mainly the costs of various campaigns and printing, also inhibited the operation of the magazine. Over and again, the inner circle’s agile reactions and versatile tactics, plus supporters’ aid, helped keep *Mother Earth* afloat. Core members would have been less successful in achieving their twofold aim to fuse revolutionary ideas and artistic expression were it not for the synergy of the magazine, the lecture tours, local meetings, and the literature. Plenty of cases evidenced how this synergy enabled Goldman to reach the “intellectual proletarians” even if they did not become political supporters of anarchism as she had hoped.

*Mother Earth*’s overtly anti-state stance had guaranteed an uneasy path for its members’ publications and activities as the government worked to suppress their efforts. The New York police department’s “Anarchist Squad,” formed in 1906, intended to block *Mother Earth*’s distribution, arrested anarchists under false pretexts, and disrupted its

meetings by any means necessary. The police wanted to prevent any violence or riots from occurring in response to anarchist activities. The police’s somewhat illegal precautionary measures played into the hands of their anarchist rivalries. Goldman argued that the reason for her numerous arrests were “not for what she said, but for what she was going to say.” Goldman’s tour lectures struck many non-anarchist reporters as not only non-violent but also inspiring. On numerous occasions, police obstruction of Goldman’s lectures backfired because it provoked free speech campaigns. (See Chapter 5) Public opinion supporting her right to speak and the appreciation of her lectures grew as time went on. While Mother Earth suffered severe financial losses from arrests and interference with Goldman’s lectures tours, its members managed to solicit enough support to survive.

Goldman expressed disappointment at the American public’s conditional interest in radicalism in contrast to the support of her resolute Russian compatriots. The fact that the sultry summer from July to October reduced attendance at her speeches irked her. Electoral politics, too, upset Goldman’s lecture tours by distracting the general public’s attention away from radicalism. Goldman attributed the lack of true radical spirit to American people’s illusory faith in electoral politics, particularly presidential elections.

Goldman’s distribution of the MEPA pamphlets for free certainly did not increase the

195 Emma Goldman, “A Woman without a Country.”
198 The presidential election of 1912, coupled with other difficulties, resulted in one of the most serious financial crises Mother Earth experienced in eight years. Emma Goldman, “To Our Friends,” Mother Earth 8:3 (May 1913): 65-66.
magazine’s revenues. Moreover, the post office sought to imperil, and eventually terminate, Mother Earth’s operations. In April 1906, Mother Earth obtained a second-class postal rate, which lowered the cost of postage, through the New York Post Office. The US postal service was the magazine’s main delivery method. Alternative means of distribution such as selling single issues and the MEPA literature during tours, by local agents, or in other radical meetings was unstable and geographically confined. The post office retained copies and suspended delivery of the magazine several times during its publication. The US Postal Inspector Anthony Comstock held up the copies of Mother Earth’s January 1910 issue because he disapproved of Goldman’s essay “The White Slave Traffic.” Though the postal delivery soon resumed, postal censorship became more severe after the outbreak of WWI. In August 1916, the New York Post Office rejected future deliveries of Mother Earth to Canada with no explanation. The June and August 1917 issues were confiscated for their anti-draft stance shortly before the Post Office revoked their mailing privileges.

Before the abrupt demise of Mother Earth, its members succeeded in operating multiform propaganda and launching numerous anti-authoritarian campaigns. Starting in

199 In 1910, for example, Goldman reported that they distributed five thousand pamphlets for free during her tours from January to June. Emma Goldman, “The End of the Odyssey,” Mother Earth 5:5 (July 1910): 159-163.
200 Mother Earth’s second-class matter was stated in its masthead: “Entered as second-class matter April 9, 1906, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.” About the classification of postal rates for periodicals at the time, see “Postal Rates for Periodicals: A Narrative History,” accessed Mar. 30, 2016, https://about.usps.com/who-we-are/postal-history/periodicals-postage-history.htm.
201 “Stop ’Mother Earth,‘” The Evening Telegram [Salt Lake City, UT], January 27, 1910, 2. For Anthony Comstock’s moral crusade and the pass of the Comstock Acts in 1873, see Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, Rereading Sex: Battles over Sexual Knowledge and Suppression in Nineteenth-Century America (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002), 299-318, 358-403. For the discussion of the Mother Earth members’ fights against the Comstockery, shorthand of the sexual censorship of the Comstock Acts, see Chapter 4.
June 1907, Goldman reduced the size of the magazine from 64 to 32 pages during summer months.\footnote{204} The page reduction became permanent by the summer of 1908 to help reduce costs.\footnote{205} Fund raising became an imperative not only for the magazine’s survival but also for the use of various campaigns. From 1906 to 1917, Goldman and her comrades solicited money for fifty-five different funds or groups.\footnote{206} Judging from the financial reports published in *Mother Earth*, donators came from all ranks of society.\footnote{207} Other ways to boost *Mother Earth*’s revenue included promoting subscriptions, marketing joint discounted sales, increasing the circulation of single copies and literature, and recovering arrears from the subscribers.\footnote{208} In early 1916, Goldman declared that the magazine had its largest number of subscribers ever. “Our magazine,” she wrote in April, was “much better placed than heretofore.”\footnote{209} When federal agents raided *Mother Earth*’s office in June 1917, they seized its list of about eight thousand subscribers.\footnote{210} The list included at least seventeen public libraries, numerous labor groups and various societies across America, as well as individuals living in Canada, Britain, Germany, Italy, Spain, Canada, Britain, Germany, Italy, Spain, and various societies across America, as well as individuals living in Canada, Britain, Germany, Italy, Spain,


\footnote{205} From July 1908 till its closure, *Mother Earth* maintained 32 pages, except for four issues: November 1909 (49 pages), July 1914 (49 pages), March 1915 (64 pages), and July 1917 (64 pages).

\footnote{206} For a complete list of these fifty-five funds that *Mother Earth* raised, see “Fund Appeals in MOTHER EARTH,” in Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III, 759-769.

\footnote{207} The amount of individual donations was as low as 25 cents; a sharp contrast to the several thousand dollars of contribution that the debt-ridden *Masses* received from a wealthy patron. Sandra Adickes, *To Be Young was Very Heaven: Women in New York before the First World War* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997), 71.

\footnote{208} Goldman had promoted one-year and five-year subscriptions (or renewals) of *Mother Earth* with *Anarchism and Other Essays* and *Prison Memoirs* as respective gifts. Other selling strategies combined Goldman’s lecture course series with subscriptions/renewals of *Mother Earth*. *Mother Earth* also held special offers, in which the purchase of multiple books or pamphlets enjoyed lower prices. In 1911, a Brooklyn comrade M. H. Woolman offered to secure one hundred subscribers provided that *Mother Earth* procured four hundred paid-up annual subscriptions or renewals within two months. The offer effectively added five hundred copies to the magazine’s circulation. “To Our Friends,” *Mother Earth* 6: 3 (May 1911): 65. “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 6: 4 (June 1911): 104.


Sweden, France, Japan, China, Argentina, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand.\textsuperscript{211} These figures indicate that the magazine did not cease publication because it was lack of supporters. Its development into a growing threat to the government during wartime resulted in its becoming the primary target of federal authorities. The arrest of Goldman and Berkman that took place at the same day when Congress passed the Espionage Act was the best evidence.

*Mother Earth*’s utilization of its propaganda quartet made the organization more successful than if they had solely relied on the magazine alone. Within a year, their difficulty unifying artistic expression and revolutionary thought became apparent. *Mother Earth* lost some readers including local agents, literati contributors and subscribers after the October 1906 issue memorializing Leon Czolgosz, although this issue was also its best seller.\textsuperscript{212} Goldman remedied the situation by reprinting Euro-American classic literary works and recruiting a new cadre of anarchist-inclined writers, such as Leonard Abbott and John R. Coryell.\textsuperscript{213} Works of literary writings or criticism, however, start to decrease after Berkman took over the editorship.\textsuperscript{214} His disinterest in literary and artistic experiments was evident in the magazine’s omission of reports on the Armory Show and the Paterson Pageant of 1913, two major modernist art events in New York.\textsuperscript{215} Out of

\textsuperscript{211}“The Subscription List of Mother Earth,” The Emma Goldman Archive, University of California, Berkeley, California.
\textsuperscript{212}Emma Goldman to Meyer Shapiro, Aug. 12, 1907, *The Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 2.
\textsuperscript{215}For the history of the Armory Show and the Paterson Pageant of 1913, see Walt Kuhn et al., *Documents of the 1913 Armory Show: The Electrifying Moment of Modern Art's American Debut* (Tucson, AZ: Hol Art
Mother Earth’s pages, Goldman’s drama and literary lectures created an alternative genre to wed artistic expression and radicalism. In 1914, her drama essay collection, The Social Significance of the Modern Drama, appeared as the MEPA’s major art production. To a certain degree, the lectures and printed literature vicariously related the production of Mother Earth to the cultural avant-garde.

Goldman’s charisma both on and off the stage in places across America drew diverse adherents wherever she toured. Berkman also had charm, but he primarily attracted militant anarchists and workingmen. On their tours, Goldman and Berkman not only reached the audiences with words; they also moved the audiences with their personalities. The direct influence of their courage, intelligence, and self-sacrifice left a remarkable impression on the audiences they met; it touched people even more deeply than the indirect contact they had with the public in their printed works. Especially for an unpopular topic like anarchism, face-to-face communication crucially facilitated the audiences’ positive perception and reception of anarchism. Many cultural elites saw Goldman as the incarnation of anarchism and were susceptible to her radical ideas.

The case of Margaret Anderson duly testified to the influence—and its limits—of Goldman and Mother Earth’s propaganda on white middle-class intellectuals’ reception of anarchism. Born into a bourgeois family in Columbus, IN, Anderson had a rebellious nature. She published The Little Review in Chicago in March 1914 to realize her interest in “Art and good talk about Art.”²¹⁶ She “turned” anarchist only after hearing Goldman’s lecture twice and, beginning in May 1914, she started an intellectual cult of Goldman in

---
her magazine. Anderson’s discussion of Goldman’s noble personality and challenging ideas initiated their personal meetings; the pair quickly became intimate in several ways. In an open letter to Anderson, published in The Little Review, Goldman noted that “[Anderson] demonstrated so much depth and appreciation of the cardinal principles in my work.” In October, Goldman introduced The Little Review in Mother Earth, “The magazine is devoted to art, music, poetry, literature and the drama…for the sake of sounding the keynote of rebellion in creative endeavor.” Two months later, Anderson became one of Goldman’s tour reviewers in Mother Earth. She commented on Goldman’s different lectures to emphasize her conviction that “her [Goldman’s] inspiration seems never to falter.” Challenging Goldman’s preference for written expression, Anderson’s article displayed the influence that Goldman’s lectures could have, even on the well-educated:

She [Goldman] has nothing to say that they [Nietzsche and Max Stirner] have not already said, perhaps; but the fact that she says it instead of putting it into books, that she hurls it from the platform straight into the minds and hearts of the eager, bewildered, or unfriendly people who listen to her, gives her personality and her message a unique value.”

217 Anderson wrote in her autobiography: “May…and the third number of the Little Review was going to press. I heard Emma Goldman lecture and had just time to turn anarchist before the presses closed.” Margaret Anderson, My Thirty Years’ War: The Autobiography: beginnings and battles to 1930 (New York: Horizon press, 1969), 54.


220 Anderson noted that Goldman was most forceful, radical, inspiring and creatively critical when she talked of her own ideas, rather than explaining those of other dramatists. She suggested some structural adjustment of Goldman’s drama lectures to allow her “to be herself” “instead of being the dramatist’s mouthpiece.” Margaret C. Anderson, “Emma Goldman in Chicago,” Mother Earth 9:10 (Dec. 1914): 320-324. For Goldman’s response to Anderson’s criticism, see Emma Goldman,” Two Mothers and After” Mother Earth 9:11 (Jan. 1915): 362-368.

Anderson’s remarks indicated that it was not just what Goldman said, but how she embodied anarchism that captivated and stimulated people. She found in Goldman a grand personality that symbolized the lofty ideas for mankind and social good that she had read about in books. Through Goldman’s lectures, Anderson was “suffering for humanity,” as her partner Jane Heap’s portrayal of her illustrated. (Image 17) The sketch of Heap, also the co-editor of *The Little Review*, captured a psychological moment when intellectuals like Anderson empathized with social miseries because of Goldman’s vigor. Anderson’s newfound allegiance to Goldman and anarchism was explicit in both *Mother Earth* and her own magazine. She promoted Goldman’s lectures, defended Goldman’s version of anarchism, lauded her character and thoughts, and advocated social revolution in *The Little Review*. In mid-1915, she declared that *The Little Review* was “a magazine written for Intelligent people who can Feel; whose philosophy is Applied Anarchism, whose policy is a Will to Splendor of Life, and whose function is—to express itself.”

Anderson’s involvement in and practice of anarchism intensely revolved around Goldman and *Mother Earth*’s campaigns, though not without boundaries. Anderson represented the type of disciple whom Goldman hoped to acquire: native-born cultural elites with defiant souls and radical passion. For her part, Anderson displayed the extent to which an “intellectual proletarian” in Goldman’s definition could devote to social

---
revolution. That is, to embrace anarchism with her mind and soul while exhibiting an anti-authoritarian attitude towards life, society, and the government. As for the overthrow of the Establishment, “Labor could do it,” wrote Anderson in a condescending tone. In her articles praising Goldman and anarchism, Anderson did not dwell on the actual means to start a social revolution. She only emphasized that the right spirit “can do anything.” Essentially, she submitted her anarchist spirit to her artistic priorities; she craved unbound freedom and self-expression in life more than a labor revolution. She appreciated anarchism, which “like all great things, is an announcement,” over socialism, which “is an explanation and falls, consequently, into the realm of secondary things.” Anarchism to her was no other than a state of free mind that “your ‘magnetic centre’ can do what it likes with that.” She gradually fell out with Goldman over their disparate attitudes about the purpose of art. Simply put, whereas Goldman upheld art for life’s sake, Anderson believed in “Life for Art’s sake.” Anderson supported anarchism because she wanted to

226 Anderson, “Toward Revolution.”
228 Anderson, My Thirty Years’ War, 149.
229 “Editorials and Announcements: Our Credo.”
preserve the artists’ absolute freedom of expression. Goldman, by contrast, insisted that “great art has always gone to the masses, to their hopes and dreams.”230 Kathy Ferguson aptly noted that while Goldman “often made alliances with modernists, her head and her heart were grounded in romantic realism.”231 Anderson yearned more for individual liberty than for social solidarity, both of which were equally indispensable to the anarchy that Mother Earth’s inner circle envisioned.

While Goldman’s receptivity to art, literature, and refined culture drove her closer to liberal-minded intellectuals, there were always limits to their conversion to anarchism. Civil liberties advocate Roger Baldwin credited Goldman for her intellectual influence on him: “Her lectures, which I began to attend in 1911 while in St. Louis, opened up all kinds of new literature to me—Ibsen, Schopenhauer, the Russians. She introduced many people to a whole literature of protest.”232 Although Baldwin subscribed to Mother Earth and corresponded with Goldman, he was reluctant to move from his philosophical anarchism towards endorsing stateless anarchy. Artist John Sloan (one of The Masses illustrators) appreciated Goldman’s lectures on “Art and Revolution” (“She was good”), but complained that she “here and there demanded too much social consciousness from the artist.”233 Like Anderson, Sloan was not willing to give up his artistic free expression in order to pursue collective social needs. Numerous intellectuals, like Anderson and Sloan, became Goldman’s and thereby Mother Earth’s friends. They arranged her lectures, contributed to Mother Earth, donated funds to its campaigns, and attended her trials to show moral support. Still, their friendships with Goldman did not all translate to

231 Ferguson, Emma Goldman, 190.
dedication to social revolution. In fact, as broad as Goldman’s definition of anarchism was, it was possible to feel committed to her ideas and not identify as an anarchist. Goldman’s *Mother Earth* tours critically widened the parameters of anarchism’s reception. But at the same time, the intellectual effect of her lectures was too broad and amorphous to be channeled into a set path.

The tributes from middle-class intellectuals to *Mother Earth*’s tenth anniversary issue in March 1915 demonstrated the intellectual enlightenment they had experienced through its propaganda. Editors, artists, writers, and other professionals sent in celebratory pieces to express their appreciation. Editor William Marion Reedy wrote that “A great part of the intelligence of the world is with her [Goldman] just now.” Bertha Fiske, calling herself “a member of upper middle-class,” described her access to *Mother Earth* and praised that “it has vitality and exerts influence.” Gilbert E. Roe, Goldman’s loyal attorney friend, stated that *Mother Earth* had “thus far made a very valuable contribution to the radical movement.” A quasi-respectable image of anarchism surfaced among such narratives about *Mother Earth*. These intelligent professionals with social respectability and cultural influence became the magazine’s new pillar. Their support boosted the momentum, and popularized core members’ anti-authoritarian campaigns even during wartime, from 1914 to 1917.

**Conclusion**

Thanks to the dynamic synergy of the magazine, its lecture tours, local events and literature, various anarchist activities, organized groups, and a non-anarchist public

---

emerged across America. Positive remarks on the growing interest in anarchism appeared in *Mother Earth* and some other presses.\(^{237}\) Socialist A. Crawford discussed his anxiety about “an anarchist revival in San Francisco” in the Chicago-based *International Socialist Review*.\(^{238}\) Goldman’s annual lecture tours vitally contributed to the “anarchist revival” in the prewar decade. The changing public image of Goldman from “agitator” to “lecturer” facilitated the spread of anarchist ideas.\(^{239}\) Labor leader Elizabeth Gurley Flynn did not appreciate anarchism, but admitted that Goldman “blossomed into a lecturer, the idol of middle-class liberals, and the crowds grew.”\(^{240}\) *Current Literature*, a New York popular literary magazine, considered *Mother Earth* nourishing “the higher type of anarchists.”\(^{241}\)

Core members used the propaganda quartet to infuse elements of art and social sciences into anarchist propaganda and pave the way for later non-conformist magazines.\(^{242}\) *Mother Earth* projected a revolutionary social order unseen in reform-oriented muckraking journalism and inspired unconventional bohemians.\(^{243}\)

Radical socialist papers, such as *The Masses*, spread the message of social revolution that core members of *Mother Earth* previously developed in their propaganda. While *The Masses* had more success in fusing modernist aesthetics and artistic creation, *Mother Earth*

---


\(^{242}\) Monk, “Emma Goldman, Mother Earth, & the Little Magazine Impulse in Modern America,” 113-125.

set the precedent for noncommercial radicalism. The cities where Max Eastman toured in the mid-1910s had all been annually cultivated by Goldman.

The nationwide distribution of the propaganda quartet created a legion of intelligent supporters who nonetheless did not develop a political commitment to anarchy. Goldman insisted that “if you believe in anarchism you must believe in revolution, for only revolution can bring about anarchism.” Unfortunately for her, they “brought about anarchism” in their private lives and refused to support political anarchy. She could not control the audience’s reception of her message. There were admirers who saw her as “more an artist than an anarchist” despite her protest that she “was the first because of being the second.” Their philosophical claims of anarchism were often too broad, and thus too vague, to be attached to a specific political movement. Adeline Champney, an individual-anarchist writer, made telling remarks on the topic. While praising the idea that *Mother Earth* made anarchism recognized and respected in America “as a theory, an ideal, that must be reckoned with,” Champney parted with its political activism. “Anarchism to me,” she stated, “is a dynamic social factor, not a political expedient. I do not foresee the State overthrown and Anarchism established.” Champney’s comment indicated how *Mother Earth*’s intellectual audience might approach anarchism and anarchy. The magazine’s demand for labor’s general strike as the means to overthrow the existing

---

248 Adeline Champney had contributed several articles to *Mother Earth*. Her essay, “What is Worthwhile?” was first serialized in *Mother Earth* and later published by MEPA as a pamphlet in 1911.
systems only distanced its bourgeois supporters from committing to militant actions.250

Altogether, *Mother Earth* won considerable audiences for anarchism but not many actual avowed anarchists fighting for anarchy in America.

Germinated in New York and propagated across the U.S., *Mother Earth* further reached out to the world. It updated its national and international audience with news of global radical activism and revolutions. Goldman and Berkman competed with other newspapers to (re)present what they deemed as the truth of international revolutionary movements. They supported every kind of social revolutionary defying government authorities in word and in action. As Chapter 3 will detail, *Mother Earth’s* members pleaded the cause of international revolutionaries while censuring the pragmatism of the U.S. government, the Socialist party, and the popular press. The magazine’s transnational activism called for a coalition of social rebels around the world against all odds. While its cause eventually failed, *Mother Earth* embodied America’s staunchest ally of international revolutionists.

---

250 “Anarchists’ Leader In The City,” *The Evening Telegram* [Salt Lake City, UT], Apr. 11, 1908, pp. 1, 7. For *Mother Earth’s* discourse on and call for workers’ general strike, see Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 3
Reaching Out to the World: Transnational Networks and Activism

Headquartered in New York, with their publisher touring across America, core members connected *Mother Earth*’s readers worldwide and supported international revolutionary movements. The magazine’s publication coincided with a historical moment when transatlantic anarchist movements developed into global ones. Numerous persecuted anarchists in fin-de-siècle Europe joined the huge outflow of émigrés to America that led to the cross-Atlantic circulation of radical ideologies. The technology of submarine telegraph cables facilitated the transcontinental exchange of ideas. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, Asians entered the U.S. in increasing numbers to work and study thanks to steamship travel. They were instrumental in spreading radical ideologies, such as anarchism and socialism, back to their compatriots in Asia. By the turn of the century, Asian, African, Australian, and Latin American anarchists joined their European and American comrades to establish a global anarchist network via correspondence, meetings, and periodical press.¹ Some of these international anarchists contributed to the pages and campaigns of *Mother Earth*. Its news coverage showcased an ever-broadening range of anarchist geopolitics.

Mother Earth operated as a major U.S. liaison for the burgeoning international anarchist movements. Goldman wanted to spread anarchist messages abroad. But the U.S. government revoked her citizenship in April 1909, forcing her to cancel all her overseas travel plans. She instead relied on her magazine and its publications, coupled with private correspondence, to continue as an active agitator for a borderless social revolution. She declared as early as 1906 that citizenship was meaningless to anarchists, for they embraced “the international republic of free spirits.”2 After losing her U.S. citizenship, she insisted that the world was her nation and that she had inherited “the kinship of brave spirits” beyond national boundaries.3 Mother Earth promoted transnational revolutionary solidarity from the prewar decade to the wartime. Its members expanded their personal networks so they could spread international revolutionary news to the English-speaking public and beyond (via translation).

Mother Earth’s writers espoused stateless internationalism in response to the growth of state nationalism and imperialism, particularly in America. Theodore Roosevelt, the first U.S. president elected after the magazine began publication, wanted to make the U.S. a leader in global politics. He wanted to increase America’s “national strength and international duty.”4 Roosevelt’s espousal of an international police force spurred core members to condemn U.S. overseas imperialism and domestic patriotism. Goldman denounced American patriotism for its assertion of national superiority over others.5 She and her comrades supported revolutionaries who were trying to overthrow their governments in the name of nationalism. Core members of Mother Earth considered

5 Emma Goldman, “Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty,” in Anarchism and Other Essays, 127-144.
domestic nationalist revolutions to be a primary phase of the international proletarian revolution. The American government and the anarchist movement clashed with each other over the Russian and Mexican revolutions. Their struggles were documented in *Mother Earth*. Its inner circle pleaded for the Russian and Mexican people’s revolutionary causes while making their case to indict the U.S. for its unjust interventions.

This chapter highlights the inner circle’s efforts to interest the American public in worldwide revolutionary movements to help forge an international social revolution. *Mother Earth*’s news coverage championed an anti-authoritarian discourse that promoted people’s revolts against their masters and governments. An editorial from the magazine’s first issue defined historical events “as an ever-recurring struggle for Freedom against every form of Might.”6 The inner circle endorsed direct action from the masses to take back their freedom and redistribute properties for communal ownership. These anarchists saw the Russian and Mexican people as waging the revolutions that they hoped to create in America. They defended *all* international revolutions in the face of various U.S. involvements that concerned other Americans. Most liberals and radicals’ would only support foreign revolutions if the revolution’s goals were compatible with American national, political, or economic interests. Core members of *Mother Earth*, on the contrary, condemned any U.S. objections to or obstructions of foreign revolutions as selfish and reactionary. The revolutions abroad constituted the magazine’s extended propaganda battlefields against any anti-revolutionary forces in foreign countries as well as in America.

---

Mother Earth writers’ narratives about the 1905 Russian Revolution and its aftermath became the archetype for its revolutionary discourse. They consistently defended people’s direct action for socioeconomic reorganization. Strategically, Goldman promoted the creation of a nonsectarian coalition amid various revolutionary groups in Russia despite her private preference to assist anarchist comrades. Goldman and Berkman’s Russian Jewish origins engaged them closely with the developments under the Czarist rule. Core members regularly praised the Russian people’s continued struggles with their government after 1906 in Mother Earth. They upheld people’s sovereignty to resist all forms of government. Thus, anyone who challenged state power could be a potential ally to anarchists in the upcoming social revolution. Compared with their domestic rivalry with socialists, they displayed ideological tolerance towards foreign oppressed socialists. All factions of socialists were “revolutionists” in Mother Earth’s Russian discourse. Mother Earth’s expedient, nonsectarian stance on foreign revolutionaries contrasted with American socialists’ criticisms of anarchists everywhere. Socialist newspapers mimicked the commercial media and compared the state of chaos caused by foreign revolutions to “anarchy.” They severely criticized the anarchists who engaged in destructive, violent revolutionary activities.

The 1910 Mexican Revolution sparked new elements in Mother Earth writers’ revolutionary discourse. Many of them were greatly concerned by Mexico’s geographical vicinity to the U.S., profound U.S. involvement, countrywide mass uprisings, and racial oppression in Mexico. They waged intense campaigns to defend exiled Mexican revolutionaries living in the U.S. Southwest. These anarchists believed the Mexican

---

7 On the pages of Mother Earth, also in this chapter, the terms “Czar(ism)” and “Tsar(ism)” were interchangeable.
8 Peter Kropotkin, “The Revolution in Russia,” Mother Earth 1:5 (July 1906): 5-10.
revolution was significant because its people wanted to remove their domestic dictators and the dictators’ imperialist patrons. During the decade-long turmoil in Mexico, many American groups and newspapers withdrew their earlier support for Mexican revolutionaries for various reasons. The inner circle of Mother Earth, however, consistently stood by the Mexican people and revolutionaries in their socioeconomic struggles. They also featured a politically de-centered discourse of the Mexican Revolution. Contrary to mainstream media’s focus on political struggles and military rivalries between individual strongmen in Mexico, Mother Earth’s coverage highlighted the masses’ fights for land and liberty. Furthermore, its writers laid heavier blame on the U.S. plutocracy for oppressing the Mexican “peons” (peasants and unskilled workers) than for affecting the Russian people.

The issue of race/ethnicity surfaced in Russia, then loomed large in Mexico and again in the case of Japan on the pages of Mother Earth. The Russian empire’s anti-Semitic pogroms had always concerned Goldman and Berkman. Yet they responded more vociferously to the massive racial discrimination and the U.S. capitalist exploitation of Mexican Indians. In late 1910, they campaigned to save a group of Japanese revolutionaries who were persecuted by the Japanese government. Core members resisted repeating the idea of the “yellow peril” that haunted the American public in their articles about Japanese anarchists. Ideological tolerance remained manifest in Mother Earth, which defended Japanese socialists no less ardently than they defended anarchists. The mourning tributes paid to the only executed female revolutionary in Japan underscored the inner circle’s support for revolutionary heroism. Their international news coverage and

---

transnational activism demonstrated their conviction that no national, ethnic, racial, or gender divide could justify one group’s domination of another.

Many *Mother Earth* supporters responded positively to its defense campaigns for international revolutionaries, but the magazine’s appeal for international social revolution fell on deaf ears. Americans of different social ranks donated to core members’ fundraisers for foreign revolutionaries. Nevertheless, they demanded democracy for foreign revolutionaries, not forcible socioeconomic reorganization. The readers felt sorry for international revolutionaries but they did not agree with or adopt anarchist revolution as a solution to the revolutionaries’ problems. In fact, their calls for democracy demonstrate that they fundamentally agreed with Roosevelt’s theory that spreading the American political system abroad would end socioeconomic injustice.

The words and deeds of core members expanded the geopolitical and ideological breadth that called for transnational solidarity and stateless internationalism. Their unconditional comradeship with rebels around the world set them apart from other U.S. sympathizers. Goldman and Berkman used all their propaganda forms to convince the American public to support international revolutions. Not surprisingly, their propaganda campaign met with significant resistance. Their transnational activism challenged U.S. state and corporate influence at home and abroad. Like a gadfly stinging mammoth America, *Mother Earth* incessantly reminded Americans that human integrity and universal conscience were stateless.¹⁰

**Networking Globally**

---

¹⁰ The metaphor of *Mother Earth* as a “gadfly” came from C. E. S. Wood. Richard Drinnon, “Introduction,” in *The Emma Goldman Papers*. 
For Goldman, anarchism’s stateless ideology required transnational cooperation to attain its “ideal of human liberty and righteousness” beyond national boundaries.\textsuperscript{11} As a principle, anarchist organizations championed egalitarian alliances and nonrestrictive decision-making. Anarchists rejected the hierarchically centralized organization common to all political parties. Their transnational associations took shape in the form of an international congress, personal contact, and, mostly, periodical circulation. This section shows how Goldman and Berkman operated *Mother Earth* as a hub for the growing international anarchist movements.

Core members contributed to transnational activism by transmitting news, coordinating activities, launching campaigns, and soliciting funds. They actively participated in anarchists’ transnational advocacy networks.\textsuperscript{12} *Mother Earth*’s geopolitical range extended beyond its predecessor *Free Society*. (Maps 7 & 8) Goldman and Berkman added articles about countries and places in Europe, Latin America, East and Southeast Asia, and New Zealand to the world map of its news coverage. It informed readers that people around the globe sought freedom from oppression in various degrees. The magazine’s coverage conjured up a rapidly expanding anarchist sphere in its readers’ minds.

\textsuperscript{12} Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink refer to “transnational advocacy networks” as the “networks of activists, distinguishable largely by the centrality of principled ideas or values in motivating their formation” in world politics. See Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 1-8.
The countries or regions that had appeared in the reports or texts of *Free Society* include Austria, Russia, Rumania, Scandinavia, Britain, Italy, France, Germany, Finland, Spain, Norway, Belgium, Ireland, Hungary, Holland, Corsica, South Africa, Canada, Turkey, Philippines, China, and Australia.

*Mother Earth* had covered all the countries or regions reported by *Free Society*. Additionally, *Mother Earth* had covered news in Switzerland, Portugal, Denmark, Bohemia, Servia, Mexico, (British) India, Japan, Korea, Chile, Argentine, Brazil, Cuba, Bolivia, Guatemala, Bulgaria, Persia, Peru, Uruguay, and New Zealand.
Mother Earth’s expanded reach developed in tandem with its members’ intensified reporting on international radical activism in a column entitled, “International Notes.” Running from 1906 to 1913, the column regularly reported on various kinds of foreign people’s direct action against authorities. These actions ranged from labor unrest, (general) strikes, and peasant rebellions to anti-military activities and individual acts of violence. Notably, “International Notes” did not cover intimate matters, such as birth control and sexuality, even though those issues were essential to Mother Earth’s anarchist project. The column highlighted general strikes—in Hungary, Italy, Brazil, Brazil, and Persia—“as an effective weapon” for asserting the workers’ rights. Government suppression of unrest and anarchist activities in Spain, Russia, Argentina, France, and Mexico abounded in the column. It also carried news about assassinations by anarchists and nationalists in Argentina, Russia, and India. Articles in “International Notes” did not denounce the assassins targeting official authorities or capitalists. Rather, one of them approvingly quoted Free Hindusthan’s defense of the assassinations as “never criminal on their part. The crime lies with the tyrant.”

15 Compared with irregular (and mostly short-lived) columns in Free Society (such as “News from Everywhere,” “Note and Comment,” “Various Voices,” “Current News,” “Here and There,” among others), Mother Earth’s “International Notes” had longer reports about the activities of foreign comrades and revolutionists around the world. The main author of “International Notes” was a Germany anarchist “Slovak” (real name Alfred Sanftleben, 1871-1952). In the first few years, “International Notes” appeared almost monthly in Mother Earth. Its appearance became sporadic after 1912 and the last issue that saw “International Notes” was in October 1913. About the biographical introduction of Slovak, see Paul Avrich, Anarchist Voices, 486.


defended insurgent nationalists for their anti-colonial and democratic struggles as the first step in social revolution. At the same time, they censured expansionist nationalisms led by states as examples of imperialism. Interestingly, none of these reports triggered U.S. government’s censorship.

“International Notes” recycled and translated notices from the European anarchist press to expand the reach of anarchist news network.20 Mother Earth’s readers learned about developments in international radical movements and about anarchist journalists’ struggles with authorities.21 The writers used comrades’ articles from Germany, Spain, France, and Great Britain to develop their stories about East Asia. The first report in the column about China, in the January 1907 issue, came from Tierra y Libertad (Land and Liberty) in Spain. The piece mentioned that several Western anarchist classics had been “translated in Chinese by the comrades.” Besides, “Seventeen papers in the southern part of the [China] empire have reproduced famous Anarchistic writings.”22 In July 1907, “International Notes” reprinted the news from Les Temps Nouveaux (The New Times) and Der Revolutionär (The Revolutionary) about the armed uprising in southern China.23

20 The anarchist news network demonstrated in “International Notes” included Les Temps Nouveaux (The New Times), L’Entr’aide (Mutual Aid) and L’Action Directe (The Direct Action) in France, Levensrecht (Rights of Life) in Holland, La Protesta (The Protest) in Argentine, Der Freie Arbeiter (The Free Workers) in Germany, A Vida (Life) in Portugal, L’Action Directe (The Direct Action) in Belgium, and Tierra y Libertad (Land and Liberty) in Spain, Anarchisten (The Anarchist) in Denmark, A Conquista do Pao (The Conquest of Bread) in Portugal, and Roumania Muncitore (Roumania Workers) in Roumania, among others.


Articles in the column demonstrate that anti-authoritarian activism was a worldwide phenomenon while encouraging American anarchist supporters to participate in it.

Goldman soon sought direct connections with East Asian anarchists with whom she and her comrades built a reciprocal transpacific network. As early as August 1907, *Mother Earth* carried a statement based on Goldman’s correspondence with Denjiro Kōtoku, a leading Japanese anarchist:

> Our readers will be glad to learn that a new Anarchist publication has been started in Tokio [Tokyo], Japan. The publishers are three Chinese girls who have courageously freed themselves from the heavy shackles of Occidental tradition, prejudice[,] and superstition. “The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation” has been translated for the first issue of the new journal.\(^\text{24}\)

While the aforementioned editorial’s accuracy is questionable, anarchist messages from *Mother Earth* had indeed appeared in East Asian publications.\(^\text{25}\)

Several exchanges between core members and their East Asian comrades revealed a transpacific comradeship, as well as *Mother Earth’s* international reputation. The first case was the introduction of *Mother Earth* in *Tian Yi* (Natural Justice), a seminal Chinese-language anarchist journal issued in Tokyo in June 1907. Its publisher was a Chinese married couple, Liu Shipei and He Zhen, who studied in Japan and associated with Japanese anarchists, including Kōtoku.\(^\text{26}\) Three months into publication, Liu and He

\(^{24}\) “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 2:6 (Aug. 1907): 239. The relationship of *Mother Earth* and Denjiro Kōtoku and his activities, which led to his execution by the Japanese government in 1911, will be discussed in detail in the last section of this chapter.

\(^{25}\) No extant record about an anarchist journal published by “three Chinese girls” at Tokyo in 1907 could be found. On the other hand, although *Tian Yi* was published in 1907, it was not issued by three Chinese girls; nor did it translate Goldman’s “The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation,” in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, 213-225.

\(^{26}\) Liu was a controversial intellectual whose ideology swung between national essentialism and revolutionary anarchism. He Zhen, Liu’s wife, was a feminist theorist who played a major part in editing *Tian Yi*. For more studies on *Tian Yi*, Liu Shipei, and He Zhen, see Fang-Yen Yang, “Nation, People, Anarchy: Liu Shih-p’ei and the Crisis of Order in Modern China” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1999); Xia Xiaohong, “Tianyi Bao and He Zhen’s Views on ‘Women’s Revolution’,” in *Different Worlds of Discourse: Transformations of Gender and Genre in Late Qing and Early Republican China*, ed. Nanxiu Qian, Grace S. Fong, and Richard J. Smith (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 298-314;
introduced *Mother Earth* and praised Goldman as an American anarchist leader known for her oratory and writing. An article in *Mother Earth* reciprocated by praising He Zhen as “the first in China to advocate Anarchism” in 1908. In April 1914, an anarchist paper in southern China, *Min Sheng* (Voice of the Common People) credited *Mother Earth* and the London *Freedom* as the two leading English-language anarchist journals.

In turn, *Mother Earth* commemorated the recently deceased Liu Shifu, editor of *Min Sheng*, in October 1915.

*Mother Earth* earned a reputation as the leading U.S. anarchist journal through the 1907 International Anarchist Congress in Amsterdam. The Congress took place from...
August 26 to 31; it was an assembly of worldwide comrades to promote transnational anarchist cooperation. 32 Several U.S. and Canadian anarchist groups recommended Goldman as their delegate to the Congress. 33 These groups acknowledged that Goldman was the most representative anarchist, since her annual tours had familiarized her with national and local anarchist groups in North America. International anarchists esteemed Goldman and elected her chair of the Congress’s final session on the 31st. 34 Max Baginski, *Mother Earth*’s first editor, went along with Goldman as the delegate of foreign anarchists in America. With its publisher and editor attending the Congress, *Mother Earth* carried first-hand news to its readers. Some international anarchist press, such as *Tian Yi*, mentioned Goldman and *Mother Earth* positively when covering news of the Amsterdam Congress. 35 By contrast, the U.S. mainstream press tried to smear Goldman in its report of the Amsterdam Congress. The *New York Times* published an article that claimed Goldman advocated “a reign of terror” as a means of readjusting social conditions.

---


33 Goldman later praised that the Amsterdam Congress had “undoubtedly brought about a closer international feeling.” She reported that the Congress gathered ninety delegates mainly from European and American countries, who represented “Germany, France, Belgium, Bohemia, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, Servia, Russia, England and the United States.” Emma Goldman, “Our Amsterdam Letter,” *Mother Earth* 2:7 (Sept. 1907): 274-275. Telegrams of greetings from anarchist groups in London, Denmark, Westphalia, Geneva, Italy, Portugal, and China were read in the Congress between sessions. *The International Anarchist Congress Held at the Plancius Hall, Amsterdam on August 26th-31st, 1907* (London: Freedom Office, 1907), 5, 12.


Berkman responded with an open letter which stressed that the Times’ readers had no doubt heard of Goldman’s lectures, which never advocated terrorism. He stove to turn the tables on the mainstream press and sustain a constructive image of anarchism in the U.S.

The 1907 Amsterdam Congress showcased Mother Earth’s role as America’s major press outlet of international anarchist news. At the congress, Goldman summarized a report on the state of U.S. anarchist movements, and serialized the full report in Mother Earth. She presented her report to the international anarchists as a manifesto against American “plutocratic tyranny.” American capitalist democracy, in her view, was no less exploitative to labor than European autocratic régimes. Adding political corruption, Puritanism, and child-labor abuse to the picture, Goldman exported a thoroughly negative image of the U.S. to the international world. Lastly, she commended Mother Earth for rekindling the propaganda fervor amid English speakers since 1906.

Baginski, for his part, drew readers’ attention to the International Bureau, an offshoot organ of the Amsterdam Congress. Headquartered in London, the International Bureau aimed at coordinating the activities of global comrades and furthering international anarchist solidarity.

---

36 Berkman claimed that those New York Times readers who had been Goldman’s audiences could educate its editor that “Anarchists teach self-reliance, co-operation and mutual aid, in opposition to the existing institutions of authority and suppression, which are based on economic violence.” “‘The Reign of Terror.’ Alexander Berkman Denies that Emma Goldman Urged It at Amsterdam,” New York Times, August 30, 1907.

37 Emma Goldman, “The Situation in America,” Mother Earth 2:7 (Sept. 1907): 270-274; Emma Goldman, “The Situation in America (Continued),” Mother Earth 2:8 (Oct. 1907): 320-329; Emma Goldman, “The Situation in America (Conclusion),” Mother Earth 2:9 (Nov. 1907): 378-388. According to the record of the Congress by the London Freedom, Goldman “brought a long account of the situation in the United States, which she thought advisable not to read as so much time had been taken up with reports. (This paper is now being printed in Mother Earth.)” The International Anarchist Congress Held at the Plancius Hall, Amsterdam on August 26th-31st, 1907, 5. Even in the contemporary compilation of the conference minutes of the Amsterdam Congress, Goldman’s report by Goldman was reprinted from Mother Earth. The International Anarchist Congress of Amsterdam (1907), 50-73.


Earth did its part by carrying the notices from the International Bureau to the international comrades.40

Goldman’s distinct identity at the Amsterdam Congress illustrates the importance of Mother Earth’s role in promoting the use of English. Baginski represented foreign anarchists in America, but Goldman went as the delegate of the U.S. anarchists. Her report on the Congress addressed the “Babylonian confusion of speech” that caused division among the workers.41 Rather than promoting Esperanto across the world as some anarchists did, Goldman upheld English as a common linguistic basis for her multi-ethnic audiences in and out of America.42 All the speakers at the Amsterdam Congress’s inaugural meeting spoke in their native languages except Goldman. Her delivery of the speech and report in English at the Congress legitimized her role as the U.S. delegate and Mother Earth as the mouthpiece of the American anarchist press.43

The English-language Mother Earth also reached parts of the British Empire (Australia, New Zealand, and India), spreading their anti-authoritarian activism to the rest of the world. Goldman started to correspond with J. W. Fleming, an Australian anarchist, no later than 1908. Fleming invited her to tour in Australia and raised enough funds for her travel fare. Goldman shipped fifteen hundred pounds of Mother Earth’s literature to

41 Emma Goldman, “The Situation in America.” “The multiplicity of languages and the consequent lack of mutual understanding” she said, “keep the workers separated” exactly as American plutocrats wished.
Australia before her planned tour. Although the revocation of her U.S. citizenship aborted her travel plan, Goldman and her Australian comrades continued to support each other. “International Notes” carried several letters from Fleming to Goldman to inform readers of developments in the Australian anarchist movement. Mother Earth also forwarded news of India and New Zealand from other peer papers, such as the London Freedom. Goldman and her comrades endorsed Hindu nationalists in India and overseas as stimulating the revolutionary spirit against colonial rule.

The cover illustration of Mother Earth in March 1916 visualized the inner circle’s internationalist ideal. (Image 18) The hand that singly upheld the globe, looking robust and steady, appeared to be that of a male worker. Symbolically, the image called for international proletarians to rise up and uplift the globe into one country. Goldman and Berkman’s conviction to bring together every anti-authoritarian element overlooked the intrinsic conflicts between internationalism and nationalism. They ardently supported international rebels with the hope of igniting social revolutions internationally. Their motherland, Russia, seemed to realize those hopes. Its revolution in 1905 greatly stirred Russian émigrés in the U.S., including Goldman, who endeavored to “plead the heroic cause

46 For an example in Mother Earth that was reprinted from Freedom, see Dr. T. F. MacDonald, “Australian and New Zealand Labor Movements,” Mother Earth 2:9 (Nov. 1907): 405-410.
of revolutionary Russia.” She devoted *Mother Earth* to defending and aiding Russian revolutionaries. The magazine’s campaign for the Russian Revolution illustrated both its members’ internationalist ideal and their anti-Czarist zeal as diasporic Jews. Their narratives of Russian affairs created a matrix of revolutionary discourse in *Mother Earth* that evolved over time.

**Image 18: The Cover of *Mother Earth*, 11:1 (March 1916)**

*Close to the pulse of Russia*: *Mother Earth* and the Russian Revolutions

Two different Russian Revolutions bracketed the magazine’s publication span. The Russian Revolution of 1905 set the magazine’s pursuit of international social revolution into motion. Goldman attributed the tenacious nature of *Mother Earth* to its “Jewish legacy,” referencing her own ethnic-cultural origins. She and Berkman strove to further the cause of their Russian compatriots to create a Free Russia. Their connection with and aid for the Russian revolutionaries symbolized their magazine’s operation of transnational activism. Typically, the inner circle rallied American moral and material

---

support for foreign revolutions by addressing four points. First, they revealed the “brutal truths” of foreign rulers’ oppression that they considered underrepresented in other mass media. Second, they denounced the international reactionary powers that conspired to crush national revolutions. Third, they drew attention to the danger of purely political change in revolutions without socioeconomic reorganization. Fourth, they lauded the revolutionary spirit demonstrated in those revolutions as universal, rather than national. These points were manifest in Mother Earth’s discourse on Russia’s conditions. Russian people’s ongoing struggles of various kinds between 1905 and 1917 constantly stimulated Mother Earth members’ will to further the cause of international social revolution.

The 1905 Russian Revolution ushered in a new age for U.S.-Russian relations. Historian Abraham Ascher argued that the revolution, unfolding from 1904 to 1907, was a milestone for modern uprisings. It consisted of mass movements from various social groups ranging from urban to agrarian regions, located in central as well as remote areas of the empire. A massacre of unarmed petitioners by soldiers at St. Petersburg in January 22, 1905, known as “Bloody Sunday,” ignited widespread rebellions in Russia. Bloody Sunday provoked the American public’s sympathetic response to the Russian revolutionaries. News about labor strikes, peasant unrest, military mutinies and terrorists’ assassinations throughout the Russian empire abounded in the U.S. press. Nonetheless, the majority of the mass media in America swung from great compassion to indifference within a year. Roosevelt’s mediation of the Russo-Japanese War at the Treaty of

---

51 The study of Arthur W. Thompson and Robert A. Hart offers a statistical observation of the changing attitude in the U.S. public opinion within the year of 1905: “Out of fifty-six important general-circulation magazines and newspapers, forty-nine definitely had favored the [Russian] revolution in January 1905. By December of the same year, forty-two of the forty-nine could be counted as supporters of the Tsar’s regime.”
Portsmouth in September 1905 saved the Czarist rule. The October Manifesto of 1905 issued by the Czar granted basic civil rights and the formation of the Duma (state assembly). A limited monarchy, which was essentially nominal, appeased Russian liberals and lessened much of the U.S. hostility to the Czar. American opinion toward the Russian revolutionaries and radical socialists began to split. The U.S. socialists gradually supported comrades in Russia with reservations. Some Russian-American Jews’ hatred of Russian peasants prevented them from supporting the revolution. Labor unions, though sympathetic to Russian workers after Bloody Sunday, did not sanction the Russian workers’ commitment to a socialist-inclined revolution that always involved violence.

By contrast, core members plunged into a consistently anti-Czarist campaign throughout the publication. Goldman denounced the Czarist regime before the birth of her magazine. “All through the years we had been close to the pulse of Russia,” she wrote, “close to her spirit and her superhuman struggle for liberation.” In early 1905, Goldman was a member of the New York branch of Russia’s Socialist Revolutionary Party, helping them to raise funds for the revolution. She and Berkman acquired news...
from their homeland through underground messages that were easily accessible in New York’s Lower East Side. They were determined to expose the various “inhumanities committed by the Tsar” to the American public.\textsuperscript{58} While highlighting the Russian people’s sufferings, they blamed other newspapers for downplaying the brutal violence committed by the Russian government.\textsuperscript{59} Goldman categorically summed up “the Jewish massacres, famine and bloodshed” as the major “crimes of Czarism.”\textsuperscript{60} From London, Kropotkin protested that less than “one-tenth of the atrocities” committed by Russian troops were reported by the British press.\textsuperscript{61} The image of blood, derived from the 1905 Bloody Sunday, became a recurring trope in \textit{Mother Earth} to convince readers of the Czar’s true colors.\textsuperscript{62} The magazine’s articles included various statistics to demonstrate the “murderous autocracy” in Russia.\textsuperscript{63} They presented data on the casualties, persecutions, executions, life sentences, exiles, pogroms, and banned newspapers in Russia as irrefutable evidence of the Czarist “bloody regime.”\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Mother Earth}’s writers praised people’s individual and collective revolts against the Czar as acts of heroism.\textsuperscript{65}

\textsuperscript{59} “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 1:5 (July 1906): 2.
\textsuperscript{60} “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 1:8 (Oct. 1906): 3.
\textsuperscript{61} According to Kropotkin, “The treaty or agreement which has been concluded a few days ago between the Governments of Great Britain and Russia explains now the cause of the opposition to the divulgence of this country of facts which were openly published in the Russian papers, in Russia itself.” Peter Kropotkin, “The Revolution in Russia,” \textit{Mother Earth} 1:5 (July 1906): 5-10.
\textsuperscript{63} “International Notes,” \textit{Mother Earth} 2:11 (Jan. 1908): 525-530. Citing data from the Russian Police Department, the “International Notes” section stated in 1909 that, “there were 3,319 condemnations to death by military courts and 1,435 executions during the four years ending January 1, last” in Russia. “International Notes,” \textit{Mother Earth} 4:2 (Apr. 1909): 61-63.
\textsuperscript{65} For example, see “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 2:9 (Nov. 1907): 365; “International Notes,” \textit{Mother Earth} 3:2 (Apr. 1908): 113-117.
These writers’ indictment of Czarism went hand in hand with their accusation that foreign powers were co-conspirators of the Czar. “The real pillars of Czarsism,” Goldman wrote in October 1906, “are not the Grand Dukes and Cossacks, but the chiefs of international finance.” She held that Euro-U.S. capitalism furnished the Czarist regime, “with the sinews of war against the Revolution.” While the Baltimore Sun claimed that “Russia look[s] to America for guidance in the revolution,” Mother Earth rebuked the hypocrisy of American corporate and state powers. Berkman pointed out two typical American attitudes toward Russian conditions in his editorial. One was pure conceit, a disposition that celebrated America as a blessed land of liberty and the model for all other nations, especially the autocratic Russia. The other was animosity to social reorganization and the belief that political democratization was the only legitimate goal of foreign revolutions. Berkman blamed the narrow ideology of the U.S. politicians and the selfish interests of Wall Street adventurers for crippling the Russian people’s effort to bring about a new socioeconomic order. He cautioned the Russians in May 1917 against Wall Street’s commercialism that would mar their achievement of social liberation during the recent February Revolution. For him and his comrades, American plutocratic influence endangered the prospect of a free Russia.

Mother Earth’s writers insisted that a free Russia could only materialize through social revolution, not the political democratization upheld by many Russians and most Americans. These anarchists considered the failures of the State Duma evidence of the

69 Berkman wrote that the U.S. government and capitalist press, pretending to rejoice over the new Russian condition, in fact feared the revolution in Russia developed out of their control. Alexander Berkman, “America and the Russian Revolution,” Mother Earth 12:3 (May 1917): 75-77.  
futility of political reform. Kropotkin repeatedly pointed out the pitfalls in Duma politics and called for social revolution, only through which the masses would be their own masters. Reports in the “International Notes” showed terrifying figures of “the Tsar’s victims” to ridicule the Russian government’s boast of “a constitution and parliament.” The magazine emphasized that political change could not liberate the people. “To the Anarchists,” Max Baginski declared, “democracy is no less a tyrant than autocracy.” His statement refuted both the political revolution and American democracy as Russia’s right path. These anarchists’ insistence on the inadequacy of mere political change drove them to push the 1917 February Revolution for socioeconomic liberation that would free the masses from bourgeois rule.

In *Mother Earth*, anarchists presented revolutionary struggles in Russia as the embodiment of a universal pursuit for freedom from all forms of government. The magazine’s first issue carried a short fable that encapsulated this message:

A few days ago the red ghost of revolution showed itself in the White House. The President saw it and threatened it with his boxing fists: “What are you looking for here, be off to Russia.” “You are comical in your excitement,” answered Revolution. “You must know, I am not only Russian, I am international, at home here as well as on the other side of the great water.”

---

73 “International Notes,” *Mother Earth* 2:9 (Dec. 1907): 467-472. The report in “International Notes” stated that “According to them [European dailies], 2,381 persons were executed without trial or hearing; 3,891 were condemned to hard labor, 605 received life sentences and the rest a total of 29,523 years.” For similar discourse that condemned the official crimes committed by the Czarist regime, see James Montgomery, “Bloody Sunday and After,” *Mother Earth* 8:11 (Jan. 1914): 335-337.
The President’s “boxing fists” symbolized Roosevelt’s combative nature and U.S. imperialism under his leadership, as well as his love of boxing as a manly sport. The fable expressed an anarchistic vision of the contagious spirit of revolution from Russia. Spanish anarchist Jaime Vidal, too, wrote in *Mother Earth* that he saw in the Russian uprisings “a hope of the awakening of all the world’s sufferers or a beginning of the universal social revolution.” When the 1917 February Revolution broke out, Goldman and Berkman hailed its slogan for bread and peace as an omen of the end of the catastrophic WWI. Goldman expected Russian revolutionaries to “extend their hands to the suffering people of all the belligerent countries” and “combine the workers of all lands for the international social revolution.”

Goldman and her comrades championed a broad-based, non-partisan Russian Revolution to increase its chances of success. Goldman supported the Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party despite disagreeing with its advocacy for the creation of a new government. Kropotkin endorsed the revolutionary acts from “the Socialist party, Revolutionary Socialists, Anarchists, and even Social Democrats.” The magazine frequently solicited various kinds of support for Russian revolutionaries and political prisoners of all sorts. Socialists in the U.S. and elsewhere, by contrast, condemned the

---

anarchists in Russia. Polish-German socialist Rosa Luxemburg criticized anarchism in Russia as a movement that stood for “the common thief and plunderer” during the revolution. German socialist leader Herr Bebel argued that anarchist’s demands for general strikes in Russia were childish and infeasible. The International Socialist Review used the term “anarchy” to describe the chaos in Russia. International socialists’ antagonism toward anarchists led to their reserved support for the 1905 Revolution, since anarchists played a part in creating it.

Maxim Gorky’s U.S. tour in 1906 exemplified the nonsectarian solidarity with worldwide revolutionaries adopted by Mother Earth’s inner circle. Gorky, a Russian socialist writer, arrived in America as an envoy of the Social Democratic Labor Party. Before his trip, Gorky’s works had enjoyed international fame. Many people in the U.S. protested after the Russian government arrested him in 1905 for anti-Czarist writings. Prominent literary figures, including Jack London and Mark Twain, welcomed his arrival to New York on April 10, 1906. A promising fundraising trip, however, soon turned into a calamity. Gorky committed a major blunder by bringing along a companion who was not held fund-raising balls for international, including Russian, political prisoners. “Advertisement: The Most Unique Event in America all Nations Political Prisoners Ball,” Mother Earth 12:1 (Mar. 1917).

82 Rosa Luxemburg, “The Russian Revolution, Anarchism and the General Strike,” in idem, Reform or Revolution and Other Writings (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2006), 101-104. This essay was originally included in a pamphlet, entitled The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Union, which was first published in 1906.


85 Maxim Gorky (1868-1936) was the penname of Aleksey Maksimovich Peshkov. He was praised as the founder of socialist realism. In the summer of 1905, Gorky joined the Bolshevik faction of Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. For more details about the events during Gorky’s American trip, see Tova Yedlin, Maxim Gorky: A Political Biography (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1999), 67-82.


his legal wife. American society abruptly shifted their original praise of Gorky to censure his private life as a sex scandal. 88 *The Duluth News Tribune*, for instance, declared that, “The people of the United States cannot condone moral obliquity in public men.”89 Mounting criticism forced Gorky and his companion out of hotels and deprived him of support.90 His defense of the IWW and striking miners in the West further irritated U.S. industrialists.91 Moralistic opinions permeated the mainstream press. *Mother Earth*’s writers defended Gorky’s revolutionary cause while criticizing his uncomradely attitude towards anarchists and his cowardice on his sex scandal.92 Nonetheless, out of revolutionary solidarity, Goldman and Berkman continued to support him by publishing his writings.93 Leonard Abbott’s article in 1908 of the “Gorky episode” sympathized with Gorky for being ostracized by priggish Americans.94

Voltairine de Cleyre’s open letter to Gorky reflected a uniquely anarchistic attitude towards revolutionary and gender politics. Reprinted in *Mother Earth* in September 1906,

88 Gorky’s travel companion to the U.S. was Maria Andreeva, a famous Russian actress. She was Gorky’s common law wife; Gorky has separated from his legal wife but hadn’t divorced her. For more details of how Gorky’s personal affair marred his fundraising trip in the U.S. and, in turn, resulted in his criticism of America, see Erich Lippman, “A Sick Dostoevsky and Rich, Healthy Shopkeepers: Maxim Gorky’s Critique of America via Dostoevsky,” in *New Perspectives on Russian-American Relations*, ed. William Benton Whisenhunt, Norman E. Saul (New York: Routledge, 2016), 112-126.


90 For example, see “Topics in Chronicling America-Maxim Gorky, Russian Author - Revolutionary, Visits the US,” accessed Feb. 11, 2016, http://www.loc.gov/rr/news/topics/gorky.html. Also see Poole, “Maxim Gorki in New York.”

91 Barbara Schmidt, “Mark Twain on Czars, Siberia and The Russian Revolution.”

92 For Gorky’s claim that anarchy stood for lawless and disorder, see “Riots of Enthusiasm Greets Gorky,” *New York Times*, Apr. 11, 1906. For *Mother Earth*’s refutation and criticism, see “International Notes,”*Mother Earth* 1:9 (Nov. 1906): 47-50; Margaret Grant, “‘This Man Gorky,’” *Mother Earth*1:3 (May 1906): 8-17.


the letter listed three mistakes that Gorky committed during his U.S. trip. First, he compared the Czar’s murderous acts to those of anarchists in a public speech. Second, he did not fight back against the hypocrisy and prudery of the American bourgeoisie who refused to support the Russian people because of his affairs. Third, he ignored the requests of poor Russian Jewish immigrants in the U.S., who toiled to donate to the Russian revolution, to lower the price of his lectures so as to facilitate their attendance.95 De Cleyre’s letter conveyed her deep disappointment at Gorky in light of her high regard for him as a representative of the Russian revolution. To her, a true revolutionary did not have to be an anarchist, but he/she had to at least show defiance towards authorities and conventions. In particular, de Cleyre deplored Gorky’s cowardice when faced with the “Puritanic hypocrisy” in American society.96

*Mother Earth’s* nonsectarian support of the Russian Revolution persisted in the pages of its successor, the *Mother Earth Bulletin*, from October 1917 to April 1918.97 While Goldman and Berkman were unable to update themselves on the complex situation in Russia after the February Revolution, they chose to side with the Bolsheviks for their adoption of some anarchist tactics.98 In the first issue of the *Mother Earth Bulletin*, Berkman argued that the October Revolution was “the Messiah come, the Social Revolution.”99 Goldman, in December 1917, suggested that this Revolution lifted Russia “out of the paralyzing position of a merely political machine into a virile, active

---

96 De Cleyre, “An Open Letter.”
Berkman’s essay of January 1918 explained why they supported the “Russian Boylsheviki”:

We believe, however, that the Russian Boylsheviki—consisting as they do of Social Democrats, Social Revolutionists, Syndicalists and Anarchists—do not represent that narrow-minded Socialist type whose ideal is a strongly centralized Socialist government. On the contrary, we have reason to believe that the Boylsheviki in Russia are the expression of the most fundamental longing of the human soul that demands fullest individual liberty within the greatest social well being. That is why they have become, and are permitted to remain, the public voice of revolutionary Russia.101

Goldman’s pamphlet, The Truth about the Boylsheviki, published by MEPA in 1918, embraced the leadership of Vladimir Lenin and Leon Trotsky. “Boylsheviki,” she argued, “is the plural term for those revolutionists in Russia who represent the interests of the largest social groups, and who insist upon the maximum social and economic demands for those groups.”102 She and Berkman remained hopeful about and faithful to the revolutionary vision of 1917 until they were disillusioned by their experiences after their deportation back to Russia in 1919.103

Revolutionary fervor in Russia initiated the Mother Earth members’ vision of international social revolution. Russia’s nominally parliamentary reform in the years after 1906, however, failed to provide an imminent prospect of drastic socioeconomic reorganization. In the meantime, some core members shifted their attention to the arrests of exiled Mexican revolutionaries in the Southwest U.S. Berkman wrote in July 1907 that, “The [American] people that go into hysterics over the crimes committed by the Czar of Russia should bear in mind that conditions nearer home, in Mexico, are in some respects

102 Emma Goldman, The Truth about the Boylsheviki.
even worse than those of Russia.” He was targeting the U.S. government that complied with the Mexican regime to suppress its revolutionaries who took refuge in America. The outbreak of the 1910 Mexican Revolution that lasted for a decade greatly stirred many members. They saw new promises of social revolution in the Mexican peons’ irrepresible rebellions. While magazine members continued the points made in their Russian coverage, they added new elements and adjusted the focus of their campaigns for the Mexican revolutionaries according to the particular conditions in Mexico.

“Land and Liberty”: Rallying for the Mexican Revolutionists

The massive armed uprisings across Mexico from 1910 evolved towards social revolution, which excited anarchists while worrying various groups in America. The capitalist, socialist and anarchist press competed with one another to lead the discourse on the Mexican situation. American capitalists, who practically dominated the Mexican economy, blamed revolutionaries for destroying their property and endangering their investments in Mexico. Constant chaos drove the U.S. socialists to criticize the violence committed by the Mexicans. The pending U.S. intervention from 1910 escalated into the military seizure of Veracruz (Mexico’s principal Eastern port) in April 1914. Various vested interests involved in Mexico complicated the Americans’ attitude towards the Mexican people’s struggles against domestic and imperialist oppressions. Unlike most of

---

the U.S. mass media, *Mother Earth*’s anarchists steadfastly championed the Mexican Revolution and the common people’s demand for “Land and Liberty.”

*Mother Earth*’s reporting on the Mexican Revolution focused on two geopolitical regions: one in the Southwest U.S. and the other across Mexico, particularly the countryside. The first type of reporting highlighted the revolutionary activities of the Mexican Liberal Party (Partido Liberal Mexicano, hereinafter PLM), founded by Ricardo Flores Magón and his brother Enrique Flores Magón in 1905. Born into an indigenous family, the Magón brothers grew into socialist-inclined intellectuals who advocated the ouster of Porfirio Díaz’s longtime dictatorship. They fled to the Southwest U.S. in 1904 to escape government suppression and create anti-Díaz propaganda. The two brothers soon befriended Goldman after attending her lectures in St. Louis. The ideas of Ricardo Flores Magón—later known as *magonismo*—fused Kropotkin’s anarchist communism with Mexican indigenous agrarian cultural values. The Magón brothers’ journalistic propaganda and revolutionary activism greatly inspired their compatriots in Mexico.

From 1907 till 1917, *Mother Earth*’s members advocated for the PLM’s cause of Mexican

---

socioeconomic emancipation. William Owen, the editor of the English language section of the PLM’s organ *Regeneracion* in Los Angeles, wrote for *Mother Earth* to update readers on Mexico’s revolutionary development. After 1910, *Mother Earth*’s geopolitical coverage of Mexico followed the peasants and laborers, whose revolts spread through all the states in Mexico. Voltairine de Cleyre’s analysis addressed the ethno-demographic and socioeconomic evolution in Mexico. The diverse narratives in *Mother Earth* mapped out a Mexican revolutionary geography broader than its national territory.

*Mother Earth*’s editorialists highlighted the close symbiosis between American plutocracy and the power of Mexico’s dictators. From the 1890s forward, U.S. corporations enthusiastically responded to Mexican President Díaz’s foreigner-friendly investment policy. Within a decade, American companies monopolized Mexico’s oil, mining, railway, copper, sugar, and smelting industries. By 1910, overall U.S. assets in Mexico amounted to almost half a billion dollars. Berkman disparaged the reform-minded landowner Francisco Madero, who rose against Díaz in late 1910, as “Díaz the Little.” Berkman cautioned against what he termed “the Madero trap,” which was a nominal yet ineffectual political reform for democracy. He also censured William Taft’s administration for sending troops to the U.S.-Mexican border under pressure from capitalists. U.S. Ambassador Henry Lane Wilson backed General Victoriano Huerta’s

---


114 “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 6:5 (July 1911): 129-131. Taft sent troops to the Mexican border to protect American lives and property but did not intervene in the Mexican civil war. “Navy Aiding
effort to launch a counter-revolutionary coup, which replaced Madero’s leadership in February 1913.115 The new U.S. President, Woodrow Wilson, however, disapproved of Huerta and instead supported Venustiano Carranza, leader of the Constitutional Army. Berkman argued that, “The Wilson-Huerta war is a quarrel between two thieves” who equally hurt the Mexican people’s interests.116 He denounced the U.S. Navy’s seizure of Veracruz as Wilson’s scheme to protect American vested interests despite the deaths of Mexican peons.117 While the U.S. officially recognized the presidency of Carranza in October 1915, Goldman lauded the Mexican people’s continued revolt. She deplored both the U.S. and Mexican government for killing people in the name of preserving order.118 Mother Earth’s last article about Mexico in June 1917 revealed that police were suppressing peaceful anarchists under Carranza’s tyranny.119

The high stakes of U.S. interests in Mexico contributed to the shifting focus in Mother Earth’s coverage of the Mexican revolution. Its writers’ condemnation of government’s atrocity and their celebration of people’s revolts in Mexico remained the same as their stance on the Russian Revolution.120 But they put more emphasis on decrying the U.S.

119 “Correspondence,” Mother Earth 12:4 (June 1917): 127-128.
120 According to the text in Mother Earth, even Mexican revolutionists invoked the Russian Revolution as inspiration, as they praised “the beautiful deeds of the Russian proletariat” and emphasized “the similarity of character, tendencies, traditions and temperament between the Russian and the Mexican peasants, as well as their common aspiration to liberate the land for the use and benefit of all, without bosses or oppressors.” “Correspondence,” Mother Earth 12:4 (June 1917): 127-128.
plutocratic tyranny inflicted on the Mexican people. They also focused more on the socioeconomic transformation and revolutionary struggles in Mexico than on the frequent regime changes and power struggles in the capital. Particularly, some *Mother Earth* writers criticized U.S. labor and socialist groups for failing to support their Mexican fellow laborers just across the border. Besides, *Mother Earth*’s coverage of the Mexican revolution highlighted race more than its narratives about Russia. They prominently focused on the image of Mexican Indians suffering miserably as wage slaves in the magazine. Last but not least, Goldman’s close association with the Magón brothers intensified *Mother Earth*’s campaign on their behalf.

The original support that the PLM received from U.S. leftist and labor groups waned after the changing political condition in Mexico in May 1911. Previously, socialist presses such as *The International Socialist Review* and *The Masses* had endorsed the PLM’s revolutionary cause.121 In 1908, some U.S. leftist groups and *Mother Earth* members jointly prevented the deportation of the Magón brothers who were arrested by the U.S. government when pressed by Mexican authorities.122 Nevertheless, the demise of Díaz’s regime and the escalating rebellions of Mexican people diminished support for the revolutionaries from the America Left. Madero’s rise as Mexico’s new leader in May 1911 drove many U.S. newspapers to conclude that the Mexican Revolution ended with

---


122 The Manifesto was signed by Ricardo Flores Magón, Antonio I. Villarreal, Librado Rivera, Lazaro Gutierrez de Lara. “Manifesto to the American People (In the Matter of the Extradition of the Mexican Revolutionists),” *Mother Earth* 2:12 (Feb. 1908): 546-554. For Ricardo Flores Magón’s tactics of concealing his anarchist ideology in the PLM’s earlier (especially the important 1906) manifestos, see Ricardo Flores Magón, *Dreams of Freedom*, 43-46, 64, 75.
the downfall of Diaz’s dictatorship. Growing numbers of U.S. sympathizers disapproved of the persistent uprisings led by the PLM after May. Many American newspapers criticized the Mexican people’s uprisings for endangering U.S. interests or disturbing Mexican politics. Conversely, some international anarchists were critical of the Magón brothers for not returning to Mexico to fight alongside their peon brothers and sisters. The PLM, for its part, issued a more radical manifesto on September 23, 1911 to justify the people’s continued revolts after Madero replaced Diaz. The PLM’s declaration of war against Authority, Capital, and the Church, which demonstrated its anarchist persuasion for the first time, drove its U.S. non-anarchist allies further away. The AFL and its president Samuel Gompers dropped their original support for the PLM at that point.


The downfall of Diaz split various Mexican revolutionary forces in their further struggles for socioeconomic transformation, which led members of *Mother Earth* to abandon the nonsectarian solidarity that they showed towards the Russian revolutionaries. The PLM refused to cooperate with military figures, although some of whom (especially Francisco “Pancho” Villa and Emiliano Zapata) appealed to Mexican peons as revolutionary leaders.\(^{128}\) The PLM also did not intend to work with American and Mexican socialists, who publicly denounced its anarchistic tactics.\(^{129}\) In July 1911, Eugene V. Debs, the leading American socialist, censured the PLM’s anarchist tactics and violent rebellions.\(^{130}\) He particularly repudiated the PLM’s advocacy of direct action that encouraged the “ignorant, superstitious, [and] unorganized” Mexican masses to insurrection.\(^{131}\) In response, several PLM leaders issued an appeal in *Mother Earth* in the following month, expressing their regrets over the opposition to them from “certain Socialist Party leaders.”\(^{132}\) William Owen, who closely worked with the PLM in Los Angeles, lamented that “the Socialist party is not a friend, but an enemy” of the Mexican people’s social revolution.\(^{133}\) Numerous cartoons in the U.S. mainstream press caricatured Mexican revolutionaries as anarchist terrorists, personifying Mexican turmoil as anarchy.

---


\(^{129}\) Socialist parties in both Mexico and the U.S. were critical of the insurgent PLM. For example, Victor L. Berger, the first socialist Congressman, labeled the Mexican revolutionists “the bandits.” Voltairine de Cleyre, “The Mexican Revolt,” *Mother Earth* 6:6 (Aug. 1911): 167-172. De Cleyre claimed that the citation was from the Chicago Daily Socialist.

\(^{130}\) Originally an ally of Ricardo Flores Magon, Debs felt compelled to reveal the PLM’s anarchistic nature he found in the latter’s armed uprising and takeover in Baja California in early 1911. Regarding the Baja California Rebellions (also called Magonista Revolt) organized by the PLM and led by Ricardo Flores Magon, see Colin M. MacLachlan, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991), 34-36.


Images 19 and 20 illustrate how the U.S. popular media attributed the chaos in Mexico to its reckless indigenous peons, who ravaged Mexico with riots, demoralization, and fiery violence. The racist portrayal of Mexican revolutionaries in these cartoons disgusted members of *Mother Earth*. They espoused the PLM as “the only labor organization in Mexico with a program fundamentally revolutionary” and defended its struggles against all organized governments. Over and over again, they prompted their readers to respond to the PLM members’ appeals for moral and financial support.

Image 19 (left) & 20 (right): Anti-Anarchy Illustrations in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *San Francisco Examiner*.

*Mother Earth’s* news coverage of the Mexican Revolution called attention to its people’s “double oppression” that varied slightly from the magazine’s revolutionary discourse on Russia. The writers singled out U.S. industries, which heavily invested in and thus controlled Mexico, as the evil root of its dictatorship. While Goldman targeted

“European and American capitalism” for backing the Czar, William Owen held “the money power of the United States” solely responsible for supporting the Mexican dictatorship. Owen and Berkman accused the U.S. companies that monopolized numerous industries in Mexico of abusing the Mexicans and their resources. Owen applauded the Mexican people’s revolts in “every State and Territory” after Díaz’s downfall as the most extensive and spontaneous demand for drastic social change.

Some writers of *Mother Earth* saw an even more promising prospect of social revolution in Mexico than in Russia. Voltairine de Cleyre commented on the Mexican Revolution, “At last we see a genuine awakening of a people, not to political demands alone, but to economic ones,—fundamentally economic ones.” For her, Mexico symbolized the forefront of the battle against organized governments and the U.S.-dominated capitalist powers.

Voltairine de Cleyre analyzed the issue of racial exploitation in her discourse on the “double oppression” in Mexico. While Goldman and Berkman condemned the pogroms in Russia, they did not address racial issues other than anti-Semitism in their comments on

---

141 Also, Berkman had concluded in July 1911 that “America is now the haven of international exploitation.” “Was it not American capital that supported the Tzar, thus aiding him to suppress the revolution in Russia?” he wrote; “It is the same power that is now killing the revolution in Mexico.” “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 6:5 (July 1911): 129-131.
the Russian Revolution. By contrast, De Cleyre underscored the inhuman treatment of the indigenous people in Mexico. There was less than one fifth of the “pure white stock” in Mexico, she said; the rest of the population was pure “Indians” and mixed breeds (Mextizos). She emphasized the sufferings of four-fifths of the population, who were exploited as slaves in the farms and factories. She also refuted the derogatory remarks of U.S. socialists about the Mexican people as illiterate, ignorant members of a lower race. “To conclude that people are necessarily unintelligent because they are illiterate,” she remarked, “is in itself a rather unintelligent proceeding.” For her, the Mexican peons were totally capable of the free, communal life that their ancestors had had before the government and foreign corporations ruined everything. De Cleyre cited several reports from Mexico to show how the doubly oppressed peons across the nation rose up to take back their land, liberty, and dignity from their government and the U.S. capitalists.

*Mother Earth*’s writers emphatically affirmed what Berkman described as “the international importance” of the Mexican Revolution. They cheered the peons’ revolts, strikes and expropriations of the landowner’s properties as strongly as they did the Russian people, if not more. These anarchists wanted to boost international revolutionary momentum from Russia to Mexico. In February 1910, William Owen denounced the U.S. government’s suppression of exiled Mexican revolutionaries as “the Russianizing of this country,” namely the Czar-like suppression of the Mexican insurgents in America.

*Mother Earth*’s strong anti-authoritarian message drew sympathizers to donate to its rescue

---

143 De Cleyre, “The Mexican Revolution (Continued).”
144 Similar narrative can be seen at George Duval, “Educational Value of the Mexican Revolution, *Mother Earth* 10:4 (June 1915): 142-143.
funds for the persecuted Mexican revolutionaries.\textsuperscript{146} Touring across America in July 1911, Goldman reported that she spoke on behalf of “the great human indignity of Mexico” as well as “the awakened revolutionary consciousness in Japan.”\textsuperscript{147} From 1910 to 1911, she and other core members strove to save persecuted Japanese revolutionaries. Cross-cultural comradeship moved them beyond the American public’s orientalist prejudices to seek international justice. The rescue campaign fueled the activist momentum that they had built to spread international social revolution.

“\textit{Long Live Anarchy!}”: Protests for the Japanese Persecuted Revolutionists

Thanks to its association with Denjiro (Shūsui) Kōtoku, the inner circle of \textit{Mother Earth} established a transpacific network for anarchist activism.\textsuperscript{148} In its first issue, the magazine carried a short piece satirizing Japan’s entry into the ranks of “civilized” countries that it marked by displaying its military power.\textsuperscript{149} From 1907, Kōtoku provided \textit{Mother Earth} with news of Japanese anarchist movements. In late 1910, he and twenty-five other Japanese revolutionaries were put on trial for plotting against the lives of the imperial family. Core members of \textit{Mother Earth} soon mobilized various protests that targeted the Japanese government. Though they failed to save the Japanese comrades, they continued to promote the latter’s anarchist martyrdom in words and deeds.

\textsuperscript{148} Instead of detailing the life and activities of Denjirō Kōtoku (1871-1911, who was better known in Japan by the nom de plume Kōtoku Shūsui), this section focuses on the interactions between Kōtoku and \textit{Mother Earth} and the latter’s campaign to rescue the former and his comrades from the Japanese government’s verdict of death sentence. For Kōtoku’s biography, see F. G. Notehelfer, \textit{Kotoku Shusui: Portrait of a Japanese Radical} (London: Cambridge University Press, 1971); Yasuko Umemura, “A Japanese Anarchist: Kōtoku Shūsui’s Letters: 1901-1911” (Master Thesis, San Francisco State University, 2007), 6-58.
\textsuperscript{149} “Japan,” \textit{Mother Earth} 1:1 (Mar. 1906): 19.
Mother Earth’s articles about Japanese anarchists featured ideological tolerance and pan-racial acceptance of them. Consistent with their attitude towards the Russian revolutionaries, core members defended various types of Japanese radicals. Similar to their resistance to the U.S. racial prejudice against Mexican peons, they pledged non-racist comradeship to revolutionaries in Japan. Goldman and Berkman highlighted the global effect of capitalist exploitation and imperialist militarism on the development of Japan as they did with Russia and Mexico. In particular, they criticized anti-Asiatic racism, to which Japanese people in the U.S. were subjected. Berkman’s editorial of May 1907 denounced the fear of “yellow peril” that had even captivated some U.S. labor radicals. Japan and China, wrote Berkman, had witnessed a “remarkable spreading of social revolutionary ideas.” The same editorial included a discussion of the program of a recently organized “Social Revolutionary Party of Japanese in America.” For Berkman, this program showed that “the American workingmen have a great deal to learn from their ‘heathen’ brothers.” The program’s appeal to abolish capitalism, inequality, and racial prejudice corresponded to Mother Earth’s anarchistic position.

Denjiro Kōtoku, the founder of this Social Revolutionary Party (Shakai Kakumeitō), owed his connection to a transnational radical network and his international fame to his American comrades. Kōtoku was a journalist whose anti-imperialism resulted in a five-month imprisonment in Japan in 1905. His reading and introspection in prison led him to convert his political allegiance from Marxist socialism to radical anarchism. After his


151 “Observations and Comments,” Mother Earth 2:3 (May 1907): 119-120.

152 “I had gone [to prison] as a Marxian Socialist and returned as a radical Anarchist;” he wrote to his American anarchist friend Albert Johnson. Denjirō Kōtoku to Albert Johnson, August 10, 1905, cited from
release, Kōtoku voyaged to San Francisco in late 1905, hoping to kindle the revolutionary fervor among kindred spirits abroad. Albert Johnson, Kōtoku’s American friend and veteran anarchist, introduced Kōtoku to leftist classics and radical groups in San Francisco. Kōtoku befriended international anarchists in the Bay Area and participated in local socialist and IWW meetings. His experience and observations in the U.S. committed him to direct action for social revolution. On the eve of his departure for Japan in June 1906, Kōtoku organized the Social Revolutionary Party in Berkeley to keep up the propaganda work among Japanese and international workers.

Kōtoku and his comrades’ activism in Japan never materialized into a revolution, but their journalistic propaganda attracted *Mother Earth* members’ attention. “International Notes” in May 1907 introduced the publication of a revolutionary Socialist daily, *Heimin Shimbun* (The Commoner's News) in Tokyo. An editorial of August 1907 quoted a letter from Kōtoku, who related “a great awakening taking place among the intellectuals

---


Kōtoku first arrived at Seattle on November 27, 1905. He went to San Francisco on December 5, 1906 and stayed there before heading back to Japan in June 5, 1906. See Yasuko Umemura, “A Japanese Anarchist,” 31-35. The Japanese immigrants started to come to the U.S. after the strong wave of anti-Chinese movement, which culminated in the Chinese Exclusion Act passed on May 1882. By 1910, the total population of San Francisco was 416,912, of which 6,900 (about 1.67%) were Japanese immigrants, and 16,918 (about 4.06%) were Italian immigrants. See The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Information and Statistical Department compiled, *San Francisco: The Financial, Commercial & Industrial Metropolis of the Pacific Coast* (San Francisco: The H. S. Crocker Co., 1915), 18. Yamato Ichihashi, *Japanese Immigration: Its Status in California* (San Francisco: The Marshall Press, 1915), 19.

Johnson’s atheism also nurtured Kōtoku’s anti-Church idea, which contradicted the Christian socialism that was prevalent among the Japanese socialists. For the prevalence of the Christian socialists in the early Japanese socialist movement and Kōtoku being the rarity who did not believe in Christianity or religion, see F. G. Notehelfer, *Kotoku Shusui*, 93-94, 101-103.


of Japan.” The March 1908 “International Notes” reprinted the declaration of a “Land Rehabilitation Society” formed in Tokyo. The appeal of the Society echoed revolutionaries in Mexico and Russia as they claimed land and liberty. The May 1908 issue carried a letter from a Japanese anarchist, who introduced three “direct actionist papers” in Japan advocating the general strike.

Unlike in America, socialism in early twentieth-century Japan was an umbrella neologism that included diverse radical ideas and anarchist tactics. A letter from Japan in the May 1908 issue of Mother Earth explained the situation:

In our country, where even the use of the word Anarchy means a fine or imprisonment, we could not, of course, have a public organization and a written list of our comrades’ names. And our movements were compelled to be always under the disguise of “Socialist” in a broad sense, or carried on very secretly for the sake of getting rid of the spies and detectives.

It was not uncommon for some social revolutionaries to hide their anarchist agenda while pursuing social revolution. Ricardo Flores Magón had strategically downplayed his anarchist tendencies in order “to obtain the great benefits for the people.” Similarly, Kōtoku sought to propagate anarchism as a socialist leader in Japan. In his letter to Albert Johnson (dated December 6, 1907), he classified “Social-Democrat and Anarchist Communist” as two parties in the Japanese socialist movement. In a sense, Kōtoku treated his conversion to anarchist communism as a change of the means but not the

159 “International Notes,” Mother Earth 3:3 (May 1908): 165-173. The three “direct actionist papers” were “Nippon Heimin Shim bun (Japanese Proletarians’ Paper), Kumamoto Hyoron (Kumamoto City Review), and Shin-Shicho (New Thought).”
161 Ricardo Flores Magón, Dreams of Freedom, 64, 350.
162 In his letter, Kōtoku continued that: “It is a very natural development known in all countries. Japan, which has already produced Social-Democrats and Anarchist Communist, shall now produce many, many Direct-Actionists, Anti-Militarists, General-Strikers and even Terrorists.” Denjirō Kōtoku to Albert Johnson, December 6, 1907, cited from “Kotoku’s Correspondence with Albert Johnson,” Mother Earth 6:9 (Nov. 1911): 282-287.
He played a key role in the ideological expansion of Japanese socialism. Even after his return to Japan from America, many of his followers still viewed his advocacy of direct action as a variant of socialist tactics. The Japanese Socialist Party, which he cofounded in February 1907, consisted of “Social-Democrats, Social Revolutionists, and even Christian Socialists.” Japanese socialists and anarchists at the time acknowledged their shared goals in egalitarianism, antiwar, and anti-capitalism while admitting their different methods for action. Socialists and anarchists became interchangeable in the American press when they discussed Kōtoku and his comrades. The New York Times, for example, reported that Kōtoku propagated “Socialistic and Anarchical doctrines” and that he “did not differentiate between the two.”

Mother Earth’s core members identified Kōtoku as an anarchist while extending their comradeship to Japan’s suppressed or persecuted socialists. Berkman’s editorials lumped socialists and anarchists together when relating to the conditions in Japan. He, however, singled out Kōtoku and labeled him the “head of the Kropotkinists.”

163 Kōtoku had continued to work and associate with the socialists and he did not form an anarchist communist party. The expression in his letter to Johnson was more like an intensification of means to the same ideal, namely the abolition of the existing political and social order. See F. G. Notehelfer, Kotoku Shusui, 133-134.
164 Denjirō Kōtoku to Albert Johnson, December 18, 1906.
165 For example, Sen Katayama (1859-1933), another noted Japanese socialist, related that “[I]n 1906 Mr. Kōtoku returned from America with and with him Direct Actionism was introduced into Japan. It was new to the comrades but all worked in harmony for the cause [of socialism],” S. Katayama, “Government Oppression in Japan,” International Socialist Review XI:2 (Aug. 1910): 80-82. Another Japanese socialist introduced his accused comrades in the High Treason Incident (see later discussion) that “[A]ll were expressed Socialists, though some preferred to be called Kropotkin communists.” “The Japanese Revolutionists,” International Socialist Review XI:9 (Mar. 1911): 519-520.
Hippolyte Havel wrote that Kōtoku had “popularized Socialist, Anarchist, and anti-militarist ideas in Japan.” According to Havel, anarchists (or Kropotkinists) in Japan, such as Kōtoku, were also known as the “Allied Socialists.” These anarchists in America admitted the strategic anarchist-socialist united front in Japan, refraining from identifying all persecuted radicals in Japan as anarchists.

The Red Flag Incident (Akahata Jiken) of June 22, 1908 was a prelude to the Japanese government’s mass suppression of Japanese revolutionaries two years after. As reported in Mother Earth, the Tokyo police interfered at a peaceful gathering of “some sixty Socialist and Anarchists” that resulted in the attendees’ resistance to the police. A dozen of them ended up serving one to two-and-a-half-year prison sentences for violating the 1900 Public Order and Police Law, which expressly targeted organized labor movements. Kōtoku was absent and hence not arrested; but his fate became intertwined with the outcome of the Red Flag Incident. The harsh sentences imposed on Kōtoku’s comrades prompted him to attack the government’s suppression of anarchists. Furthermore, the activist fervor of his common-law wife, socialist Kanno Sugako,

---

169 A. B. (Alexander Berkman), “The Martyrs of Japan,” Mother Earth 6:3 (May 1911): 82-84. This article reprinted a letter from Dr. Tokijiro Kato, a Japanese comrade, who wrote that: “As to the question what parties our martyrs belonged to, it is very difficult to answer. Some of them declared themselves as Anarchists-Communists. Some of them simply as Socialists. And some others said that Communism, Socialism and Anarchism are one and same thing…In short, they were the most radical revolutionists in Japan.”
170 The report of “International Notes” wrote that the gathering was for welcoming a recently released comrade. At the end of the meeting, some of them sang revolutionary songs and waved red flags inscribed with “Anarchism” in the streets, which caused police interference and “a hand-to-hand fight.” “International Notes,” Mother Earth 3:7 (Sept. 1908): 299-302. The Red Flag Incident took place in June 22, 1908; the report in “International Notes” mistook the date as July, 22, 1908. For a much detailed account of the happening of the Incident, see F. G. Notehelfer, Kotoku Shusui, 158-161.
fomented his resolve to take revolutionary action. The events led Kōtoku and a group of anarchists to develop a plot to bomb Emperor Meiji and start a revolution. Though Kōtoku later left the group planning the assassination, he did not prevent his comrades from manufacturing bombs to carry it out.

The High Treason Incident (Taigyaku Jiken) of 1910 brought about a tragic end for Kōtoku and his comrades while making their revolutionary activism known worldwide. The Incident, also known as the Kōtoku case, referred to the mass arrest, trial, and execution of Kōtoku and his comrades by the Japanese government. From May to October 1910, the Japanese police arrested Kōtoku, Kanno, and another twenty-four revolutionaries for plotting to assassinate Emperor Meiji. After the trial in December held privately, all the defendants were found guilty. Kōtoku, Kanno and twenty-two other defendants received death sentences; the other two received prison terms. An Imperial Rescript soon commuted twelve of the prisoner’s death sentences to life imprisonment after the Emperor granted them amnesty. Kōtoku, Kanno, and the other ten were hung on January 24 and 25, 1911. The case first appeared in the U.S. press in June 1910, soon after the arrest of Kōtoku. By early November, dailies like the New York Times and the Morning Oregonian began to spread news of the “plot” in Japan to the American

---

174 The preliminary investigation in November established the case against the defendants for violating the new Criminal Code, Article 73, which sough capital punishment for plotters against the throne. F. G. Notehelfer, Kotoku Shusui, 184-188.
175 For a comprehensive and interdisciplinary study of the High Treason Incident and its historical significance, see Masako Gavin and Ben Middleton eds., Japan and the High Treason Incident (New York: Routledge, 2013). For the detailed account of the trial, see F. G. Notehelfer, Kotoku Shusui, 184-200.
The trial, to quote the *New York Times*, “created an indescribable sensation in Japan” and across the Pacific. Several U.S. newspapers portrayed the moment when Kōtoku cried out “Long live anarchy” after hearing the verdict of his death. After the execution, the *New York Times* wrote that “It was said that all [of the executed], including the woman, met their fate cheerfully.” Other mainstream papers, like the *New York Sun*, however, showed no sympathy for the condemned or their revolutionary beliefs.

While many U.S. dailies and socialist presses covered the Kōtoku case earlier than *Mother Earth*, it was among the first to launch a campaign to rescue the Japanese revolutionaries. From June to November 1910, the U.S. journalism simply stated the facts of the arrest of Kōtoku and his “accomplices.” While the *International Socialist Review* carried Japanese socialist Sen Katayama’s article, the editor did not solicit support for Japanese socialist comrades. Katayama revealed the plight of the Japanese socialist movement but expressed disapproval of Kōtoku’s use of direct action. In fact,

---


179 “Plotters Against the Mikado to Die.”


182 “Kotoku, Japan’s Anarchist,” *The Sun* [New York, NY] LXVIII:143 (Jan. 21, 1911): 4;

183 For examples, see “Plotters in Tokio,” *The Evening Star* [Washington, DC] 18167 (June 23, 1910): 11; “Infernal Machines in Japan,” *Norwich Bulletin* LI:149 (June 24, 1910): 1. The content of these news was identical, referring to the same source from Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. Instead of questioning the Japanese government’s indictment of the socialists, however, the news focused on something else. The *New York Times*, for instance, explained how absolute reverence of the Mikado in the past 2500 years made the plot unthinkable to the Japanese people. “Plotters Against the Mikado to Die.”

184 Katayama received college education in the United States and became a Christian socialist while studying at Yale Divinity School. Katayama was Kōtoku’s moderate rival and did not share the latter’s enthusiasm in anarchism. For the ideological difference between Katayama and Kōtoku, see F. G. Notehelfer, *Kotoku Shusui*, 93-94, 201.
Katayama blamed the Direct Actionists for risking the lives of all the other socialists and endangering the prospects of the Japanese socialist movement.\textsuperscript{185} Mother Earth’s members tried to save all the Japanese revolutionaries who were being tried, regardless of their ideological preferences. As it was too late to include coverage of the Kōtoku case in the magazine’s November issue, Goldman and her comrades voiced their protests in open letters, telegrams, and lectures. They teamed up with the Free Speech League and the Ferrer Association to initiate a nationwide campaign.\textsuperscript{186} Five Mother Earth core members sent a protest telegram to the Japanese ambassador in Washington, D.C.\textsuperscript{187} They (plus Hutchins Hapgood and Leonard Abbot) also circulated an open letter among labor unions and radical groups through America. The socialist New York Call reprinted both of the documents on November 12.

The telegram and open letter issued by core members featured the discursive rhetoric and protest strategy that found echoes in liberal or international radical circles. Goldman and her comrades denounced the indictment as illegal and the sentences as outrageous. They tried to mobilize written or cabled protests to Japanese ambassadors all over the world. The aforesaid protest telegram compared the Japanese government’s action to Spain and Russia in its “barbarous method against intellectuals.” It appealed to the progressive elements in the U.S. to protest “in the name of humanity and international brotherhood.” Likewise, the open letter concluded, “We, the international soldiers of freedom, are not willing to have our friends in Japan fall victims to the reactionary


forces.” Bolton Hall, a single taxer and Goldman’s good friend, sent a letter to the New York Times in early December. Hall hoped that “Energetic protests of the Western world will force Japan to terminate its secretiveness and give to the world the proofs of the alleged crime.” Sadakichi Hartmann wrote a manifesto to solicit support for Kōtoku and his comrades. Havel wrote to the New-York Tribune that their appeals solicited “hundreds of letters and telegrams of protest” sent to D.C. Protestors who gathered at the mass meeting at New York’s Lyric Hall on December 12 sent a protest telegram to the Japanese Premier Katsura Tarō afterwards. Various protests voiced by Mother Earth’s members also reached their European comrades. The Paris Les Temps Nouveaux, a leading French anarchist paper, responded to Mother Earth’s appeal and call for international revolutionary solidarity.

Starting in its December issue, Mother Earth plunged into a polemical attack on the Japanese government’s insistence on the legality of the trial and the guiltiness of the defendants. It was unclear if core members were aware of some of the defendants’ actual involvement in the bomb plot. Yet if Goldman, Berkman, or Havel had learned

---

195 Neither Kōtoku nor Kanno Sugako intended to deny their involvement in the bomb plot during the trial. In her prison writings, Sugako recorded her regret that “the actions [plot] of five or six of us” would cost several innocent comrades’ lives upon hearing the death verdict. Mikiso Hane ed., Reflections on the Way to the Gallows, 51-74.
of Kōtoku and (particularly) Sugako’s scheme, they would likely have retained their staunch defense of the Japanese anarchists. Havel cited a letter from the editor of the *Japan Chronicle* (“a capitalist publication” in Japan), who depicted the process of the trial as “unconstitutional and unprecedented.”\(^{196}\) He criticized the Japanese officials’ attempt to whitewash this case of judicial murder. Havel stressed the unbearable socioeconomic condition in Japan to justify the revolutionary cause of Kōtoku and his comrades.\(^{197}\) Additionally, *Mother Earth*’s anarchists accentuated the “intellectual” image of the accused Japanese comrades to impress readers with the “unjust and barbarous” treatment these comrades received. Berkman described Kōtoku as “a man who has devoted himself to intellectual pursuits” including popularizing Western thought in Japan.\(^{198}\) Havel claimed that the twenty-six convicted comrades were intellectual proletarians from various professions.\(^{199}\)

The multiform rescue campaign by *Mother Earth* members stirred widespread sympathies, which collectively put pressure on Japanese authorities. Goldman mobilized written and cabled protests to the Japanese ambassador, the Consul General at New York, and the U.S. press. Berkman reported that protests of the Kōtoku case took place in cities across America and Europe, including London, Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Rome, and elsewhere.\(^{200}\) These international pressures on the Japanese government, though unable to

---

\(^{200}\) “Japan and Her Radicals. Individual Protest in This Country Called For,” *Springfield Daily Republican* [Springfield, MA], 218:15 (December 6, 1910).
save the twelve executed revolutionaries, contributed to the commutations of the other twelve previously condemned defendants’ sentences.201

*Mother Earth*’s inner circle carried on their protests to Japanese authorities and their tributes to the Japanese comrades after other U.S. publications ended their coverage of the affair. Their meeting in New York’s Webster Hall on January 29, 1911 was “the largest and most significant” amid the Western continual protests, according to Berkman.202 Over two thousand people from radical and labor groups attended the meeting and voiced revolutionary spirit in a fiery resolution. A spontaneous street demonstration after the meeting resulted in the arrest and indictment of several radicals. *Mother Earth* reacted by setting up a “Defence Committee of the Kotoku Protest Conference” to aid the indicted comrades and the families of the convicted Japanese comrades. *Mother Earth*’s office became the liaison center for contacting comrades and donators.203 Goldman, for her part, tried to interest her audience in the Kōtoku Memorial during her lecture tours.204 She tirelessly spoke “in behalf of the awakened revolutionary consciousness in Japan.”205 The Defence Committee produced a distinct effect. Two Japanese socialists wrote to

---

201 A letter from a Japanese socialist sent to the *International Socialist Review* after the execution of the Japanese socialists and anarchists in January 24 and 25 expressed that: “It was the splendid activities of our foreign comrades that caused the Imperial government to relent in severity a little. Only because of pressure from WITHOUT was the government made to feel how the civilized world looked upon secret trials of men of learning.” “The Japanese Revolutionists,” *International Socialist Review* XI:9 (Mar. 1911): 519-520. Also see Stefan Anarkowic, “Taigyaku Jiken: ‘High Treason Case’,” in idem, *Against the God Emperor: The Anarchist Treason Trials in Japan* (Sacramento: Kate Sharpley Library, 2009), 5.


*Mother Earth* expressing their gratitude for the Defence Committee’s financial aid. One of them, Toshihiko Sakai, told Berkman: “The Japanese Government is confiscating all the papers and magazines of Socialism or Anarchism, but I often receive MOTHER EARTH from some friend in America.”

While *Mother Earth*’s members extended solidarity to socialists in Japan, they added some persecuted socialists to the lists of international martyrs as if they were anarchists. A photo of Kōtoku and his three comrades appeared on the front cover of both *Mother Earth* (February 1911)


and London *Freedom*’s pamphlet, entitled *The Japanese Martyrs* (1911). (Images 21 & 22)

Intriguingly, the Japanese government only executed Kotoku from among the four men in the photo;

---


207 Toshihiko Sukai [Sakai], “Voices from Japan.”
the other three men pictured were socialists, not anarchists. Either accidentally or intentionally, the photo supported *Mother Earth* and *Freedom*’s propaganda maneuver to promote anarchist heroism and international revolutionary solidarity. Berkman’s editorial exalted the victims’ martyrdom by juxtaposing the dates of their death with those of the Haymarket anarchists and Francisco Ferrer:

November 11th, 1887;  
October 13th, 1909;  
January 24th, 1911—  
these are the great days that will be treasured in the memory of the international proletariat as the most sacred moments of their emancipation.

For Berkman, the Japanese martyrs and their Western predecessors fought “in the common cause of international regeneration.” Havel, too, uttered that, “the solidarity of the international proletariat has been crowned. The West and the East have found each other.” He repeated the cry of his Japanese executed comrades, “Long Live Anarchy,” a slogan that conveyed the importance of their sacrifice.

Goldman chose to classify the Japanese imprisoned radicals as anarchists to demonstrate her inclusive ideological identity and her allegiance to their martyrdom. She explained herself in a sharp correspondence with Bolton Hall that appeared in the April 1911 issue of *Mother Earth*. Hall proposed that the *Mother Earth* writers’ should avoid labeling the twelve Japanese prisoners as “anarchists” for the sake of their safety. He opined that the public’s “ordinarily, though erroneous” perception of anarchists as

---

208 The four Japanese radicals on the photo were: Kōtoku, Toshihiko Sakai (1871-1933), Kōjirō Nishikawa (1876-1920), and Sanshirō Ishikawa (1876-1956). These four were identified by *The Japanese Martyrs* as “Original Editorial Staff of ‘Yorozu Cho-ho’.” Nishikawa was one of the founders of the social democratic party; Ishikawa was Christian socialist. See *The Japanese Martyrs* (London: The Freedom Press, 1911). This short pamphlet, while featuring the same photo like the one in the February 1911 issue of *Mother Earth*, carried an article reprinted from the February 1911 *Freedom*; the author was “one who knew Kotoku personally.” The source of the photo is so far unknown.


“terrorists” would jeopardize the lives of the imprisoned comrades in Japan. The anarchist label, for Hall, was “a means ill-adapted to the end,” which he felt should be to save the men from the Japanese government’s iron hand. Goldman’s unapologetic reply to Hall insisted on the importance of showing the anarchist identity of Japanese comrades. It did not matter to her if those imprisoned or persecuted radials called themselves anarchists or socialists. She believed whoever died for their social revolutionary ideals embodied the brave, anarchist spirit. Particularly, Goldman considered it a “downright betrayal” for American anarchists to refuse to recognize the men’s anarchist identities when they “proclaimed themselves as Anarchists.” She told Hall that she would only disclaim these Japanese radicals as anarchists if they denied the identity. “But as long as they are brave enough to stand up for the truth, why should I, or my comrade here, be expected to join in the popular howl against them?” For Goldman, a true anarchist would not obscure his/her true identity because he/she was afraid of government oppression. Mother Earth’s anarchists embraced a nonsectarian coalition for international social revolution so long as socialists were willing to collaborate with them. They defended persecuted socialists worldwide as their governments victimized them.

Mother Earth’s memorial coverage of the Japanese revolutionaries included two elements absent in earlier discourses on Mexico and Russia. One was a criticism of Christianity, and the other one was a tribute to revolutionary heroism. The criticism of Christianity appeared in the correspondence between Kōtoku and Albert Johnson, which

---

212 Emma Goldman and Bolton Hall, “Are Kotoku Protests Justified?”
core members serialized in late 1911.  

The letters dated from November 25, 1904 through April 11, 1910, covering Kōtoku’s largest period of activism as a socialist-turned-anarchist.  

Kōtoku’s letters disclosed the severe press censorship, police monitoring, and political oppression that social revolutionaries were experiencing in Japan. In addition, he pointed out how the Japanese government disguised the nation as “a civilized Christendom” to counter the image of Japan as “a yellow peril” that emerged during the Russo-Japanese War. Rapidly expanding Christianity, he noted, was “propagating in full vigor the Gospel of Patriotism” with protection from the Japanese government. Kōtoku condemned what he saw in Japanese Christianity, which had become “a great bourgeois religion and a machine of the State and militarism!”  

Kōtoku’s censure of Christianity was in tune with Mother Earth’s anti-Church stance, expressing disapproval of any religious hindrance to the social revolution.  

Moreover, the magazine writers’ portrayal of Kanno Sugako (spelled as Sugano Kano) displayed their admiration of her revolutionary heroism and her femininity. Earlier in April 1910, “International Notes” had reported the imprisonment of “comrade Kan[n]o” for her radical speeches. This report described Kanno as “a gifted young authoress” and satirized the Japanese government for “competing with the Tsar in despotic brutality.”

---


216 “Kotoku’s Correspondence with Albert Johnson,” Mother Earth 6:7 (Sept. 1911): 207-209.

In Havel’s eulogy of Kōtoku and Sugako in February 1911, he captured a clearer picture of Sugako:

They [Kōtoku and Sugao] were very dear to us. We mourn not; yet our hearts are saddened at the thought of the charming Suga[n]o. Lovingly we dwell upon her memory. We see the tender lot[os] ruthlessly destroyed by the hand of the hangman; we behold her, weakened through illness, broken by long imprisonment, yet joyfully and calmly meeting her terrible doom.218

Havel praised Sugako for “voluntarily exposing yourself to danger, hardships, and hunger.” He deplored the respectable classes for smearing Sugako’s reputation because of her non-marital relationship with Kōtoku. Gesture to the Russian revolutionary tradition, Havel expected that “some day there will arise a Turgeniev in the land of Nippon, and the name of Sugano Kano will be hailed with the Sophia Perovskaias, the Vera Figners, and Maria Spiridonovas.”219 Havel’s comment was appropriate because Sugako modeled herself on these Russian revolutionary heroines.220 The single picture of Sugako, enclosed in Havel’s essay, was the only female image in the inner pages of the entire run of Mother Earth. (Image 23)

Havel’s tribute to Kanno as a revolutionary heroine echoed Max Baginski’s 1916 essay introducing two European revolutionary heroines, Louise Michel and Catharine Breshkovsky. Breshkovsky’s status as the founder of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, rather than as an anarchist, did not prevent Baginski (or Goldman) from revering her as a revolutionary role model. Baginski praised Breshkovsky as one who, “has remained the sweet, mild, bold woman undaunted by cruelty, persecution[,] and privation” throughout her revolutionary struggles with the Czarist regime.221 These narratives tended to emphasize the

heroines’ feminine features while accentuating their extraordinary courage for devoting themselves to a dangerous, male-oriented revolution.


*Mother Earth’s* coverage of Japanese anarchism after 1911 continued to feature Kōtoku and his comrades’ revolutionary spirit. In his review of the events of 1911, Harry Kelly remarked that the “tragedy at Tokyo” testified to the growth of radical ideas in East Asia. Berkman memorialized his Japanese comrades in February 1912 by saying, “when in the coming days the trumpet of social revolution will sound the death knell of this false civilization, the spirit of Kotoku and his comrades will be the inspiration of the soldiers of liberty.” These core members continued to commemorate Kōtoku and his comrades on subsequent anniversaries of their death. Berkman’s editorial in January 1914 again reminded the readers of “the martyrdom of the pioneers of Anarchism in the land of

---

the Mikado. The Japanese rebels, out of the spell of the “yellow peril,” became a transnational inspiration for social revolution in the discourses of Mother Earth.

Conclusion

Mother Earth’s global network benefitted from a transnational circuit of anarchist information and actions but it also contributed to it. Rather than relying on American newspapers, the inner circle obtained international news from their frequent contact with foreign comrades and like-minded periodical writers. The technology of electric telegraphy greatly boosted the transcontinental exchange of news. Core members helped create a borderless anarchist community in which common causes, shared values, and memorial events prevailed. Collectively, they turned the anti-authoritarian messages of individual national revolutions into universal ones. These anarchists indicted capitalism and the political regimes that it supported as common enemies of the international proletariat. They particularly underscored the destructive effect of American plutocracy on the domestic labor movement and foreign revolutions. Following this logic, underprivileged working people in plutocratic America fared no better than those in autocratic Russia or chaotic Mexico. The imperative of international solidarity for social revolution appeared in Mother Earth to be more urgent than ever.

For core members, transnational activism involved an unconditional, anti-authoritarian commitment to radicalism beyond national, racial, and ideological lines. Their support of foreign socialists contrasted sharply with the U.S. socialists’ reservations about social revolutions abroad. Their faithful solidarity with international revolutionaries also distinguished them from other anarchist groups, some of whom expressed doubts about

certain revolutionaries as insufficiently anarchistic. The authors of *Les Temps Nouveaux*, for example, suspected that neither the PLM members nor the Mexican rebels were anarchists.²²⁵ William Owen, writing to *Mother Earth* in February 1912, described it as “monstrous” that some anarchist outlets ignored and even antagonized the Mexican Revolution.²²⁶ Even Goldman lamented that her anarchist comrades in Chicago lacked interest in the Kōtoku case. “Japan is far away;” she noted in *Mother Earth*, “even Anarchist do not easily overcome distance.”²²⁷ The inner circle’s nonsectarian campaigns on behalf of all kinds of social revolutionaries around the world distinguished them from other radical groups.

Rallying to international revolutions and social rebels, the inner circle of *Mother Earth* engaged in an alternative praxis of “propaganda by the deed.”²²⁸ Instead of practicing vindictive violence (*attentats*), core members appealed to reason to arouse the public’s

---


actions against authorities and injustice. For them, the anarchist assassinations of monarchs or capitalists in Europe, Latin America, and East Asia were vicarious examples of “propaganda by the deed.”

The magazine’s multiform transnational activism championed an anti-authoritarian spirit, which resonated with the American public to a certain extent. The rescue campaigns on behalf of foreign comrades were marginally successful. Goldman’s lecture tours managed to stir some audiences’ interest in and sympathy for international revolutionaries. Nellie T. Craig recorded how her friends Goldman and Berkman succeeded in bailing the incarcerated Magón brothers out of the L.A. County Jail in 1916. Craig wrote in *Mother Earth* about her deep impression of Goldman’s “power of action” in raising enough funds for the Magón brothers when the local Defense League had earlier failed to do.\(^{229}\) Goldman also noted that “the workers everywhere contributing to the needs of their brothers in the East, as well as for their [Mexican] comrades across the border line” during her lecture tours.\(^{230}\) Besides, her Russian drama lectures conveying Russian people’s revolts “met with the heartiest approval” and “stirred the [Berkeley Theater] audience profoundly.”\(^ {231}\) These audiences’ “heartiest approval” attested to the intellectuals’ reception of the revolutionary spirit, if not action, expressed in Goldman’s lectures.

The “action” that came from the audience’s “heartiest approval” was no more than donations and moral support for foreign revolutionaries and domestic labor radicals. The anti-authoritarian spirit that *Mother Earth*’s members kindled among the U.S. public was not an impetus for social revolution. Many intellectuals’ concerns about national security,

social progress, economic growth, and even cultural supremacy subdued their anti-authoritarian impulses stirred by anarchists. These non-anarchist audiences might sympathize with the plights of foreign people during their revolutions, or agree with the criticism of U.S. plutocratic powers covered in *Mother Earth*. But they were quite unresponsive to the anarchists’ appeal for international proletarian solidarity. Goldman’s argument that intellectuals were really part of the proletariat did not seem to convince these cultural elites that they shared the same fate with labor. She and her comrades’ campaigns for foreign revolutionaries achieved little in forging an international cooperative for waging a social revolution. Notwithstanding this failure, they faithfully supported international justice for global revolutionaries in contrast to the pragmatic support offered by the majority of Americans.

Last but not least, *Mother Earth*’s international revolutionary coverage revealed some members’ interest in women’s issues. In fact, the magazine’s discourses on women far exceeded their coverage of foreign revolutions. As the next chapter will elaborate, *Mother Earth* proposed sex radicalism for revolutionizing the existing socioeconomic and sexuo-ethical order. Woman’s emancipation in the discourses of *Mother Earth* was the key to liberated intimacies, gender equality, and autonomous sexuality. Notably, *Mother Earth*’s publications on women and sexuality had an international reach outside of international anarchist circles. The best example was the emergence of Goldman’s writings on free love in East Asian progressive journals. While Goldman’s notions of women and sexuality were anarchistic, they also echoed some Western progressive feminist ideas. The extent to which *Mother Earth*’s members actually distinguished its sex radicalism from other Western progressive ideas will be the next chapter’s focus.
CHAPTER 4

Propagating Sex Radicalism:
Anarchist Solutions for Women and Sexuality

Led by Goldman, *Mother Earth* promoted an anarchist style of sex radicalism as an essential component of both personal regeneration (for both sexes) and social revolution. Writing of the U.S. in *Mother Earth* in 1908, Goldman declared that “Nowhere does one meet such density, such stupidity, as in the question pertaining to love and sex.” Even the so-called radicals of the time still confined themselves to a “bourgeois morality in matters of sex, thanking the Lord they are not like the other fellows.”

Goldman fused European sexology with the anarchist legacy of sex radicalism from the 1870s to formulate a politics of sexuality to compete with the gender politics promoted by progressive-era feminists. She believed that women could only be truly free through radical social transformation. She expected women to be her own emancipator in the social revolution that would usher in a new sexuo-ethical order with neither hierarchies nor suppressions. She and other *Mother Earth* writers championed abolishing political, socioeconomic, religious, and sexual hierarchies in society to create a stateless and egalitarian anarchy. By contrast, socialist feminists targeted capitalism and patriarchy while looking to the state to provide

---

2 Since the 1870s, some individualist anarchist magazines started to focus on the issues of free love, women, and sexuality. *The Word*, a monthly published by freethinker and free lover Ezra Heywood from 1872 to 1893, first linked sex radicalism with individualist anarchism. Its defiant spirit of free love found echo in *Lucifer, the Light-bearer* (1883-1907), a weekly by Moses Harman first in Kansas and later in Chicago. Harman’s sex radicalism especially exerted significant influence on Goldman and the members of *Firebrand* and *Free Society*. Falk, “Forging Her Place: An Introduction,” 9, 42. For a general discussion of American anarchist feminism from the 1870s to the 1920s, see Margaret S. Marsh, *Anarchist Women: 1870-1920*. When *Mother Earth* was first published in 1906, the term “feminism” had not acquired its place in the mass media of American society. *Mother Earth*’s members were not fond of the term, nor the conception, of “feminism.” They saw “feminism” as a white, bourgeois-led ideology focusing on asking for votes and economic independence for middle-class women regardless of the severe economic inequality and social injustice. The term “feminism” rarely appeared in the text of *Mother Earth*. For one exception, see R. A. P., “Feminism in America,” *Mother Earth* 9:12 (Feb. 1915): 392-394.
just laws and secure social welfare.³ Other feminists of various schools demanded a range of rights for women but seldom challenged existing political and religious establishments.⁴ The majority of feminists were closer to the liberal, reform-driven mainstream than to Mother Earth’s anarchism in their political goals.

This chapter characterizes Mother Earth writers’ advocacy of free love, birth control, and sex education, their criticism of marriage, and their defense of homosexuality as “sex radicalism.” The term highlights their espousal of inclusive sexual freedom for both sexes as the key to gender equality, liberated intimacies, and individual self-expression. Scholars have approached Goldman’s interpretive framework in a number of ways. Linda Gordon argued that Goldman, more than any other figure, “fused into a single ideology the many currents that mingled in American sex radicalism.”⁵ Numerous biographies and thematic studies of Goldman have stressed the uniqueness and iconoclasm of her insistence on free love and sexual pleasure, but they tend to be brief in their assessment of various themes.⁶ Alternatively, other scholars have engaged in a critical analysis of Goldman’s discourses in light of modern theories of sexuality and identity politics. But they are prone to anachronism, reading Goldman outside of her historical context.⁷ The ideas of postmodern feminism, which resists essentialist generalizations about men/women and fixed notions of sexuality, were not available in Goldman’s time. Some scholars have

⁴ For the historical development of feminism and the feminist movement in Progressive America, see Nancy F. Cott, The Grounding of Modern Feminism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).
⁶ For the list of Goldman’s biographers, see note 8 of my dissertation’s “Introduction.”
⁷ Bonnie Haaland, for example, utilized post modern feminist theories to criticize Goldman’s heteronormative position on sexuality and reproduction. Her interpretation sometimes overlooked the anarchist premise of Goldman’s sex radicalism. Haaland, Emma Goldman. Also see Linda L. Lumsden, “Anarchy Meets Feminism.”
interpreted Goldman’s sex radicalism outside of rather than within its anarchist framework. The identification of Goldman as a feminist rather than as an anarchist fails to grasp the revolutionary connotations of her sex radicalism. Goldman and other writers of *Mother Earth* worked with concepts of women, sexuality, marriage, family, and gender relations from an anarchist worldview, in which neither authorities—the state or manmade institutions—nor men could suppress women. Whereas other progressive-era feminists sought change “on their own behalf” as Nancy Cott described it, *Mother Earth* writers called for radical change on behalf of all human beings.8 To these anarchists, women held the key to both their own emancipation and to the anarchist revolution.

This chapter charts the discourse, propagation and reception of these writers’ sex radicalism to clarify its influence as anarchist propaganda in America and beyond. My study reveals three important but previously underexplored points. First, *Mother Earth* writers showcased a diverse, rather than homogeneous, repertoire of sex radicalism as anarchist solutions to “the woman question” and “the sex question.”9 Second, Goldman radicalized sexological ideas by arguing that liberated intimacies and autonomous female sexuality could play a creative role in anarchist revolution. Third, these ideas of sex

8 Nancy F. Cott, *The Grounding of Modern Feminism*, 3-50.
radicalism not only attracted an intellectual audience in America, but also enlightened a growing numbers of East Asian modernizing elites.

These points shed light on the interplay between various radical and progressive ideas in a transnational context. The surge of the woman suffrage movement, the rise of the New Woman, the popularization of modern feminism, and the ideas of sex radicalism in the fin-de-siècle West led to changing gender relations and sexual norms around the world. This chapter reveals the anarchists’ determination to set women and men free. My analysis of Goldman and Berkman’s perspectives on homosexuality revises the opinion of previous scholars, such as Linda Lumsden, who focused on Mother Earth’s “exclusively heterocentrist focus.” By examining not only its discourses and campaigns but also the audiences’ responses, we can better understand Mother Earth’s influence on Progressive ideologies.

In addition, East Asians’ translations and reception of Goldman’s sex radicalism demonstrate the transpacific anarchist effects of Mother Earth. As a school of socialist philosophy, anarchism pioneered the exporting of Western radical ideas to the rest of the world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The anti-authoritarian messages in Japanese and Chinese anarchist papers, for example, enlightened their intellectuals by encouraging their modernizing tendencies. These modernizing elites looked to the West for inspiration to regenerate their nation and civilization. On the one hand, non-anarchist intellectuals in East Asia sought to increase the intellectual effect of Western ideas to transform their society and culture. In the process they tended to homogenize diverse

---

10 Lumsden, “Anarchy Meets Feminism.”
Western ideas to serve their purposes. On the other hand, Goldman’s translators popularized her sex radicalism while accidentally weakened its message of anarchist politics. Japanese and Chinese anarchists chose to publish the translation of Goldman’s sex radicalism papers in non-anarchist, progressive journals to introduce anarchism to a wider audience. This choice took her sex radicalism out of its anarchist framework and transplanted it to a discursive context of progressive thought. Audience of these progressive journals conflated her sex radicalism with other Western feminist ideas and categorized them all as “progressive thought.” Goldman’s ideas about free love and new sexual morality inadvertently furthered America’s cultural ascendancy by encouraging East Asians to adopt Western progressive ideas.

Both at home and abroad, the anarchist message of sex radicalism in Mother Earth’s propaganda broadened its non-anarchist intellectual audience. Anarchism’s association with assassinations and bombs had marred its public image for decades. For her part, Goldman served prison time for inciting a riot and was allegedly involved in two assassinations before 1901.12 Her advocacy of free love, birth control, free speech, and modern drama during the Mother Earth years steadily transfigured her public image, allowing her to reach middle-class Progressive intellectuals. She exploited the rising tide of iconoclastic bohemianism to disseminate her version of anarchism. Most of her new adherents were young bohemian intellectuals who appreciated her notion that free individuality and free sexuality were the foundation of a new social order. Sex radicalism became a stepping stone for Goldman and her comrades to promote social revolution through personal emancipation.13 Nonetheless, her audience’s anarchist practices were

---

12 Drinnon, Rebel in Paradise, 55-94.
more of a philosophical gesture than a political commitment. Their support of the core members’ anti-authoritarian campaigns for birth control and free love did not incite them to overthrow the state.

Empowering Women from Within: Goldman’s Anarchistic Sex Radicalism

The Mother Earth years marked Goldman’s most prolific and active period of sex radicalism despite the indifference of her close male comrades. As scholars have noted, most male anarchists deemed women’s issues secondary to the anarchist revolution for all humankind.14 Goldman’s biographers often quote her dispute with Peter Kropotkin over “the sex question” to indicate its importance to her.15 Before defying repressive institutions and gender norms, she had to first confront the opposition to sex radicalism among her closest companions.16 The “Mother Earth male quartet”—Berkman, Baginski, Kelly, and Havel—were rather silent about issues of women and sexuality in their contributions to the magazine.17 Kelly even categorized these issues as “personal matters” that sought self-expression. He urged his comrades to devote their energy to the impersonal, altruistic causes of social revolution instead.18 Male anarchists’ primary concern was securing everyone’s socioeconomic freedom, which, they believed, was essential to gender equality and free sexuality.19 While Goldman recognized the importance of the material

16 Goldman recalled that “in my own immediate ranks I was very much alone” with regard to her insistence on the importance of the sex question. She only found in the Abe Issaks family, who issued Firebrand and later Free Society with attention paid to the issue of sex, love, and marriage. Goldman, Living My Life, Vol. I, 224-225.
17 For the term of “Mother Earth male quartet,” see Ben Reitman, “Following the Monkey,” 252.
19 Such opinion was an echo of Peter Kropotkin, who commented on the anarchist paper Free Society in “doing splendid work, but it would do more if it would not waste so much space discussing sex.” Goldman,
basis for female and sexual freedom, she refused to subordinate women’s emancipation to socioeconomic revolution. Through *Mother Earth*’s propaganda, Goldman and a coterie of sex radicals outside her inner circle made their voices heard beyond traditional anarchist circles. Goldman, for one, covered the widest spectrum of issues about women and sexuality in her writings, lectures, and essay collections.

This section scrutinizes what I call Goldman’s sexuo-political reasoning in order to demonstrate how she integrated sexology into her anarchist ideology. To Goldman, the sexual was political and economic: total sexual freedom compelled an overall political-economic transformation towards anarchy. Her sexuo-political reasoning also led her to assert that liberated sexuality lay at the heart of women’s autonomy and their strength. Women’s free sexuality, moreover, was central to not only their own emancipation but also the creation of a new socioeconomic order. This reasoning justified Goldman’s claim that “the woman question” and “the sex question” could only be solved within, rather than outside of, the anarchist project.

In her sexuo-political reasoning, Goldman attributed the causes of social injustice, female subjugation, and sexual suppression to various institutional vices rather than to male oppression. “For ages,” she asserted, woman “ha[s] been on her knees before the altar of duty as imposed by God, by Capitalism, by the State, and by Morality.” In other words, religious, economic, state, and ethical repression was responsible for the miseries of women. Goldman tended to treat all women as victims under the existing systems, which mimicked the reasoning of her anarchist analysis in which she spoke of individuals in

---


universal terms.\textsuperscript{21} Despite her extensive associations with women from different ethnicities, races, and classes, she generally addressed them as a uniform group whose gender identities were the source of their repression. When she, for example, talked about the trade in women, she included “not merely white women, but yellow and black women as well” without differentiation.\textsuperscript{22} While Goldman’s generic narrative risked omitting social and racial hierarchies among women, it served her purpose to target existing institutional evils. Her opposition to social hierarchies rejected white middle-class feminist demands that came at the cost of other women’s or men’s interests. The same mindset shaped her reconciliatory attitude towards men in solving “the woman question” and “the sex question.” She argued that mutual aid, rather than antagonism, between the sexes was necessary to strive for a just and equal social reorganization.\textsuperscript{23}

Goldman’s narrative of human nature and instincts reflected her anarchist conception of new, harmonious heterosexual relations that would secure women’s freedom. She defined human nature as an individual’s “latent qualities” and “innate disposition,” which were subject to external influences.\textsuperscript{24} Theoretically, the anarchist conception of human nature allowed for the possibility that a person could be sociable and self-fulfilled at the same time. This conception of human nature actually conflicted with a utopian vision of

\textsuperscript{21} Marso, “A Feminist Search for Love.”
\textsuperscript{22} Emma Goldman, “The Traffic in Women,” in Anarchism and Other Essays, 177-194.
\textsuperscript{23} Emma Goldman, “The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation” and “Marriage and Love,” in Anarchism and Other Essays, 213-239.
anarchy, as there was no guarantee that human egotism or violence would be extinguished in a society without authorities. Goldman’s argument bypassed anarchy’s uncertainty while blaming the capitalist system for “humiliating and degrading” humanity. She agreed with Kropotkin’s opinion that the evolution of human societies and individuals “depends upon the conditions of life under which they are developing (italics original).” While admitting good and bad tendencies in the human species, Goldman insisted that the goodness of humanity could only prevail in a classless and free social order, in which new heterosexual relations would develop on an equal and congenial basis. Hence Goldman’s cheerful statement that, “Some day, some day men and women will rise, they will reach the mountain peak, they will meet big and strong and free, ready to receive, to partake, and to bask in the golden rays of love.” She chose to believe (at least in her public writings) that respect and trust would diminish sexual jealousy even though she experienced it repeatedly in her private life.

European sexology, especially the works of British sexologist Havelock Ellis, strengthened Goldman’s anarchist notion of human nature and convinced her of the value of a reconciliatory approach for solving gender inequality. Sexology, as a new discipline in
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28 Emma Goldman, “Marriage and Love,” in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, 239.
nineteenth-century Europe, focused on the scientific study of human sexual activities, desires, and functions. Sexologists combined biology, psychology, criminology and medical science to interpret the interplay of human nature, sexuality, and society. Goldman first came into contact with sexology during her two trips to Europe in the late 1890s. There she learned about the concept of sexual repression from Austrian neurologist Sigmund Freud; later, she came across Ellis’s work *Sexual Inversion* (1897). Goldman subscribed to Ellis’s idea of expressive sexuality and his philosophy of the “art of love.” Ellis wrote that “the sexual energy of the organism is a mighty force, automatically generated throughout life.” In his science of desire and procreation, Ellis argued that sex had a higher purpose than merely being a personal impulse. He believed that sex, when channeled into mutual affection, could benefit men, women, and their offspring. The mutual affection expressed by having sex, namely love, was “the great transforming and inclusive agency, the ultimate virtue of all life.” In his philosophy of the “art of love,” Ellis argued that sex could be an altruistic impulse that helped create
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32 The sexology of Freud and Ellis, though distinct, buttressed Goldman’s sexuo-political reasoning about sex and women. Ellis’s expressive concept of sexual instinct stood in contrast to Freud’s notion of “sublimation,” which associated human creativity and civilization with sexual repression. Goldman embraced Ellis’s concept of expressive sexuality and the art of love while developed the Freudian notion of children’s sexuality and the psychoanalysis theory. See Haaland, *Emma Goldman*, 123-143.
35 Weeks, “Havelock Ellis and the Politics of Sex Reform,” 141-185.
personal pleasure, harmonious union, and social well-being. Like Ellis, Goldman considered sex, “the most natural and healthy instinct,” vital to happiness and self-expression. Love was for her “the strongest and deepest element in all life,” which “finds supreme joy in selfless giving.” Goldman did not characterize women’s sexuality as passive even though that was Ellis’s belief. Yet they both pictured the essential joy of free sexuality in a relational sense. Goldman’s treatment of “the woman question” always adhered to her goal of creating loving (hetero)sexual unions in which both sexes could be truly free.

Goldman drew upon Ellis’s ideas to pinpoint the shortcomings of her contemporaries’ political-economic solutions to “the woman question.” For over half a century, American middle-class white women formed the core of an organized woman’s movement. The demands of progressive-era feminists ranged from political participation and economic independence to personal achievement, spiritual awakening, and sexual rights. Goldman dismissed the women’s suffrage movement and simplistically generalized all schools of feminism as rights-demanding movements. She labeled the
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feminist demand for economic independence at the expense of their emotional, sexual, and maternal nature a “tragedy.” Borrowing Ellis’s techniques, Goldman fashioned a psychosexual analysis that supposedly exposed the flaws in the feminist version of woman’s emancipation. She explained that the true, complete emancipation of woman would secure everyone’s right “to be one’s self and yet in oneness with others.” For a woman, Goldman wrote, the marrow of being herself was to develop her nature and gain unrestricted freedom. Being “in oneness with others,” in her words, meant “to give of one’s self boundlessly, in order to find one’s self richer, deeper, [and] better” in the relation of the sexes. The feminist conception of woman’s independence, as Goldman saw it, did exactly the opposite. She argued that educated “New Women” achieved economic autonomy by stifling their romantic, sexual and maternal impulses. These New Women forsook what Goldman romantically considered woman’s most vital right, “to love and be loved.” Their demands for civil rights from without further drove them away from their inner selves and voices. She observed that while they focused on fighting “external tyrannies,” they fell prey to the more harmful “internal tyrants.” To Goldman, the weight of prejudices, traditions, and customs were women’s worst enemies. Her analysis concluded that the feminist movement failed to emancipate women: not only did it sever woman from her own nature; it also potentially turned woman against man.

For the sake of “emancipating [woman] herself from [the existing] emancipation,” Goldman prescribed free love/sexuality and liberated intimacies as a remedy. True emancipation, she declared, began “neither at the polls nor in courts” but “in woman’s

43 Emma Goldman, “The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation.”
44 The psychosexual approach in this chapter refers to the discourses that highlighted the broad psychological realm, encompassing emotional, mental, and cognitive aspects, of sexual development.
45 Goldman, “The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation.”
She asserted that woman’s nature was the source of her power, and “her freedom will reach as far as her power to achieve her freedom reaches.” Only through her “inner regeneration,” Goldman averred, could woman outgrow ethical and social conventions. As Candace Falk noted, Goldman fully believed in “the power of love and sexual desire as crucial cohesive elements of social harmony.” Woman’s fullest expression of her love and sexuality was in Goldman’s view the way to “be human in the truest sense.” No manmade institution could “give birth to true companionship and oneness” that she expected to result from the practices of free love and free sexuality. She held that heterosexual liberated intimacies would free both sexes from conventional restraints and prejudices that antagonized them.

The centrality of sexuality and love in Goldman’s sex radicalism reflected the particularity, and also the potential problems, of her version of anarchy. Her sexuo-political reasoning distinguished the free expression of love and sexual nature from socially constructed commercial sexuality. She saw no hierarchies in a “true conception of the relation of the sexes;” rather, “it knows of but one great thing: to give of one’s self boundlessly.” In her ideal anarchy, truly liberated persons had no need to resort to violence for enjoying sex and love. Her anarchist logic contributed to her disregard of female sexual vulnerability and the gender pitfalls that later feminist scholars have identified as subsequent outcomes of sexual liberation.
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envisioned as the basis of harmonious anarchy did not provide solutions for destructive factors, such as jealousy, multiple sexual relationships and betrayal (which she experienced), which can occur even in equal and free relationships. Her perception of anarchism as “the reconstructor of social life, the transvaluator of all values” drove her to predict that the old, perverted values in sexuality would cease to exist in her ideal anarchy.\(^{54}\) Historians Ellen Carol Dubois and Linda Gordon argue that a credible feminist politics about sex “must seek both to protect women from sexual danger and to encourage their pursuit of sexual pleasure.”\(^{55}\) Goldman’s anarchism, at least in her own reasoning, would produce those results. She believed that when anarchy overturned exploitative social hierarchies, women would be free to enjoy sex and love without the potential for sexual danger.

Goldman’s radical adaptation of Ellis’s sexology work showcases how she appropriated scientific findings about sexuality to serve her anarchist project. In her essay “The Hypocrisy of Puritanism,” for example, Goldman turned Ellis’s historical discussion of nakedness into evidence of the injurious effects of Puritanical prudery. Ellis elaborated on the hygienic, aesthetic, educational, and moral value of nakedness in history. His focus was on the benefits of cultivating nakedness for children’s sexual education and physical beauty.\(^{56}\) Goldman transformed Ellis’s detached, apolitical commentary into a rhetorical assault on Puritanism, which she argued was a “crime against humanity:”

The result of this [Puritanic] vicious attitude is only now beginning to be recognized by modern thinkers and educators. They realize that “nakedness has a hygienic value

---


as well as a spiritual significance... The vision of the essential and eternal human form, the nearest thing to us in all the world, with its vigor and its beauty and its grace, is one of the prime tonics of life.”* But the spirit of Puritanism has so perverted the human mind that it has lost the power to appreciate the beauty of nudity, forcing us to hide the natural form under the plea of chastity.

*The Psychology of Sex. Havelock Ellis.57

Goldman continued her selective citation of Ellis’s text to strengthen her criticism of chastity as “but an artificial imposition upon nature, expressive of a false shame of the human form.”58 Ellis’s nuanced analysis of chastity as “the virtue which exerts its harmonizing influence in the erotic life itself” was lost in Goldman’s discourse.59 For Goldman, chastity was totally harmful to women’s well-being because it was an imagined virtue that cut women off from their sexual natures.

As a rule, Goldman radicalized Ellis’s intellectual concepts to bolster her anarchist argument for revolutionary change in socio-political and sexuo-ethical realms. In “The Traffic in Women,” she ascribed the rampant practice of prostitution to economic exploitation, religious superstition, sexual suppression, and moral hypocrisy.60 She revised passages from Ellis’s work to offer a stronger account of prostitution’s religious origins. Ellis’s assertion that “The rise of Christianity to political power produced on the whole less change of policy than might have been anticipated” became “The rise of Christianity to political power produced little change in policy” in Goldman’s text. Goldman edited Ellis’s passage, “The leading fathers of the Church were inclined to tolerate prostitution for the avoidance of greater evils” into “The leading fathers of the

57 Emma Goldman, “The Hypocrisy of Puritanism,” in Anarchism and Other Essays, 170-171. For Ellis’s original text, see Havelock Ellis, Studies in the Psychology of Sex, Vol. VI, 111.
Church tolerated prostitution” in her work.  

She mobilized data from Ellis to support her own condemnation of the sham and hypocrisy of cultural conventions. Near the end of her article, Goldman invoked Ellis’s historical account of the futile legal regulation of prostitution in sixteenth-century France in order to make the argument for “a thorough eradication of prostitution.” She argued that the abolition of commercial sex compelled “a complete transvaluation of all accepted values” and should be “couple[d] with the abolition of industrial slavery.” A revolutionary statement like this did not appear in Ellis’s works. In another essay, “Prisons: A Social Crime and Failure,” Goldman’s call for the “complete reconstruction of society” through the eradication of prisons and other institutions was again absent in Ellis’s work on prison reform and the reorientation of criminology.

Goldman’s radicalization of Ellis’s ideas illustrated her anarchist criticism of the “external tyrannies” (institutional authorities) and the “internal tyrants” (“ethical and social conventions”) that distorted women’s nature while exploiting their sexuality. Her emphasis on women’s sexuality, love, and maternal instincts accompanied her demand for total socioeconomic and political reorganization. Goldman made it clear that woman “should take her part in the business world the same as the man; she should be his equal before the world.” But she disapproved of economic self-sufficiency at the price of sacrificing woman’s inner needs for love and sex. Goldman also did not see motherhood
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as a biological imperative as some current feminist scholars suggest. Despite her high praise for maternal instinct, she viewed motherhood as “a powerful predisposition that could nonetheless be resisted” as Kathy Ferguson notes. Goldman set an example by intentionally keeping herself from having children in order to dedicate herself to the anarchist cause. She particularly detested the “much-lauded motherhood” under the existing socioeconomic system as “a hideous thing.” She emphasized that woman’s freedom and development “must come from and through herself,” not by inclusion in external institutions as feminists were demanding. Women’s liberation from conventional norms, in her view, was both an end and a means to the creation of an anarchist society.

Goldman’s sexuo-political reasoning located women’s free sexuality as the nexus around which a liberated psychosexual life and equal socioeconomic status would interact. She targeted capitalism, Puritanism, and militarism as the evil trio that exploited women’s bodies and sexuality. Capitalism was a callous, male-dominated institution that created poverty, ignorance, and the demoralization of workers. She contended that women’s socioeconomic inferiority under “the merciless Moloch of capitalism” drove them into prostitution. Puritanism, as she saw it, was the straightjacket of female sexuality. She held Puritanical sexual mores to be responsible for

66 Haaland, Emma Goldman, 99-122; Lumsden, “Anarchy Meets Feminism.”
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68 Goldman had the problem in her uterus, a variant on endometriosis, which caused her pain especially during menstruation and prevented her from bearing child. Doctors had recommended a surgery but she refused it. Goldman, Living My Life, Vol. I, 57-61; Falk, “Raising Her Voice,” 30-33.
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the tyranny of sexual repression and the perpetuation of women’s sexual ignorance.⁷⁴

Under the sway of Puritanism, women were coerced into one of three possible sexual roles: a celibate, a prostitute, or a helpless breeder of hapless children.⁷⁵ Capitalist values and Puritanical prudery indulged the materialistic and male-centered sexuality that deprived women of their sexual autonomy. By the same token, she accused militarism of being “the greatest bulwark of capitalism,” which turned women into breeding machines for the army and factories.⁷⁶

Goldman encouraged women to sabotage the exploitative socioeconomic and sexuo-ethical order by taking back their sexual agency. Anarchists, she wrote, maintained that social revolution should take place in “every phase of life.”⁷⁷ Her anarchist project was to mobilize women to disrupt the prism of capitalism, Puritanism, and militarism in their daily lives. Her anarchist thinking rejected the conventional notion of separate spheres.⁷⁸ For her, women were able to blur the conventional public/private divide as they engaged in public production and private reproduction.⁷⁹ Women’s everyday acts of revolution, according to Goldman, hinged upon their awakened and autonomous sexuality. By stopping what she described as the “indiscriminate breeding of children,” women’s free sexuality would enable their daily resistance to the oppressive social order.⁸⁰ Unlike the
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late-nineteenth-century idea of “voluntary motherhood,” her proposal upheld women’s sexual pleasure in addition to birth control.81

Goldman’s goal was to transform sex from a reproductive liability and commercialized commodity into an instrument for women’s liberation. In order to achieve that goal she called for sexual education, the abolition of marriage, and birth control. She found that existing economic conditions and gendered social roles made it “infinitely harder to organize women than men.”82 Contrary to her call for the collective action of a general strike amid the (male-dominated) workers, Goldman advised women to take on direct action individually.83 “Direct action against the invasive, meddlesome authority of our moral code,” she wrote, “is the logical, consistent method of Anarchism.”84 Goldman declared that, a woman would emancipate 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 family, etc.; by making her life simpler, but deeper and richer.”85 Once a woman acquired power from her nature, she would refuse to be an inferior and a victim. Goldman’s antidote for women was for them to refuse serving not only men but also the Church and the State.

**Addressing and Defending Homosexuality**

Despite her desire for women to engage in free heterosexual intimacies, Goldman’s defense of homosexuality further distinguished her from other New Women and sex
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83 Goldman’s (and other *Mother Earth* members’) advocacy of the general strike as the means for the working class to launch social revolution will be discussed in Chapter 5.
85 Emma Goldman, “Woman Suffrage,” 211.
radicals. Incidentally, Berkman also weighed in on homosexual politics in his prison memoirs. Goldman’s lectures and Berkman’s memoirs, both presented as the productions of *Mother Earth*’s propaganda, openly supported the social, ethical, and cultural place of homosexuality. As early as 1895, Goldman and other anarchists defended the celebrated Irish writer Oscar Wilde on his charges of homosexuality. She learned about homosexuality during her voyages to Europe in the late 1890s. Although her essays in *Mother Earth* rather uniformly addressed heterosexual intimacies, Goldman discussed homosexuality in her lectures, correspondence, and autobiography. Berkman encountered same-sex eroticism during his fourteen-year incarceration. His *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist* revealed heartrending episodes of his same-sex experiences. My analysis in this section shows that Goldman and Berkman adopted a middle way in their politicization of the issue of same-sex eroticism. While Goldman and Berkman used anarchism to defend homosexuality, they were unable to perceive same-sex desire as the ideal intimacy for creating a new social order.

Goldman’s defense of homosexuality demonstrated her anarchist resolution to defend individual freedom and fight against authorities. In a private letter, Goldman stressed how she addressed homosexuality differently from sexologists like Ellis, Edward


88 Amid her essays in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, Goldman only touched upon homosexuality in “Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty.” See Goldman, “Patriotism,” in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, 127-144.

89 Terence Kissack, *Free Comrades, 1895-1917*, 127-152.
Carpenter, and Auguste Forel, whose names had all appeared in *Mother Earth*. She treated homosexuality not only as a sexological issue, but also as a cultural-political problem. She viewed homosexuality as an expression of personal sexuality that should be free from official prohibitions. Sexologists such as Ellis tried to decriminalize homosexuality by arguing that it was innate; by contrast, Goldman laid emphasis on the freedom of homosexual expression. Ellis treated homosexuals as sexual beings and defended their right to practice their inherent sexuality, whereas Goldman saw them as human beings and asserted their individual right to be themselves. She also demanded the abolition of army barracks and prisons that bred male homosexuality in an involuntary manner. In her essay “Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty,” for example, Goldman cited a passage of Ellis’s account that described barracks as “great centers of male prostitution” in England. Consistent with her other usage of Ellis’s works, she stretched his narrative of how male prostitution was rampant at some barracks in Britain to support her argument that “the growth of the standing army inevitably adds to the spread of sex perversion” in America. Goldman translated Ellis’s sexological data into evidence that the conditions of men’s military service led them to engage in involuntary, and therefore degrading homosexual practices.

Narratives in Goldman’s autobiography and private letters illustrated the extent to which she commented on the subject of homosexuality. Later in her letters to Ellis, Goldman recalled that his work *Sexual Inversion* inspired her after she discovered it in
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From that time on,” Goldman wrote to Ellis, “I have carried your ideas and your pleas for human rights all over the United States, into the Industrial Centres and wherever I came to lecture.” In her published letter to German sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld on the subject of sexuality, she argued in an Ellisian tone that she had used her pen and voice “in behalf of those whom nature, herself, has destined to be different in their sex psychology and needs” since the late 1890s. In her autobiography, Goldman discussed the effect of her homosexuality lectures on audiences. She first noted how the anarchist ranks censured her for discussing “unnatural” themes such as homosexuality. Next she described how her lectures helped her homosexual audience members to stop being ashamed of their sexuality. Her lectures were often the first place they received information about homosexuality. A 25-year old female audience member confessed to Goldman that she felt “excruciating remorse” for instinctively finding men sexually repugnant. Goldman’s lecture enabled this woman to know that feeling and acting on her natural sexual desires was acceptable. “My lecture had set her free,” Goldman proudly declared; “I had given her back her self-respect.” Goldman’s meetings with homosexuals on the road provided her with first-hand evidence that her theories of sex radicalism liberated people, which in turn enriched her lectures.

---

92 Ellis’s Sexual Inversion meant to challenge Britain’s strict laws and harsh social climate against homosexuality in a tense atmosphere after the 1895 trial of Oscar Wilde. Homosexuality, in Ellis’s usage, was an umbrella term for “all sexual attractions between persons of the same sex,” in which the innate sexual inversion was included. Ellis argued that sexual inversion, as a congenital abnormality, was not a disease, and thus, harmless to society. Thus it required neither medical treatment nor legal regulation. See Havelock Ellis, Studies in the Psychology of Sex, Vol. II: Sexual Inversion (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, 1915), 1.


95 The censorship from Goldman’s own ranks, according to her, only reinforced her resolve to plead for every victim, “be it one of social wrong or of moral prejudice.” Goldman, Living My Life, Vol. II, 555.


While Goldman did not elaborate on the subject of homosexuality in *Mother Earth,* her tour reviewers’ remarks indicated the reception of her ideas. Several reviewers attested to audiences’ interests in Goldman’s homosexual lectures nationwide. Anna W. depicted how Goldman’s very taboo lecture on “The Intermediate Sex” in Washington, D.C. drew “a dignified, tense and eager audience crowded the hall to its fullest capacity.” W. captured the audience’s transformed attitude before and after the lecture:

I do not hesitate to declare that every person who came to that lecture possessing contempt and disgust for homo-sexualists and who upheld the attitude of the authorities that those given to this particular form of sex expression should be hounded down and persecuted, went away with a broad and sympathetic understanding of the question and a conviction that in matters of personal life, freedom should reign.  

Margaret Anderson praised Goldman’s talks on homosexuality as “big, brave, [and] beautiful.” Echoing Anderson, Christian socialist William Thurston Brown wrote in *The Little Review* that Goldman’s persistent “struggle for freedom from exploitation” nurtured the depth of her lectures on homosexuality. Musician George Edwards of Portland, Oregon celebrated Goldman’s homosexual lectures for bringing fresh air into the antiquated mind of the city. Goldman’s informative speech on homosexuality attracted an increasing number of medical professionals. These lectures were evidence of her inclusion of all persecuted people in her anarchist agenda, and they also drew followers.
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99 Anderson, as *The Little Review*’s editor, praised Goldman’s insights on homosexuality by contrasting the latter’s lectures with that of Edith Ellis’s. Edith Ellis, the wife of Havelock Ellis and a lesbian writer, visited Chicago in 1915 and gave a talk on “Sex and Eugenics.” Anderson considered Mrs. Ellis’s much-anticipated talk lacked thoughtful perception and addressed, instead, merely common sense. By contrast, she found much inspiration in Goldman’s lectures. Margaret C. Anderson, “Two Points of View: Mrs. Ellis’s Failure,” *The Little Review*, 2:1 (Mar. 1915): 16-19. Also see Christina Simmons, *Making Marriage Modern: Women’s Sexuality from the Progressive Era to World War II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 100.
from the ranks of the sexually marginalized and homosexuals. Scholars have identified Margaret Anderson and Almeda Sperry, a labor activist and sex worker in New Kensington, Pennsylvania, as two known lesbian radicals close to Goldman. However, according to the available scholarly research, Goldman only expressed her same-sex eroticism in her writing.

While Goldman evidently defended homosexual rights, she espoused free heterosexuality as the key to women’s emancipation and social revolution. Essentially, her sexuo-political reasoning led her to view reproductive sex as one of the determining factors to the growth of modern capitalism. Goldman did not assume that homosexuality had the same revolutionary potential to bring down the existing social order. For her, homosexuality failed to provide the capacity to sabotage the unequal division of labor in re/production. Goldman intended to defy heteronormative patriarchy directly by declaring that women could emancipate themselves in heterosexual relationships. On the one hand, she saw asceticism and celibacy as patriarchal traps that forced women to repress their needs. On the other hand, she thought of Lesbianism as a retreat into a female world. It lacked the unruly edge that women’s free sexuality could exert on the male dominant division of labor. Moreover, she believed that female homosexuals renounced the joy of true companionship and oneness that she believed they could only find in heterosexual love unions. In sum, Goldman’s anarchist project and
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personal preferences propelled her to adhere to heterosexuality and reject asceticism, celibacy, and homosexuality as alternative means to women’s emancipation.

By contrast, Alexander Berkman’s narrative of homosexuality in his *Prison Memoirs* revealed a distinctly different tone and approach to same-sex eroticism. Unlike Goldman’s forays into sexology and free contact with “sexual inverts,” Berkman’s same-sex erotic experience only occurred in prison. He found homosexuality revolting during his long-term imprisonment. A senior inmate named “Red” asked Berkman to be his “kid” (a passive sexual partner). Initially Berkman did not understand what “Red” was asking him about and so “Red” taught Berkman prison sex slang and about the so-called “moonology.” After knowing what a “kid” referred to in prison slang, Berkman retorted by asking “Red”, “How can you love a boy?”107 “The panegyrics of boy-love are deeply offensive to my instincts,” Berkman wrote; “The very thought of the unnatural practice revolts and disgusts me.” His description of the “depravity” and “unspeakably vicious practices” involved in sex between men manifested his early hostility towards homosexuality. He condemned the hierarchal and coercive character of prison homosexuality that he witnessed in the lust of men like “Red” for junior inmates (“kids”). Berkman addressed involuntary homosexuality as the brute exercise of power. He viewed the “man-kid” relations in prison as a double (institutional and sexual) violence forced on younger, weaker men against their nature or wills.

Berkman’s attitude towards homosexuality changed as time went on because he shared “the kinship of suffering” and common misery with some inmates.108 He developed close bonds with two junior inmates, first Johnny Davis and then Russell
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Schroyer. This gave him a gleam of hope for humanity in the brutal and degraded conditions he experienced in prison. Although Berkman contended that their relationships were not sexual, he and these young prisoners had romantic feelings for one another and shared erotic fantasies. Berkman felt, for example that, “an unaccountable sense of joy glows in my heart” when he learned that Johnny wished to kiss him when they were held in adjoining cells during a period of solitary confinement. Also, after going through thick and thin with his faithful friend Russell, Berkman sensed “a strange longing” for the latter’s companionship.\(^{109}\) Sadly, Johnny and Russell both died in prison due to the abuse and negligence of the warden.

In *Prison Memoirs*, Berkman disclosed the complex interplay of spiritual communion, emotional attachment, and physical fantasy in his experiences with other men during his confinement. Contrary to his critical observations about the coercive “man-kid” relations, Berkman portrayed his own homosocial experiences with an emotional sense of longing and loss. He tended to cast a dignified light over his intimate relationships with his good-natured fellow inmates. A conversation with George, a senior inmate and physician, toward the end of Berkman’s imprisonment, reads like a moral vindication of same-sex love.\(^{110}\) George’s lengthy account of prison stories provided an empirical, quasi-sexological analysis of homoeroticism. George first narrated his loving and gradually erotic relationship with another young inmate. Berkman responded with the positive comment: “George, I think it a very beautiful emotion. Just as beautiful as love for a woman.” The respective experiences of Berkman and George testified to the former


\(^{110}\) Terence Kissack judges that “George” is very likely to be “a literary creation” by Berkman, “a very compatible foil for a dialogue on the ethical, social, and cultural status of same-sex love.” Whether “George” was a real person or a fictive character by Berkman, these two men’s conversation no doubt represented Berkman’s view on homosexuality. Kissack, *Free Comrades*, 113-114.
that consensual same-sex love was neither a crime nor a sin. In return for George’s confidence, Berkman related his feelings for Russell. “I felt no physical passion toward him [Russell],” said Berkman, “but I think I loved him with all my heart.”

Berkman made himself an inescapable witness and unexpected participant in the panorama of prison homosexuality while also turning it into a powerful indictment of the prison system. His long letter to Goldman, dated December 20, 1901, included in *Prison Memoirs*, conveyed how the many years of imprisonment compelled him to grow out of “all traditions and accepted beliefs” and “revise[d] every emotion and every thought.”

Berkman’s growth took form in his transvalued notion of homosexuality and the reassertion of his anarchist belief. “My youth’s ideal of a free humanity in the vague future has become clarified and crystallized into the living truth of Anarchy,” he told Goldman, “as the sustaining elemental force of my every-day existence.” Against his previously biased expectation, Berkman found that same-sex love could be the anarchistic element in the despairingly brutal environment of prison. The sincerity, mutual trust and aid, and equal treatment that he experienced in interacting with Johnny and Russell manifested the beauty of human nature that was foundational to his ideal anarchy. Shared erotic fantasy constituted but one part of the beautiful emotions that existed between Berkman and his fellow inmates.

Berkman’s revelation of profound same-sex bonding in the face of the violently hierarchal prison system served as a manifesto for his defiant sexual politics. His projection of same-sex love as a source of hope for humanity sharply contrasted with his
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113 As Terence Kissack frames it, “Erotic desire between men…directly counterpoised to the values of the prison system that Berkman so powerfully condemns.” Kissack, *Free Comrades*, 109.
representation of prison as the social institution most destructive to human nature. The advertisement of Berkman’s memoir in *Mother Earth* made sure that the theme of sexuality was clearly known to their readers. Berkman’s lecture audiences praised his speech on “Homosexuality and Sex Life in Prison.” “Berkman’s handling of the sex question exhibits a breadth and comprehension I have never seen surpassed,” commented Rebekah E. Raney in 1915 from San Francisco. “Billie” McCullough, an anarchist in Los Angeles, credited Berkman’s lecture for shedding clearer light on homosexuality than sexologists did. “I’ve read Ellis and a few others along these lines,” McCullough wrote, “but had remained a narrow-minded prude, classing all Homosexualists as degenerates. Now I have the clearer vision. That lecture [of Berkman’s] should become a classic.”

Berkman’s definition of same-sex love as an individual’s resistance to the spirit-crushing surroundings of prison resonated with Goldman’s scheme of women’s everyday revolution via free sexuality. While Goldman awakened repressed female heterosexuality, Berkman defended persecuted male homosexuality. For both of them, voluntary same-sex desire that was a matter of individual choice and expression deserved the same rights of expression as heterosexuality. The symbolic potency and potential agency of sexual love against authorities was explicit in both of their writings. In addition, they honored the persecuted gay writer Oscar Wilde as the martyr of homosexuality by quoting his poem about prison brutality.
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118 For the biographical study of Oscar Wilde, see John Sloan, *Authors in Context: Oscar Wilde* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003). Regarding the trials Oscar Wilde involved in 1890s, see David Schulz,
essays on prison and on Leon Czolgosz included excerpts from Wilde’s *The Ballad of Reading Gaol* (1898) to commemorate Wilde’s suffering.\(^{119}\)

There were, however, limits to their support for homosexuality as anarchists and as individuals. For Berkman, equal same-sex love served as an act of defiance to the cruel and tyrannical rule in the prison. But he did not treat homosexuality as a powerful disruptive force against the authorities outside of prison. Rather, he believed that workers were the main force to overturn the dominance of capitalism and the State. Berkman’s sex/love relationships after his prison years showed no indication of homoerotic tendencies. For her part, Goldman believed that consensual and autonomous heterosexual love was an effective confrontation to existing institutions. Neither of them prioritized same-sex desire in their distinct but complementary anarchist projects. Their support of homosexuality, though strong, was conditional. Other writers in *Mother Earth* tended to focus exclusively on heterosexuality to voice their objections to the existing order and their prospects for a new one. As we shall see, these writers’ heteronormative narratives offered women different ways out of their shackles.

**Anarchist Re-conceptions of Sexual Unions and Maternity**

Narratives of *Mother Earth* writers on “the woman question” and “the sex question” revolved around maternity and sexual unions.\(^{120}\) As a principle, they upheld free sexuality, autonomous motherhood, and liberated intimacies as solutions for women and men, but


\(^{120}\) The contributors of this group mostly published just one (no more than two) articles in *Mother Earth* except for Goldman and John Russell Coryell. Given that Goldman’s writings had numerical advantage while carrying discursive weight, it is instrumental to juxtapose her ideas with those of other *Mother Earth* writers to make sense of the magazine’s overall position on the woman question and the sex question.
they did so from diverse perspectives. Collectively, these anarchist writers condemned Comstockery, the censorship based on the federal Comstock Act of 1873, which criminalized the act of mailing “obscene” publications, materials, or instruments via the U.S. postal service.121 Political liberals and radicals, including anarchists, fought against Comstockery in defense of free speech and sexual freedom. Several anarchist papers before Mother Earth, such as Lucifer, the Light-Bearer and Firebrand, were censored due to their inclusion of sex-related literature.122 Anarchists defied Comstockery to such an extent that Harry Kelly commented that while European anarchists fought capitalists, their American comrades fought Comstock.123

John Russell Coryell’s essay, “Comstockery,” in Mother Earth’s first issue set the oppositional tone by defining Comstockery as “an organized effort to regulate the morals of the people.”124 Coryell was an anarchist-inclined liberal, novelist, a good friend of Goldman, and a teacher in the Ferrer School.125 He contributed more than a dozen articles to Mother Earth, with a focus on issues of marriage, family, and morality. Coryell berated Comstockery for making sex obscene, criminalizing knowledge of sex, and

125 For a biographical sketch of Coryell, see William R. Hun, Body Love: The Amazing Career of Bernarr Macfadden (Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1989), 162; Goldman, Living My Life, Vol. I, 335-336. By the time Coryell became the original member (the “foster parent” as Goldman nicknamed) of Mother Earth, his detective fictions had brought him fame and fortune. His known pseudonyms included Nick Carter (in detective novels), Bertha M. Clay, and Margaret Grant (in Mother Earth). For Coryell’s interpretation of anarchism, see John R. Coryell, Making of Revolution (New York: The Corwill Publishing Company, 1908), 3.
making hypocrisy respectable. Echoing Goldman’s exaltation of the sexual instinct, Coryell wrote that “sex in itself is absolutely a work of the deity.” To keep humankind ignorant “of self, of life, [and] of sex,” also to glorify women’s sexual ignorance as innocence as Comstockery did was immoral to Coryell. His other essays in *Mother Earth* under the penname of Margaret Grant mocked the conventional norm of female modesty. “Let us live maimed, deformed, decrepit, ignorant, half-sexed caricatures of women,” Grant/Coryell ridiculed, “—but let us be modest!”

Without reflecting on its controversial implications, Coryell used the notion of “race suicide” to contradict the goal of Comstockery to keep women sexually “innocent.” The term “race suicide” was coined by sociologist Edward Ross and popularized by Theodore Roosevelt in the early 1900s. Roosevelt expressed deep concern over the nation’s “dwindling families in some localities” in his 1905 speech “On American Motherhood.” Roosevelt’s “race suicide” narrative specifically targeted the “old-stock Americans,” namely the white, native-born middle class. The “willful sterility” of these old-stock married couples, in his view, was an act of “viciousness, coldness, shallow-heartedness, [and] self-indulgence.” Coryell did not criticize Roosevelt’s nativist and elitist tone in

---

emphasizing women’s procreative imperative. He did not even attend to Roosevelt’s highly selective appeal to upper- and middle-class women. Coryell only satirically questioned how sexually ignorant women under Comstockery could meet the standard of Roosevelt’s expectation to remedy “race suicide.” His point, instead, was to highlight the immorality and unhealthiness that Comstockery imposed on women. Thus, he ignored Roosevelt’s sanction of Comstock’s notion of sexual morality. In fact, Coryell’s remark that “motherhood is woman’s highest function” echoed Roosevelt’s view of women’s reproductive duty. What set him apart from Roosevelt’s narrative was his anarchist assertion that women should not only be economically and sexually free, but also free to decide if or how many children they wanted.

Coryell’s denunciation of Comstockery, coupled with his criticisms of marriage, home and Puritanism, was in line with his advocacy of free motherhood. For him, motherhood defined women’s primary nature and function. Instead of focusing on motherhood’s potential to sabotage the capitalistic order, Coryell discussed what he called “healthy motherhood” and criticized marriage. He branded marriage as the “most artificial of the relations,” which disabled healthy motherhood. He argued that marriage could be for pecuniary gain, social status, family interest, and political or religious concerns, but never for the physiological and psychological compatibility of the would-be husband and wife. In his view, only the consensual, conscious, and equal union of the sexes could guarantee free motherhood. He further maintained that women’s maternity should be

134 Coryell, “Marriage and the Home.”  
135 Coryell, “Marriage and the Home.”  
136 John Russell Coryell, “Marriage or Free Union; Which?” Mother Earth 2:12 (Feb. 1908): 566-578.
freed not only from marriage, but also from paternity. In his logic, no one but the woman herself should be in total charge of her motherhood. Coryell summed up that “a woman can be a mother in freedom; she cannot be a wife in freedom.”

To him, motherhood was a natural right, while wifehood was an obligation under an external system.

Coryell also lashed out against the double standard of chastity and prostitution as a dual social evil. In “The Value of Chastity” (1913), he attributed prostitution to the connivance of male sexuality and, above all, the fetish of female chastity. A prostitute was in his view collateral damage, or the denigrated “other,” to the socially approved “chaste” woman. As he framed it, “a certain number of women must be set aside for infamy in order that all other women may be chaste.”

His analogy of conventional marriage to “legalized prostitution,” which was also used by progressive reformers, matched Goldman’s analysis of women and their marketable sexuality. Goldman additionally condemned Puritanical hypocrisy for promoting the growth of venereal disease, which passed from lustful men to their innocent wives.

She and Coryell both saw a vicious cycle of marriage and prostitution driven by society’s obsession with female chastity.

Coryell’s cult of maternity was subtly yet crucially distinct from Goldman’s discourse. Coryell’s treatment of women’s maternity as independent of paternity conflicted with

---

137 Coryell, “Marriage or Free Union; Which?”
139 Coryell’s narrative of “legalized prostitution” could also be found in Lawrence Rochester’s essay. Rochester expressed that “A man and a woman living together, bound by no tie but a legal contract, are nothing more or less than legalized prostitutes of the basest sort.” Lawrence Rochester, “The Rightful Sanctions of Marriage,” *Mother Earth* 2:12 (Feb. 1908): 554-555. The usage of “legal prostitution” to describe marriage was often seen in feminist writings; it could at least be traced back to the British liberal feminist Mary Wollstonecraft’s work in the late eighteenth century. See Mary Wollstonecraft, *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Vindication of the Rights of Men and a Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, ed. Sylvana Tomaselli (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 238-239. Also see Herbert Spencer, *The Principles of Ethics, Vol. 1* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1910), 540.
Goldman’s claim that a child born in freedom required both parents’ love.\textsuperscript{141} Goldman’s exaltation of love between the sexes seldom appeared in Coryell’s discourse. She defended the freedom of love, while Coryell defended women’s motherhood freed from the shackle of marriage. Goldman attended to a broader range of women’s needs and free development, whereas Coryell zoomed in on women’s biological functions. Olive Allerton, a female one-time contributor in Mother Earth, expressed ideas similar to Coryell. Allerton affirmed that “woman was made to be a mother.” “To sexual pleasures she always prefers the love of her children; to the political life, the home life.”\textsuperscript{142} Allerton’s view that “maternity and family came first” resembled Coryell and diverged from Goldman’s emphasis on women’s sexual pleasure and autonomous development. Goldman wanted to create free women; Coryell and Allerton wanted to create free motherhood.

Coryell’s biologically-oriented view of women and sexual unions resulted in his defense of the family, which also varied from Goldman’s discourse. Coryell emphasized the difference between the “family” and the “home.” He specified that a family was “a natural group based on sex attraction and parental love,” unbound by legal marriage. The Home, on the contrary, was “based on the ceremony of marriage” and thereby was an artificial establishment.\textsuperscript{143} He deplored the intrusion of the Church in sexual unions of men and women that obligated them to each other in the sanctified institutions of marriage and home. His distinctive notion of family allowed him to picture what he thought of as the most natural, hence ideal, form of sexual union and reproduction. Unlike Coryell, Goldman

\textsuperscript{141} Goldman, “The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation.”
and other *Mother Earth* writers tended to equate the family with the negative features of the home.\(^{144}\) Goldman expected women to refuse to be servile to “God, the State, society, the husband, the family, etc.”\(^{145}\) Her critique of the existing family system, however, did not keep her from proposing a new kind of family without hierarchies. Interestingly, Goldman continued to use “family” to denote the anarchist community revolving around *Mother Earth*. The “*Mother Earth* (anti)family,” as Chapter 1 has detailed, testified to her vision of a voluntary, mutual-aid union not centered on parental love, sex attraction, or legal marriage.

Another writer, Ada May Krecker, also challenged Coryell’s sanction of family in her plain announcement that the family should go. Her essay “The Passing of the Family” (1912) offered a substitute for family akin to Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s notion of “public housekeeping.” Gilman proposed that professional service workers should take up the cooking, cleaning, and nursing work of the family while retaining a kitchenless home for domestic privacy and parental love.\(^{146}\) Krecker moved beyond Gilman’s concept of the kitchenless family/home to demand their abolition because family/home “impede[s] the perfect expression of the individual.”\(^{147}\) In Krecker’s utopian imagery, the hotel-like communities will release individuals from the conventional bonds and responsibilities of the family. Individuals, she described, could “come and go, eat, sleep, rise, go to bed

\(^{144}\) For the anarchists’ general objection to the family system, see Margaret S. Marsh, *Anarchist Women*, 45-46, 51-52.

\(^{145}\) Goldman, “Woman Suffrage,” 211.


without referring to the programs of the other members of the group.”\(^{148}\) In her narrative, these communities would open various kinds of jobs—though they looked like physical or even menial labor—to women for earning a living and possibly developing their talents.

Krecker’s idealistic portrayal of communal life renounced the parenting function of family and pictured a quasi-Gilman (but more radical) notion of mother-child relationship. In *Concerning Children* (1900), Charlotte Perkins Gilman proposed the notion of “the unnatural mother” as an alternative to the normative “natural mother.” The natural mother, she wrote, cared only for her children, whereas the unnatural mother cared for “Children—all of them.”\(^{149}\) The unnatural mother’s world, her cause in life, and her self-realization no longer pivoted on her child(ren).\(^{150}\) Gilman sought the “progress of motherhood” from a primitive maternal nature to an evolved, altruistic concern for all children. Krecker’s vision of mothers was more “unnatural” than Gilman’s notion. She did embrace Gilman’s idea of communal childrearing: “the ideal for child care and child culture will rise altogether out of reach of any one mother single-handed.”\(^{151}\) But Krecker further suggested separating the prenatal stage from the postnatal phase of motherhood and that women only needed to attend to the former. According to her reasoning, expecting mothers were “often unfitted by nature to entertain or to develop” their own offspring after the child was born. The solution was for women to dedicate themselves fully to their unborn children during pregnancy and then leave them with “experts” after they were born. “If the mother mothers her child unborn,” she asserted, “anybody can mother it

\(^{148}\) Krecker, “The Passing of the Family.”
\(^{151}\) Ada May Krecker, “The Passing of the Family.”
Krecker categorically defined maternity as a biological, not a social, function. A pregnant woman should try every means to love and take care of her unborn child; but after her delivery, the child should be the society’s responsibility, not hers. Mother-child relationships would be contingent on “personal tastes and mutual congeniality.” She went on delineating the assorted facilities and expertise needed for communal parenting and the mothers’ free choice of career without the duty of childrearing. “Nothing can keep them out of careers,” proclaimed Krecker; women “will go out into the world and work anyhow.”

Krecker had a unique vision of what women could achieve in a communal society freed from the conventional bondage of marriage, maternity, and family life. She imagined an anarchistic future where woman would fulfill herself without being confined by her maternity. Notably, Krecker’s opinion that mothers should be released from childrearing departed from Goldman’s idea that, once a woman became a mother, “to grow with the child is her [the woman’s] motto.” Furthermore, Krecker suggested women should be open to all forms of relationship or sexual unions with men as they saw fit. Women should be economically autonomous (“Nothing can keep them out of careers”), so they wouldn’t be forced to live under their husbands’ or lovers’ roofs. Women, Krecker expected, would be free to maintain harmonious, multiple relationships with men

Ada May Krecker, “The Passing of the Family.”
As Krecker put it, “there may be years when they will be together, years when they will be apart. They may always be under the same roof or never under the same roof. Any way. Just as it suits.” Ada May Krecker, “The Passing of the Family.”
Linda Lumsden’s reading of Krecker’s essay shows that Krecker was ignorant of the double burden of the working mother. I find Lumsden’s analysis problematic, for Krecker actually proposed to release the mothers’ childrearing responsibility after their delivery, so that they could dedicate to the work that they like. For Lumsden’s analysis, see Lumsden, “Anarchy Meets Feminism,” 36.
Krecker’s opinion of public childrearing echoed Goldman’s. See Emma Goldman, “What is There in Anarchy for Woman?” St. Louis Post-Dispatch Sunday Magazine [St. Louis, MO], Oct. 24, 1897, p. 9, cited from The Emma Goldman Papers, reel 47.
Krecker, “The Passing of the Family.”
in their professional and intimate lives. “Some [women] will have one love. Some will have many loves,” she wrote; “some will have more loves and fewer friendships. Some vice versa.”

Goldman’s worship of “the true companionship and oneness” in heterosexual love was absent in Krecker’s narrative.

Voltairine de Cleyre shared Krecker’s anarchist proposal for women’s maternal role and sexual unions while underscoring the importance of individual growth and self-development for women. De Cleyre elaborated her ideas in the lecture “They Who Marry Do Ill,” reprinted in *Mother Earth* in January 1908. She considered “the growing ideal of human society” to be the development of the free individual. While criticizing the “sacrament of marriage” sanctioned by the church or the state, she probed into the intercommunions that she broadly identified as “marriage”:

> The ceremony is only a form, a ghost, a meatless shell. By marriage I mean the real thing, the permanent relation of a man and a woman, sexual and economical, whereby the present home and family life is maintained. It is of no importance to me whether this is a polygamous, polyandric or monogamous marriage, nor whether it is blessed by a priest, permitted by a magistrate, contracted publicly or privately, or not contracted at all.

De Cleyre’s definition of marriage, unlike other *Mother Earth* writers, included conventional marital arrangements and free unions, whichever involved cohabitation. She pointedly argued that “marriage” in all of its forms was “detrimental to the growth of individual character.” She accused parenthood and the bond of love in marriage with
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158 Krecker, “The Passing of the Family.”
159 Goldman, “Marriage and Love,” 239.
160 In the beginning of the lecture text, the editor stated that this lecture was presented “the negative side of the question, whose positive was argued under the heading ‘They Who Marry Do Well,’ by Dr. Henrietta P. Westbrook; both lectures delivered before the Radical Liberal League, Philadelphia, April 28, 1907.”
162 De Cleyre, “They Who Marry Do Ill.” Apart from various detrimental effects that marriage had on the individual growth, De Cleyre found voluntary resignation, self-suppression, and interdependence prevalent features even in the so-called “successful” marriages. For her, these features for the sake of preserving the
hampering the growth of individuality. “The development of individuality,” she claimed, “does no longer necessarily imply numerous children, nor indeed, necessarily any children at all.” Her statement, in the face of the heightened fears of race suicide, argued for quality rather than a large quantity of offspring, without any hint of racism. De Cleyre also argued that the close bond in marriage was “vulgarized by the indecencies of continuous close communion.” The only way to preserve love, in her view, was “to maintain the distances.”¹⁶³ Lastly, she harkened back to the childrearing issue and stated that biological parenting was not of necessity better than other forms of parenting.

Voltairine de Cleyre’s “They Who Marry Do Ill” was her individualist manifesto describing the ideal sexual union and liberated intimacies. She valued invention and evolved consciousness in human history, which decreased the need for certain instinctive functions like prolific childbearing. For her, nothing—not love, sex, or even offspring—should stand in the way of women’s individual growth. In her lecture, de Cleyre did not dwell on women’s motherhood like John Coryell. Nor did she encourage women’s resistance to the authorities via their autonomous sexuality as did Goldman. Sounding less romantic than Goldman, de Cleyre concluded: “[T]hat love and respect may last, I would have unions rare and impermanent.”¹⁶⁴ In short, de Cleyre demanded the uninhibited freedom of women as individuals, not as females or mothers.

Taken together, Mother Earth’s members presented three foci for re-conceiving maternity and sexual unions for women: free women, free motherhood, and free individuals.

¹⁶³ De Cleyre found voluntary resignation, self-suppression, and interdependence prevalent features in “successful” marriages. These features for the sake of preserving the family and social respect became the foes to the development of sound individuality. De Cleyre, “They Who Marry Do Ill.”
¹⁶⁴ De Cleyre, “They Who Marry Do Ill.”
They represent distinct, rather than homogenous, tendencies in envisioning women’s free development in anarchy. Goldman worked to free women by transforming their deprived and repressed sexuality into an empowered vehicle for their lives and social revolution.

Coryell was the typical advocate of free motherhood that he hoped would work to dismantle the marriage system. De Cleyre focused on the conscious growth of individuality in women (and men). She endeavored to awaken in individuals what she termed the “dominant idea”—“the force of purposive action, of intent within holding its purpose against obstacles without.” (italics original)\(^\text{165}\)

These writers’ re-conceptualizations of maternity and sexual unions reflected their antagonism not only to existing institutions but also to the women’s rights movement. They particularly disagreed with the prevailing suffragist notion of female moral superiority. Goldman made it clear that while women deserved every civil right, they would not be free through those rights. She felt the need to emphasize how feminist achievements would keep women’s true liberation from occurring. Robert Allerton Parker criticized some states’ enfranchised women who lobbied against prostitution as abusing their political freedom to oppress their exploited sisters.\(^\text{166}\) For these anarchist writers, feminists’ accomplishments did not really benefit the whole of mankind or even women as a whole. The middle-class suffragist rhetoric prioritizing white women’s superiority over immigrants and foreign “barbarians” also clashed with anarchists’ general stance against


any form of discrimination, including racism. Only by overthrowing the entire
government, these anarchists insisted, could women and men all be free.

*Mother Earth* writers’ assertion on behalf of all humanity and reconciliatory attitude
towards men overlooked the power hierarchies between both sexes. Their belief that
women’s oppression came from wrongful systems, customs, and values shifted the blame
away from men and their vested interests in these systems. John Coryell claimed that “man
is quite as much the victim of these [deteriorating moral] conditions as woman.” Robert
Allerton Parker, in his essay, “Feminism in America” (1915), offered a similar
self-defense. He agreed that “the true enemies of woman are not men individually, but the
corrupt and enslaving forces of the State—representing the industrial masters, the Church,
Morality, [and] Custom.” These writers concentrated on inequalities in the
state-capitalist system, above all class exploitation, hence the criticism of class arrogance,
sexual prudery, and the ethical hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie. They subsumed the issues of
race into class inequality, which required social revolution as its solution. Regarding “the
woman question” and “the sex question,” they wanted to empower women as individuals
rather than through external institutions.

The key to woman’s empowerment, Goldman believed, was sexual autonomy. With
WWI breaking out in Europe in 1914, she and her comrades plunged into an intense
birth-control campaign for women to reject being breeding machines for the State. The
birth-control campaign demonstrated how *Mother Earth*’s members advocated
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167 For the Progressive-era suffragists’ tactics of arguing their case in the context of America’s rising
expansionism both at home (in Indian and Mormon territory) and abroad (in Philippines, Hawaii, and
Puerto Rico), and how woman suffrage developed along with American imperialism, see Allison L. Sneider,
University Press, 2008).
169 R. A. P., “Feminism in America.”
contraception as the most effective means to safeguard women’s sexual pleasure, individual agency, and free motherhood.

**Sex Radicalism in Action: Making Birth Control an Anarchist Campaign**

The events of 1914 marked a watershed that transformed Goldman’s original approach to birth control. As early as 1900, Goldman began to offer lectures on birth control after she learned how to use existing contraceptive methods at the Paris Neo-Malthusian Conference.\(^{170}\) As a midwife on the Lower East Side of New York, she saw first-hand how working-class women suffered because of unintended pregnancies. Goldman believed that birth control was a better alternative than abortion for women’s reproductive control.\(^{171}\) But in her early estimation, the question of limiting offspring represented “only one aspect of the social struggle,” which was not worthy of going to prison over.\(^{172}\) Goldman did not publish any essays on birth control before 1914. Initially, some core members adopted a dual approach to the subject of birth control by openly lecturing about it but only hinting at it in their publications. John Coryell and Voltairine de Cleyre’s essays implied the importance of birth control without spelling it out.\(^{173}\) Goldman provided spoken (not written) forms of birth control propaganda through which she hoped to avoid arrest for violating the Comstock laws. Margaret Sanger and her husband’s prosecution in 1914 for distributing birth control literature intensified Goldman’s advocacy of birth control.\(^{174}\) She shifted from offering lectures to practical activism. When


\(^{173}\) Coryell endorsed the notion of “free motherhood” while de Cleyre supported “limited parentage.” See John R. Coryell, “Marriage and the Home”; John Russell Coryell, “Marriage or Free Union; Which?” De Cleyre, “They Who Marry Do Ill.”

\(^{174}\) Margaret Sanger and her husband William Sanger joined the bohemian radical circle of Greenwich Village in 1910 and befriended Goldman and many other progressive writers and activists. She issued a
Margaret Sanger fled to Europe in October 1914, Goldman launched her own anarchist campaign for birth control.

Goldman used the *Mother Earth* propaganda quartet to fight for legal access to birth control. The intensity of her campaign increased as her rivalry with Sanger grew. In the spring of 1915, when Sanger was in exile, Goldman began to make her case for birth control. She chose the liberal-minded Sunrise Club in New York as her platform to discuss openly contraceptive methods. About six hundred people, she recalled, “among them physicians, lawyers, artists, and men and women of liberal views” were present. She addressed the historical and social aspects of birth control and put her own anarchist spin on its imperative. To her, birth control not only improved women’s lives but also defied political and religious authorities. Unlike Sanger, Goldman paid tribute to the radical...
precursors of birth control advocacy. She praised anarchist papers such as *Lucifer*, *Firebrand*, and *Free Society* for teaching people about the importance of birth control.

Goldman’s advocacy of birth control as the basis of an anarchistic sexuo-ethical order was distinct from other advocates who turned to institutions, experts, or the government for resources. Unlike Sanger, Goldman never compromised with medical or legal authorities in her demands for birth control in order to gain their endorsement. Sanger sided with bourgeois liberals and medical professionals despite her early radical approach to birth control. Her eugenic stand on racial hygiene and population control through legal and even coercive means grew stronger in the interwar period. Sanger’s categorization of Negroes and immigrants as the “unfit” indicated an “elitist bigotry.” By contrast, Goldman wanted every woman to be able to control her own fertility without the intervention of men or institutions. Birth control, she declared, was a woman’s primary, individual right. Her advocacy of birth control had nothing to do with perfecting or purifying any particular race, nation, or culture. Although Goldman assumed that dealing with labor issues would resolve any lingering racial problems, she rejected racist ideas, class discrimination, and eugenicists’ coercive tactics as she offered birth-control education. She condemned any official or institutional interference with individual

178 Linda Gordon remarks that Margaret Sanger “was ignorant, in the early years of her career, of the free-love and feminist roots of birth control propaganda.” Gordon, *The Moral Property of Women*, 145, 147.
181 For the historical development of eugenics before WWI, see Gordon, *The Moral Property of Women*, 72-168, 196-204.
sexuality in the name of eugenics. She argued that birth control education was socio-politically important because it would help women secure autonomous motherhood, free sexuality, and social hygiene. For her, birth control was an anarchist cause that would empower women and change the existing social order.

Goldman’s first arrest for spreading birth control literature took place in Portland, Oregon in August 1915, when she and Reitman distributed Sanger’s pamphlet Family Limitation during her lectures. With the help of their attorney friend C. E. S. Wood, the judge dismissed their case. Reitman expressed excitement about the nationwide growth of support for contraceptive information during their 1915 tour. On February 11, 1916, Goldman was again arrested in New York for lecturing on birth control and released on $500 bail. Her statement in the March issue of Mother Earth called for readers’ support. “What now?” she appealed to the readers, “First, a country-wide publicity campaign” to protest her arrest for birth control. Goldman’s other requests to her supporters included writing letters to the New York District Attorney and to their local papers, as well as arranging meetings in their own cities.

On the eve of her trial on April 20, Goldman issued Mother Earth’s “Birth Control Number” to set its anarchist tone and rally the movement’s supporters. Goldman’s opening appeal explained this special number’s rationale for sexual enlightenment and defiance.
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184 For a similar anarchist criticism on coercive measures in the name of eugenics, see Peter Kropotkin, “The Sterilization of the Unfit,” Mother Earth 7:10 (Dec. 1912): 354-357.
188 “I am not afraid of prison. I have been there before,” said Goldman. She continued that “the radicals of this country would do well to try it for a time. It would strengthen their backbone and spirit.” Emma Goldman, “My Arrest and Preliminary Hearing,” Mother Earth 11:1 (Mar. 1916): 426-430.
against Comstockery. The writers in the volume highlighted the political centrality of free speech, autonomous sexuality, female liberation, eugenic hygiene, sex education, and civil disobedience in birth control. Leonard Abbott contrasted the U.S. censorship of contraceptive information with the tolerant attitude shown in Europe. Several speech extracts from the March 1 Carnegie Hall rally for Goldman’s case followed. Dr. William Robinson condemned undesired and forced motherhood as “ugly and injurious.” Dr. A. L. Goldwater, relating his own witness of excessive pregnancy, labeled Comstockery and the limitation of information about birth control as “criminal.” The free-speech advocate Theodore Schroeder ascribed the suppression of birth-control literature to “a trick of the emotions” that adopted “a puritan mask.” Reb. Raney of San Francisco described an audience’s eagerness at a Goldman protest mass meeting to get contraceptive literature. She stressed the imperative of spreading birth-control information to a wider public. Two readers’ letters, from a mother of seven children and a 34-year old single woman, testified to the urgency of making birth-control information available. Besides the “Birth Control Number,” the members distributed a large number of pamphlets to mobilize protest against Comstockery and

189 Goldman revealed how the issue of birth control was persecuted by the laws and tabooed by many radicals: “a great many radicals everywhere have excommunicated me from their lives because I discuss the subject and devote space in MOTHER EARTH to it.” E. G., “An Urgent Appeal to My Friends,” Mother Earth 11:2 (Apr. 1916): 450-451.
educate the public about contraception. The May 1916 issue continued to forge revolutionary momentum for birth control as a harbinger of a social war on behalf of the masses. This issue also detailed the course and outcome of Goldman’s trial. Despite her eloquent defense of herself, Goldman was found guilty. Between the choice of paying $100 and serving a fifteen-day Workhouse term, she chose the latter.

As the campaign leader, Goldman clarified her reasoning for risking her personal freedom to advance the cause of birth control. Birth control, she argued, was not only a life-and-death matter to woman; it also set anarchism in motion. She highlighted how the suppression of birth control in the U.S. symbolized the social evils created by state, corporate, religious, and moral powers. She grounded her birth-control argument in class and poverty and made a clear line between her ideas on birth control and those of the eugenicists. She did not register any defects in a child as congenital; rather, she blamed them on environmental institutional wrongs. She applied demography and medical science to prove the link between the underfed, overworked conditions of the parents and their “defective, crippled and unfortunate children.”

The campaign of Mother Earth members helped to create a pan-birth control front, consisting of sex radicals, anarchists, socialists, and liberals from different social statuses and ethnicities. Two meetings at Carnegie Hall, one protesting Goldman’s arrest and the other welcoming her release from jail, gathered a representative audience from all social ranks. Harold Titus recorded in Mother Earth that participants at the first meeting on
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197 Leonard Abbott’s recap of the trial highlighted the ridiculousness of the case: Goldman was indicted for giving a much-repeated lecture on birth control in Yiddish. She was wrongly accused of offering the lecture in German and of presenting “to a promiscuous audience.” Leonard D. Abbott, “Reflection on Emma Goldman’s Trial,” Mother Earth 11:3 (May 1916): 504-507.
March 1 showed cross-class solidarity and great enthusiasm for birth-control information. A short report of the second Carnegie Hall meeting indicated that it was “the most important in the series of Birth Control meetings that have been held during the past year.” The advertising leaflets for the meeting were even distributed in a church, according to the New York Times. The meeting yielded 627.17 dollars for “Birth Control Agitation and Mother Earth sustaining fund.”

Ben Reitman’s activism for birth control provided a male and medical view for the Mother Earth audience. Reitman’s status as a physician lent him a certain medical authority while sharing Goldman’s anarchist belief that women did not need to defer to male authorities on this question. Reitman proved his commitment to the cause of birth control by enduring imprisonment. Arrested in Cleveland in December 1916, he received the most severe sentence for advocating birth control in the 1910s: six months in jail plus a fine of $1,000. The judge in Reitman’s last case in Rochester acquitted him; Goldman was also acquitted of the charges from her last arrest on October 20, 1916. In Mother Earth, Goldman interpreted these acquittals as evidence of the judges’ growing awareness of the legitimacy of birth control. The circular tactic of
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205 It was “certainly worth going to jail,” Goldman wrote, “to teach a judge the importance of Birth Control for the masses of people.” Emma Goldman, “Again the Birth Control Agitation,” Mother Earth 11:9 (Nov.
“lecture-pamphlet-court-rally-prison” adopted by Goldman, Reitman, and Sanger raised national attention to the importance of birth control.

Mother Earth’s propaganda quartet championed birth control as the nexus between free women and free society; access to birth control was not a feminist agenda but an anarchist task. Its members wanted to achieve women’s autonomy by bringing down the existing sociopolitical order. For Goldman, birth control was indispensable for enabling women to contribute to the anarchist social revolution. But in the spring of 1917, their birth-control battle gave way to the more pressing anti-militarist campaign in the wake of America’s entry into WWI. Margaret Sanger, by then estranged from the anarchist circle, carried on her birth-control fight while parting ways with the radicals.206 In the Red-Scare of the 1920s, the birth-control movement lost its earlier radical significance as part of a coming social revolution. Even so, Mother Earth’s anarchist propaganda sowed the seeds of social and sexual change in the early twentieth century. By propagating sex radicalism as part of their anarchist project, Mother Earth’s writers opened up new ways for audiences to learn about and adopt anarchism. The last section will explore how and to what extent the magazine writers’ sex radicalism actually realized its revolutionary project in and beyond America.

Sex Radicalism as Anarchist Propaganda: Echoes, Extents, and Limits

William Marion Reedy commented in 1908 that Goldman was “about eight thousand years ahead of her age.”207 Reedy’s remark was more historically accurate in relation to Goldman’s anarchist ideals than he was about her sex radicalism.

206 Ellen Chesler, Woman of Valor, 150-175.
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Unconventional sexual ideas and behavior were not rare in metropolises like New York and Chicago. Christina Simmons’s study of modern American women’s sexuality notes that “most sex radicals had one—often more—of three broad intellectual affiliations: to the political Left, feminism, or the artistic bohemian world.”

That was the case with Goldman’s neighborhood in New York. Greenwich Village in the prewar decade witnessed a unique fusion of art and politics, known as “the Little Renaissance.”

Novelist Malcolm Cowley categorized two mingled currents there:

individualistically-oriented bohemianism and socially-inspired radicalism.

Avant-garde ideas and practices were in vogue for young (male and female) intellectuals, who interacted intellectually and physically in an intimate way. Their longing for a free lifestyle and self-realization opened them to liberating ideologies including anarchism.

*Mother Earth* members’ sex radicalism found echoes in the prewar generation of intellectuals and social rebels who called themselves feminists, socialists, or bohemians. This generation responded positively to Goldman’s emphasis on individuality as the bedrock of her sex radicalism. The iconoclastic spirit of anarchism empowered them to defy what they saw as the priggish genteel traditions of the middle class. By the 1910s, many younger feminists held more open attitudes towards sex than senior feminists who
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211 Goldman defined individuality as “the consciousness of the individual as to what he is and he lives. It is inherent in every human being and is a thing of growth.” She considered expression “the very essence of individuality,” which thrived with “the sense of dignity and independence.” Emma Goldman, “The Individual, Society, and the State,” in *Red Emma Speak: Selected Writings and Speeches by Emma Goldman*, Third Edition, ed. Alix Kates Shulman (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 1998), 109-123.

212 Leslie Fishbein, *Rebels in Bohemia*, 3-112.
sought social respectability by asserting female virtue and motherly duty.\textsuperscript{213} The younger feminists were more susceptible to the new ideas and practices related to love, sex, and sexuality elaborated in the productions of *Mother Earth*. Goldman would have appreciated the feminism of lesbian writer Rose Young, who said that woman “wants to push on to the finest, fullest, freest expression of herself.”\textsuperscript{214} Numerous literary bohemians demanded sexual pleasure, self-expression, and free love explicated by Goldman and her comrades.\textsuperscript{215}

Thanks primarily to Goldman’s message of sex radicalism, core members gained easy access to friendly spaces and non-anarchist audiences in the bohemian and liberal milieu of New York. Several representative groups of Greenwich Village bohemians invited Goldman to lecture on various topics about anarchism, including free love. Goldman and her comrades participated in events at Mabel Dodge’s salon, the Liberal Club and Heterodoxy. Many members of the new Liberal Club supported Goldman’s radical ideas on love and sexuality.\textsuperscript{216} Other New York social clubs including the Harlem Liberal Alliance, the Women’s Trade Union League, the Brooklyn Philosophical Association, and the Sunrise Club also invited Goldman to address them, as discussed in Chapter 1. Although Max Eastman did not support anarchism, he defended Goldman’s campaign for birth control and endorsed her idea of free love.\textsuperscript{217} The radicals, bohemians, liberal left, and socialists agreed on the basic tenants of Goldman’s sex radicalism.

\textsuperscript{215} Judith Schwarz, *Radical Feminists of Heterodoxy*, 75-96; Sandra Adickes, *To Be Young was Very Heaven: Women in New York before the First World War*, 59-79, 89-90, 139-164.
\textsuperscript{216} Keith Norton Richwine, “The Liberal Club,” 94, 145.
Goldman’s cult of expressive and amorous sexuality was more attractive to young bohemian intellectuals than it was to younger anarchists and older feminists. Most anarchist communists, particularly radical laborers, prioritized socioeconomic issues over personal matters.\textsuperscript{218} Young immigrant rebels found that Alexander Berkman shared their militant tendencies. They were critical of Goldman for catering to bourgeois audiences.\textsuperscript{219} Young anarchist Kate Wolfson of New York recalled how she and her sisters went to Goldman’s lectures on birth control and drama but regarded their subject matter as “secondary issues.” “We were fiery young militants,” claimed Wolfson, “and more concerned with economic and labor issues.”\textsuperscript{220} Respectable older feminists like Charlotte Perkins Gilman refused to endorse Goldman’s advocacy of free love for different reasons. Sex also mattered in Gilman’s discourse on feminism, but not in the exalted fashion that Goldman adopted. Gilman ascribed gender inequality to what she called “androcentric culture.”\textsuperscript{221} In her view, “the male has to use violence, falsehood, bribery, legal and religious coercion, in order to obtain [sex] satisfaction.”\textsuperscript{222} Gilman’s feminist utopia of “herland” sharply contrasted with Goldman’s anarchistic vision of heterosexual harmony by imagining a world without men.\textsuperscript{223} But Goldman’s cult of individuality and inner strength struck a chord with the young intellectual vanguard. Their understanding of anarchism, filtered through her lens of sex radicalism and free expression, shifted to a lifestyle or a set of individual practices instead of a political ideology. Goldman attracted many bohemian

\textsuperscript{219} Avrich, \textit{Anarchist Voices}, 73-74; Ganz, \textit{Rebels}, 148.  
\textsuperscript{220} Avrich, \textit{Anarchist Voices}, 73-74.  
\textsuperscript{222} Charlotte Perkins Gilman, “The New Mothers of a New World,” \textit{The Forerunner}, 4:6 (June 1913): 147.  
intellectuals to anarchism as the foundation of their moral conduct and liberated their emotional and sexual lives in the process.\textsuperscript{224} Beyond New York, Goldman reached a considerable audience with her lectures on women and sexuality, the subjects that concerned people across a spectrum of political ideologies. Various reports in \textit{Mother Earth} attested to the American public’s growing interest in Goldman’s sex radicalism. Goldman noted to an interviewer from the \textit{Denver Daily News} in 1912 that her talks about sex drew large crowds.\textsuperscript{225} Fellow anarchist writer Adeline Champney credited Goldman with spreading “sex-rationalism” during the \textit{Mother Earth} tours.\textsuperscript{226} Ben Mandell reported from Chicago that, amid the themes of Goldman’s 1916 tour, “the sex lecture predominated both in point of interest and attendance.”\textsuperscript{227} David Leigh’s recap of Goldman’s lectures in San Francisco in 1915 illustrated how her sex radicalism challenged the audiences’ ingrained ideas with facts and data.\textsuperscript{228} Several review essays in \textit{Mother Earth} on Goldman’s lecture tour in 1916 pointed to the audiences’ rising interest in birth control.\textsuperscript{229} Agnes Inglis from Michigan praised Goldman’s lecture and Reitman’s circulation of contraceptive information that enlightened many female college students.\textsuperscript{230} A reader (“Plain Talk”) in Grand Rapids, Michigan defended Goldman when a Christian reader attacked her in the local \textit{Grand Rapids Press}. “Plain Talk” praised Goldman’s sex lecture for being “a serious, rational

\begin{itemize}
\item[226] “No propaganda is more fearfully needed,” Champney remarked, “none more far-reaching in its potentialities for human happiness than the propaganda of sex-rationalism, and MOTHER EARTH is not the least of its prophets.” Adeline Champney, “Congratulations—Plus,” \textit{Mother Earth} 10:1 (Mar. 1915): 416-421.
\end{itemize}
treatment of a difficult subject;” “The calm, intelligent discussion which followed [the lecture] illustrated that thinking men and women are awakening to the need for a candid consideration of sex problems.” Even Margaret Sanger, Goldman’s protégé-turned-rival, admitted how important her work was. “Emma Goldman had been there [the West Coast] year after year,” Sanger wrote, “and had stirred people to dare express themselves.” The ideological groundwork laid by Goldman for sexual enlightenment on both coasts impressed her contemporaries. By propagating sex radicalism, Goldman opened up various opportunities for her audiences to learn about and adopt anarchism.

While Goldman embedded sex radicalism in her anarcho-communist project and vision, her audiences were free to detach it from the political context of stateless anarchism to suit their needs. Goldman’s advocacy of self-realization and free expression for both sexes was contagious among bohemian intellectuals, sex radicals, and even some liberals. Their reception of Goldman’s sex radicalism, though essential to her anarchist project, did not mean they were becoming anarchists. Above all, the middle-class intellectuals hardly showed an intention to overthrow the state with force. Mabel Dodge apparently favored the peaceful methods of her “intellectual anarchist” friends like Hutchins Hapgood and Lincoln Steffens, who “believed in dealing Death by words and influence,” not by killing or using violence as she believed Goldman would. Seeking their own moral and artistic regeneration, they tended to de-politicize the elements of anarchism that they chose to receive. Margaret Anderson, who was still Goldman’s

233 Luhan, Movers and Shakers, 88.
passionate adherent at that time, repudiated the government and its violence, to which she had responded: “For God’s sake, why doesn’t some one start the Revolution?”

But Anderson’s anarchist practice was essentially artistic, individualist, and philosophical. Bohemian intellectuals took the individualist elements of Goldman’s sex radicalism, disregarding its stateless political and communist socioeconomic premise, as the totality of anarchism. Or they consciously filtered out Goldman’s revolutionary militancy, which inevitably involved violence, and favored her sex radicalism and libertarian philosophy as their version of anarchism. The philosophical anarchists and literary bohemians cared more about their personal and sexual awakenings than the drastic institutional obliteration urged by core members of Mother Earth. Goldman’s sex radicalism, while drawing large audiences and convincing some to adopt certain personal anarchist practices, did not create a collective effort for her envisioned anarchy.

The potential and challenge of promoting Goldman’s sex radicalism as the vanguard of her anarchist philosophy were also evident in East Asia, but in a different manner than in America. As a philosophy advocating liberty, equality, and iconoclasm, anarchism had an even stronger appeal to East Asian intellectuals than their U.S. counterparts. The anarchists’ terrorist image that alarmed most thinking Americans did not bother East Asian intellectuals as much, since their anti-imperial and revolutionary fervor made them more open to the use of force. The East Asian anarchist papers before 1910 focused principally on introducing Goldman’s anarchist struggles against authorities and Mother

237 Dirlik, Anarchism in the Chinese Revolution, 86-87.
Earth as the U.S. organ of the anarchist movement as discussed in Chapter 3. Goldman’s *Anarchism and Other Essays* published in 1910 became the main source text for her East Asian translations. Several of its essays on women and sexuality were particularly welcome. While Goldman’s U.S. adherents embraced her sex radicalism without registering its political premise, her East Asian translators accidentally detached it from its anarchist premise as well. Japanese and Chinese translators—mostly anarchist-inclined radicals—intended for Goldman’s sex radicalism to attract audiences to anarchism. They published their translations of her sex radicalism essays in non-anarchist journals in order to popularize her ideas. Unfortunately, thanks to their publication venues and translations, her readers did not understand that she felt creating anarchy was necessary for people to enact her sex radicalism. In the process, Asian readers (mis)classified her as a feminist rather than as an anarchist in the discourses on women and sexuality that were prevalent in progressive journals.

Japan’s first feminist magazine, *Seitō*’s (Bluestocking, 1911-1916) presentation of Goldman’s work on sex radicalism was a case in point. *Seitō* gathered a group of avant-garde female writers in Japan to offer all forms of women’s literary works and to champion women’s rights. Its female writers translated Euro-American artistic and literary works for intellectual inspiration.238 One of them, the anarchist-inclined Itō Noe, published her translation of Goldman’s “The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation” in *Seitō* in 1913.239 The fact that Itō promoted Goldman’s sex radicalism in a feminist journal like *Seitō* contrasts sharply with the publication of Goldman’s work in the U.S. American

---


feminist papers consistently condemned Goldman’s anarchism and her notion of sex radicalism, which critiqued suffragism and other schools of feminism. Suffragist Laura A Gregg, for example, wrote in The Woman’s Standard that “Emma Goldman has for years been more cold blooded and defiant than her fellow anarchists, taking refuge in her belief that because she is a woman, not legally responsible, she would be spared the vengeance of the people, should they become outraged by her teachings.”240 Such feminist/suffragist criticism of Goldman in the U.S. hardly appeared in Japan (or China). For Itō Noe, Goldman’s sex radicalism fit more in a woman’s journal than in a male-dominated anarchist paper. Itō intended this essay to inspire Japanese women’s gender, sexual, and individual awakening. She viewed Goldman’s sex radicalism as an ideal medium to spread new, radical, and anarchistic ideas to a broader, namely non-anarchist readership. In 1914, Itō published a translated collection of Goldman’s works.241 These translations furthered the reception of Goldman’s idea of free love by Japanese New Women.242

In a similar fashion, Goldman’s Chinese translators published her works on sex radicalism in leading, non-anarchist presses while leaving her political-economic treatises in anarchist papers. In 1917, Yuan Zhenying, an English major with anarchist leaning at Peking University, chose “Marriage and Love” as his first translation of Goldman and published it in the influential Xin Qingnian, a chief left-wing liberal monthly in China.

that later promoted communism. Meanwhile, Yuan and his anarchist friends issued the translations of Goldman’s “Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty” and “Anarchism: What It Really Stands For” in an essay volume of their Anarchist Society. Yuan tried to smuggle Goldman’s politically revolutionary connotation of anarchism into Xin Qingnian. At the end of his translated “Marriage and Love,” Yuan appended a succinct sketch of Goldman’s anarchist activities and Mother Earth’s propaganda. He closed by stating that “Marriage and Love” was a must read for all Chinese male and female youths.

While Goldman’s East Asian translators sought to popularize her sex radicalism, it became conflated with other feminist, radical thought under a general category of “progressive ideas.” Goldman’s East Asian readers were free from the negative, dangerous image of her that gripped American audiences who read about her in the mainstream press. Some modernizing elites in Japan and China, eager to seek inspiration from Western new ideas, took Goldman’s sex radicalism out of its anarchist communist premise and incorporated it into their conglomeration of progressive thought. The fusion of heterogeneous advanced thought from the West was not uncommon in East Asian modernist journals. Seitō’s concurrent introduction of the works by Goldman and Swedish feminist Ellen Key was one example. The Japanese translation of Key’s “The Evolution of Love” and Goldman’s “The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation” appeared back to back in the September 1913 issue of Seitō. Key advocated the freedom of marriage and
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245 “The Evolution of Love” was a chapter in Ellen Key’s Love and Marriage. See Ellen Key, Love and Marriage, trans. Arthur G. Chater (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1911), 57-106. For its Japanese
divorce while exalting the duty of motherhood; her feminist thinking did not include the abolition of marriage and other existing institutions. For some of Seitō’s female writers, Key’s new sexual ethics echoed Goldman’s notion of free love despite their ideological discrepancies and distinct social ideals. Even Itō Noe, though she expressed a deeper affinity for Goldman’s ideas than for Key’s, recognized both of them as pioneers of new sexual freedoms.246

Consequently, Japanese and Chinese non-anarchist writers, unlike their American counterparts, represented Goldman as a progressive thinker rather than an anarchist revolutionary. Chiang Fengzi, a Chinese feminist writer, advocated women’s education and emancipation in an influential liberal magazine, Funü zazhi (The Ladies’ Journal, 1915-1931). She quoted Goldman’s work alongside that of Ellen Key, Henrik Ibsen, and Margaret Sanger.247 Many other writers introduced Goldman along with various Western big names of sex radicals—Havelock Ellis, Edward Carpenter, Ellen Key, and South African author Olive Schreiner, to name a few—who promoted libertarian, individualist ideas.248 Contrary to their U.S. counterparts, East Asian feminist journals neither highlighted nor censured Goldman’s criticism of women’s suffrage.249 In these non-anarchist publications, Goldman became a pioneer of free love and sex liberation. Japanese and Chinese feminists and liberals received Goldman’s sex radicalism free from its anarchist premise of socioeconomic reorganization. The anti-capital and anti-state
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246 Itō, “‘Fujin kaihō no higeki’ ni tsuit.”
249 Carrie Chapman Catt, “Calumniators of Suffragists Warned.”
agendas in her revolutionary project did not benefit much from her growing fame as a sex radical.\(^{250}\)

The propagation of Goldman’s ideas in America and East Asia exposes the extent and limits to which her sex radicalism worked as anarchist propaganda. Sex radicalism broadened the foundation for Goldman and her comrades’ anarchist propaganda work. The message of individual awakening and sexual consciousness in anarchists’ sex radicalism appealed to a wide array of leftist intellectuals. The distribution of their ideas on free love and birth control gave anarchist philosophy new international audiences. But Goldman’s sex radicalism did not nullify the violent image of anarchism for the American public. In her interview of Goldman, the Denver journalist Alice Rohe stressed that “when Emma Goldman makes a statement it is regarded as shockingly anarchistic, but when Ellen Key[es] or Karin Michaelis [Danish feminist] express the same view it is regarded as the message of the ‘emancipated.’”\(^{251}\) Goldman and her comrades’ call for the destruction of sociopolitical, economic, and religious authorities, even for the sake of liberating sexuality and women, was too radical for most of her American audiences. In East Asia, Goldman’s texts about sex radicalism found a new, more popular context detached from its anarchist ideological basis. The disconnection prevented her sex radicalism from creating new support for anarchism.

**Conclusion**

*Mother Earth*’s discourses on women and sexuality followed the anarchist premise that rejected gradual change, ineffectual reform, and nominal rights in the existing social order. Goldman intended for her proposal for women’s “inner regeneration” to go


\(^{251}\) “Sex Problem Talks Fill Hall to Doors, Says Emma Goldman.”
hand-in-hand with labor’s socioeconomic struggles to emancipate society. In her scheme, intellectuals would play an important role in supporting the revolution. Her inclusive approach to propagating social revolution involved working-class general strikes, women’s emancipation, and sexual liberation. In *Mother Earth* members’ activist project, free sexuality and free motherhood was a part, rather than a result, of anarchist revolution. And yet, these anarchists’ discussion of women’s roles did not explicate how women should acquire economic autonomy. In their anarchist logic, women’s lives and living should be free to follow their own course. Goldman argued, based on her understanding of gender, that every woman “must accomplish what she has to do through her artistic sense, her intuitions, [and] her psychic methods.” She tried to defy the male-dominated society in which she lived to assert a woman’s right to freedom of choice. She insisted that woman “should work under conditions where it does not matter how much she can do but how well she can do her work.” Goldman, like other *Mother Earth* writers, did not feel the need to specify how women could achieve that goal since it would be their own will to decide. Likewise, these anarchists were too enmeshed in their egalitarian vision of anarchy to dwell upon the possibilities that women might otherwise still need to rely on men. Again, their anarchist logic led them to declare that (in John Coryell’s words) “women, of course, should, in any case, be economically free.” This “mater-of-fact” attitude towards the issue of female economic independence did not help to clarify why women should join the ranks of anarchism.

The open-ended socioeconomic analysis of women and sexuality in *Mother Earth* paved the way for its audiences’ detachment of sex radicalism from the communist

253 “Emma Goldman’s Solution.”
254 Coryell, “Marriage and the Home.”
framework of anarchism. The reception of anarchist sex radicalism among bohemian intellectuals, philosophical anarchists, and sex radicals was not equal to acceptance of the anarchism from which it was conceptualized. These leftist intellectuals had no problem grafting Goldman’s sex radicalism onto a more practical, socialist-inclined, political prospect than anarchism. Most of them preferred a stronger, though less repressive, state that redistributed wealth and power, rather than a non-existent or profoundly minimalist one. Their tendency to dissociate anarchist sex radicalism from its ideological roots demonstrated the anarchist’s failure to compete with other progressive reforms. Orthodox anarchist communists still clung to labor issues and distanced themselves from the bourgeoisie and intimate matters.

Moreover, Mother Earth’s discourse of sex radicalism lacked a compelling argument for middle-class women to forego feminism in order to pursue the anarchist revolution. The magazine’s authors did not spell out what or how educated women should contribute to an anarchist society. To these women, especially the younger generation, Goldman’s advocacy of women’s sexual autonomy could coexist with their fights for suffrage and work. It was hard to convince feminists that being true to their female nature alone could emancipate them. They found inspiration in anarchistic sex radicalism, but it did not turn them into anarchist communists.

While sex radicalism was foundational to the magazine members’ anarchist vision of women’s emancipation and sexual liberation, their campaigns for free speech and against militarism symbolized the ultimate anarchist principle of universal freedom and peace. The last chapter will elucidate how these anarchists’ fights for free speech continued.

255 Fishbein, Rebels in Bohemia, 5; Parry, Garrets and Pretenders, 190; Richwine, “The Liberal Club,” 82-83, 157, 174-175.
to attract non-anarchist sympathizers, while their anti-militarist struggles eventually ended the magazine’s life.
CHAPTER 5
Fighting for Universal Freedom:
Free Speech and Anti-Militarism

*Mother Earth* members developed a uniquely *American* form of anarchist propaganda, which integrated a free-speech movement with anti-militarist struggles besides advocating sex radicalism. British and European anarchists did not usually consider free speech part of an anarchist agenda. In America, the Comstock Act and anti-anarchist laws obliged anarchists to wage a battle against legal injustice and press censorship.¹ From the 1870s, U.S. anarchists asserted their constitutional right to freedom of speech in alliance with liberals and free thinkers. But it was not until *Mother Earth*’s national campaigns that free speech became linked to anti-militarism.

During Goldman’s annual promotional tours, core members encountered unparalleled physical violence from the police and civilian vigilantes who came from the propertied class. A nationwide united front for free speech emerged and revolved around Goldman’s tours. Otherwise aloof middle-class liberals felt sympathy for the anarchists after reading about the police brutality exposed by *Mother Earth*. In New York, some members’ free-speech campaigning grew militant as they defended themselves against police violence and sought vengeance against capitalists. The onset of WWI further meshed their fights for free speech with anti-militarism as they denounced international warfare. The inner circle’s class war against WWI culminated in their creation of the

¹ The prosecutions of some anarchists (such as Ezra Heywood, the editor of *The Word*; Moses Harman, editor of *Lucifer, the Light-bearer*, and Abe Isaak, Henry Addis, and A. J. Pope, editors of *Firebrand*), for publishing obscene materials propelled some liberal intellectuals to defend the right to free speech. See Rabban, *Free Speech in Its Forgotten Years*, 23-76; *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II*, 557-558.
No-Conscription League, which encouraged individual free expression to reject militarism.

*Mother Earth* anarchists had to secure their freedom of speech in order to express their anti-militarist principles publicly. Their propaganda work and the magazine’s survival hinged upon their capacity to dissent in speech and in print. Free speech became both a tactic and an imperative to discuss and spread the magazine’s anti-militarism. Hence Goldman’s succinct definition: “Free speech means either the unlimited right of expression, or nothing at all.” Core members believed that all forms of government were essentially violent and thus militaristic. In their view, the authorities controlled militarism in the name of law, order, and national honor. These anarchists broadly defined militarism as the organized armed forces (federal troops, national guards, local police, militias, private security agencies, and vigilantes), which served the interests of the privileged class during peace and wartime.

*Mother Earth* members’ anti-militarist practices involved active rejection of and passive resistance to the state, corporate, civilian and patriotic violence, as well as compulsory conscription. They advocated a range of means, including economic direct action, sabotage, and the general strike for the working class to resist violence from elites. To their middle-class audiences, they invoked free speech as the basic human and constitutional right to resist violent suppression from the police. In the magazine’s
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2 The 1902 New York Criminal Anarchy Act and the 1903 federal anti-anarchist Immigration Act were two representative anti-anarchist laws passed by the state and federal government in the wake of President McKinley’s assassination. Falk, “Raising Her Voices,” 16-24.
multiform operations, fighting for free speech was no different than fighting against militarism.

This chapter reveals the interplay between free speech and anti-militarism in the propaganda work of *Mother Earth*’s members to showcase their contribution to fighting for universal freedom. Scholars have researched the free-speech campaigns led by the middle class, various kinds of antiwar or anti-militarist movements, and the IWW’s arduous battles for free speech and against militarism. They have, however, seldom examined the connections between the anti-militarist and free-speech movements in the early twentieth century. Nor have they suitably evaluated anarchists’ role in these two movements. The words and deeds of *Mother Earth* members offer a rare opportunity to observe the interplay of the two movements across class, ethnic, ideological, and gender lines.

This interplay was evident in *Mother Earth* members’ struggles with legal, patriotic, civilian, corporate, and state violence, as the following sections will discuss respectively. Throughout its publication, core members targeted the legal use of violence by law agencies hostile to anarchists. Goldman and her comrades formed a pan-ideological,

---


6 Among the limited historical works on *Mother Earth*, including several biographers of Emma Goldman, no scholars have looked into the interplay of free speech and anti-militarist issues in its members’ anarchist propaganda. Richard Drinnon’s classic biography of Goldman has a chapter on her free speech battles in the prewar decade; but he did not connect Goldman’s free speech campaign with her anti-militarist efforts. See Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 121-142.
nationwide free-speech movement by highlighting police brutality and judicial injustice. They utilized the rhetoric of civil liberties, which invoked the constitutional right to freedom of speech to form coalitions with non-anarchists. Police and civilians attacked anarchists and even audience members during Goldman’s lecture tours. Some local vigilante groups posed a dangerous threat to core members’ safety during the tours. Goldman succeeded in soliciting support from liberal intellectuals to restore her right of free speech in several cities. While on the road, she called attention to the violence encouraged by patriotism by hailing a decorated soldier, who was court-martialed and imprisoned for attending her lectures and shaking her hand. She intended for the magazine’s coverage of the war hero’s conversion from a militarist patriot to a peaceful anarchist to demonstrate that patriotism justified the violation of personal freedom of expression and conscience.

Meanwhile, core members constantly agitated for labor to rise up against capital and the mercenary violence they used to suppress workers. They championed syndicalism—a fusion of craft unionism and labor solidarity—as the means to mobilize the workers. While the inner circle upheld syndicalism as their principal economic ideology, some of their anti-corporate actions grew violent as they faced intensified threats to labor strikes and their free speech. Their struggles against state-led militarism peaked between 1914 and 1917 in reaction to the escalating suppression of free speech and the inflamed patriotism. In their uncompromising, anarchist manner, *Mother Earth* members organized to oppose domestic and international warfare. During their arduous campaigns for free speech and against militarism, Goldman and her comrades highlighted some gender and class elements of hierarchical violence. The contrasting images of delicate female
(civilian/anarchist) victims versus muscular male policemen, the uniformed solider versus the anarchist woman, the powerful top-hatted man versus the downtrodden laborer, and the female hunger-striker anarchist against the judicial system were manifest on its pages. These juxtapositions allowed core members to reveal the oppressive militarist nature of those in power. All in all, this chapter illuminates how social rebels like anarchists devoted themselves to preserving individual freedom in times of heightened militarist threats both at home and abroad.

The chapter’s analysis of the inner circle’s tactics assesses their strengths and limitations in attacking militarism and demanding free speech. Their promotion of a libertarian spirit of expression generally garnered wide support beyond anarchist ranks. Goldman was more interested in finding allies among middle-class liberals than in forcibly striking back at legal and civilian violence. Her perseverance and composure won her sympathy over the years, which allowed her and her comrades a certain freedom of speech. While she had no intention of toning down her voice against militarism, it was her male comrades who actually wrote and acted in a retaliatory manner. Berkman’s anti-militarist campaign cemented the alliance between Mother Earth and the IWW although it disturbed some of their moderate allies.

Core members’ versatile tactics to assert free speech while advancing their anti-militaristic cause give us insight into the dilemmas they faced in spreading anarchist propaganda. My previous chapters have discussed how core members operated Mother Earth’s propaganda to disseminate the liberating goals of anarchism even though they did not build much support for the creation of a stateless anarchy. This chapter reaffirms their asymmetric achievements. Anarchists’ struggles against authorities created a common
battleground for people of various ideologies who defended free expression. Yet the nationwide sympathy anarchists aroused through their free-speech campaign did not build public support for anarchist politics. Some core members’ radicalism was too militant or too proletarian-oriented to gain political support from middle-class intellectuals. Goldman and Berkman’s commitment to speaking out against militarism and the draft eventually cost them their freedom and led to Mother Earth’s demise. Though core members stirred anti-authoritarian impulses amid the liberty-loving public, they failed to channel those impulses into an anti-state revolution.

Seeking Allies: A National Free-Speech Movement against Legal Violence

Free speech as a natural right was rarely an anarchist cause outside the United States. Peter Kropotkin’s attitude was representative of non-U.S. anarchists toward the issue of free speech. In October 1903, British anarchist John Turner became the first victim of the federal Immigration Act that banned foreign anarchists from entering America.\(^7\) Kropotkin wrote to Goldman in December about the free-speech campaign she had launched in collaboration with respectable American liberals on Turner’s behalf.\(^8\)

“Altogether,” Kropotkin told Goldman, “I think that the agitation against the anti-Anarchist law must be carried on by the Trade Unions & the American Radicals,

---

\(^7\) John Turner had embarked on his first visit and lecture tour in America in 1896 with Goldman’s assistance. He went on his second US lecture tour again on October 1903, and was soon arrested and charged with “violating Section 38 of the Act to Regulate the Immigration of Aliens.” Goldman adopted the tactic of appealing Turner’s case to the Federal Supreme Court after the order of his deportation was sustained in the first hearing of his trial. She cooperated with the Free Speech League and publicized the case as a free-speech battle. In her calculation, while the final ruling by the Supreme Court should remain unchanged, “I felt that the fight for Turner would be splendid propaganda by bringing the absurd law to the attention of the intelligent public.” During this free-speech campaign, many of her anarchist comrades (including Isaak, the editor of Free Society) did not approve of her tactic of appealing to the Supreme Court. Instead, she found many allies among middle-class intellectuals and professionals. Goldman, *Living My Life, Vol I*, 346-358. *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II*, 115, footnote 1, 117, footnote 5, 560.

\(^8\) For Goldman’s cooperation with the Free Speech League, whose members were mainly white native-born liberal intellectuals, see Goldman, *Living My Life, Vol. I*, 346-358.
who believe in political liberties under the present State.’’ He put it plainly: “As to repealing these laws, it is not our [anarchists’] business to ask it.”

He thought that it was only natural for the state to pass laws to suppress the propaganda activities of those who wanted to overthrow the state. The anarchists’ primary goal, in his view, was to abolish the state, not to repeal the laws that it made. Kropotkin dismissed the value of Goldman’s free-speech campaign that invoked the U.S. Constitution. Instead he favored a campaign for complete social revolution. Despite their spiritual tutor’s lukewarm response, Goldman and her comrades in America carried on their free-speech fights out of belief and necessity. Goldman’s individualist tendency echoed the American republican tradition of individual liberty of speech. She was just as inspired by the U.S. liberal doctrines of Thomas Jefferson, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau and Walt Whitman as she was by the authors of European anarchist classics. The hybridity of her anarchism reflected both her ideological choices and the sociopolitical conditions she encountered.

After the assassination of President McKinley in 1901 and the subsequent red scare, free speech became an anarchist cause. Under the 1902 New York Criminal Anarchy Law, the police could arrest individuals, break up (two or more persons’) meetings, seize publications, and shut down lectures that involved advocacy for “overthrowing or overturning organized government by force or violence, or by assassination of the executive head or of any of the executive officials of government, or by any unlawful

---

10 Kropotkin wrote: “Are we not at war with the bourgeois society?” he questioned Goldman; “all we can do is to fight that society albeit its laws.” Kropotkin to Goldman, Dec. 16, 1903.
11 Candace Falk has pointed out Goldman’s “remarkable ability to combine old and new world thinkers into her hybrid notion of anarchism.” Falk, “Forging Her Place,” 10.
means."12 This law gave the police free reign to disrupt the distribution of *Mother Earth* and Goldman’s lectures. Despite the peaceful nature of their propaganda activities, anarchists were at the mercy of law enforcement. In response, Goldman sought allies among cultural elites who could help her secure the right to peacefully spread anarchist messages. Since the inner circle distanced themselves from “criminal anarchy,” the public would listen to their protests against police violence. *Mother Earth*’s persistent free-speech fights embodied core members’ efforts to create nonsectarian cooperation for civil resistance in America. Demanding the right of free expression that could not be hampered by violence further reinforced these anarchists’ struggles against militarism.

The Free Speech League was by far the inner circle’s most socially respectable ally, whose members included a range of liberal-minded intellectuals. Formed in May 1902 in New York City, the Free Speech League advocated for people’s ability to exercise their constitutionally guaranteed rights.13 The League sought lawful means to oppose violations of all forms of expression and promoted legislative enactments as well as constitutional amendments to undo censorship.14 Goldman’s collaboration with the League to appeal Turner’s deportation case in 1903 initiated their friendship. Later, *Mother Earth* members’ resistance to censorship forged a closer alliance between them and the Free Speech League. League members such as Theodore Schroeder and Leonard D. Abbott, attorney Gilbert Roe, and the muckraker Lincoln Steffens were familiar faces in the *Mother

---

As they campaigned for free speech, the two groups often had to resist organized violence together.

Tactically, *Mother Earth*’s members adopted the civil liberty approach promoted by the Free Speech League to advocate repeal of laws that breached the U.S. Constitution. According to the First Amendment of the Constitution, Congress shall not make laws that prohibit citizens’ freedom of speech and the press. Goldman and her comrades thought it was expedient to attack the state’s power by supporting laws that limited the state’s authority. Besides, the principle of the First Amendment accorded with the anarchist principle of absolute individual freedom. Theodore Schroeder’s treatises in *Mother Earth* represented this civil liberty approach. In his view, Americans were left with “liberties only by permission, not as a matter of right;” they were “governed by the mere despotic wills of officials.” The “intellectual bankruptcy of our courts and judges,” plus the willful behavior of law enforcement, resulted in what he termed “our progressive despotism.” He advocated the abolition of laws that violated the “rule of liberty,” namely equal freedom for those who did not infringe on others’ freedom.

In *Mother Earth*, Schroeder extended his libertarian principle to defend anarchists’ freedom of speech and press with anti-militarist implications. He emphasized that true freedom entailed one’s liberty and that of his/her opponents. His conception of true freedom led him to defend the free speech of “the most despised” speakers, the anarchists.

Schroeder categorized anarchists, especially the philosophical kind, as peace-loving and

---

17 Schroeder, “Our Vanishing Liberty of the Press.”
tyranny-resisting idealists.20 He showed anti-militarist tendencies while calling for the repeal of the “iniquitous” anti-anarchist laws in his protests of the police’s willful breakup of anarchist events.21 His open letter to the New York City Police Commissioner in December 1906 denounced the police’s prohibition of *Mother Earth*’s circulation and its activities as “lawless.” “It is precisely such police lawlessness as this,” he wrote in *Mother Earth*, “which breeds Anarchists of the violent type.”22 Schroeder’s criticism of the police’s excessive violence validated *Mother Earth*’s anti-militarist stance.

Echoing Schroeder’s legal point of view, Goldman employed gendered rhetoric to contrast the brutality of law enforcement with the peacefulness of nonviolent anarchists.

In October 1906, the New York police raided two peaceful anarchist meetings and arrested a dozen attendees. Goldman recreated the scene of the second meeting for *Mother Earth*’s readers:

Twenty-five police officers began to club the audience out of the hall. A young girl of eighteen, Pauline Slotnikoff, was pulled off a chair and brutally dragged across the floor of the hall, tearing her clothing and bruising her outrageously. Another girl, fourteen years of age, Rebecca Edelsohn, was roughly handled and put under order…The same was done to three other women…I was about to leave when one of the officers struck me in the back, and put me under arrest…Six women and four men were packed like sardines into a patrol-wagon and hustled off to the station house, where we were kept in vile air and subjected to vulgar and brutal annoyance by the police until the following morning; then we were brought before a magistrate and put under $1,000 bill each for assault. (Italics original) Fancy girls of fourteen

---

20 Schroeder quoted British biologist Thomas H. Huxley’s definition of anarchy, which “as a term of political philosophy,…has nothing to do with disorder or with crimes; but denotes a state of society, in which the rule of each individual by himself is the only government the legitimacy of which is recognized.” Theodore Schroeder, “Our Vanishing Liberty of the Press.” For the original text of Huxley, see Thomas Henry Huxley, “Government: Anarchy or Regimentation,” in idem, *Collected Essays; Vol. I: Methods and Results* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 383-430.

21 Schroeder, “Our Vanishing Liberty of the Press.”

22 In the letter, dated December 26, 1906, Schroeder related two “lawless interference” of anarchist papers and activities by the New York police. The first one was police prohibition of selling “all future numbers” of *Mother Earth* in the Manhattan Liberal Club. The second one involved the police’s forcible cancellation of a memorial of the Chicago Haymarket anarchists without sound reason. Theodore Schroeder, “An Unanswered Letter,” *Mother Earth* 2:4 (June 1907): 181-183.
and eighteen, of delicate physique, assaulting twenty-five
two-hundred-and-fifty-pounders! Goldman’s portrait of the police’s victimization of young girls accentuated the police’s excessive and indecent use of violence. She designed her narrative, which implied that the police used physically and sexual violence against the women, to provoke indignation from her respectable readers. As she concluded, the police were violent “in the most brutal and unspeakable manner.”

Core members leveraged their appeal to civil liberties by criticizing the inconsistency of the government that created but also selectively breached people’s constitutional rights. Goldman likened the U.S. government to a parvenu barbarian who arbitrarily deprived dissidents of their free speech. “This barbarism,” she stated, “is the great foe of the libertarian and revolutionary element in America.” She argued that the incoherent enforcement of constitutional rights was more hypocritical and worse than the outright censorship used by European autocratic regimes. Harry Kelly further claimed that hardly anyone in America was immune to the government’s Caesar-like suppression of free speech. He described President Roosevelt’s ban of anarchists at home and military expansion abroad as representing “the true American spirit of invasion.”

---

23 The first meeting took place in October 27, 1906, to discuss “whether or not Leon Czolgosz was an Anarchist,” which resulted in police arrest of three speakers. The arrest led to the second meeting three days later to protest against the police suppression of free speech, which again caused the police arrest of ten people, including Goldman. Emma Goldman, “Police Brutality,” *Mother Earth* 1:9 (Nov. 1906): 2-3.

24 Goldman, “Police Brutality.”

25 In an editorial from April 1907, she listed a number of U.S. radical, labor, and anarchist groups that were denied basic free-speech rights as “the best proofs of our vaunted freedom!” “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 2:2 (Apr. 1907): 60-61.


Anarchists demanded that the government guarantee their freedom of speech even as they attacked the violent nature of the state and its law-enforcement agencies.\textsuperscript{28} Goldman wrote in April 1907 that “America is the best proof that social tyranny and economic despotism are safest under the mask of political phrases.”\textsuperscript{29} Victor Robinson, a Russian immigrant and physician, criticized the arbitrariness of “law and order” in America.\textsuperscript{30} These anarchists documented the reality that the police singled them out with harsher treatment for their political views. In January 1907, the police arrested Goldman during her lecture on “Misconceptions of Anarchism” at the \textit{Mother Earth} Club. She retorted in her magazine that she had given the same lecture earlier at the Brooklyn Philosophical Association without interruption. Her point was that the police targeted anarchist events while tolerating the respectable “non-anarchistic elements.”\textsuperscript{31}

During her 1908 tours, the police harassed Goldman repeatedly which aroused anger among middle-class liberals across America. Incidents of violence earlier that year in a few cities involved suspected anarchists, causing a new surge of “anarchist scare.”\textsuperscript{32} The police retaliated by targeting Goldman whenever alleged anarchist violence took place. At her stop in Chicago in March, local police canceled her scheduled lectures after the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{28} Representing the attitude of her magazine, Goldman’s fight for free speech, as Candace Falk remarks, “was never without an angry charge against the state.” Falk, “Raising Her Voices,” 77.
\textsuperscript{29} “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 2:2 (Apr. 1907): 62.
\textsuperscript{30} “As soon as you admit you have no faith in law,” Robinson noted, “you are at once branded as an enemy of order, a disturber of the peace, a rioter, [and] a dangerous person.” Victor Robinson, “College Education,” \textit{Mother Earth} 2:2 (Apr. 1907): 72-76.
\textsuperscript{31} “‘Tis no more a question of free speech,” she declared; “It is a conspiracy against the spread of Anarchism.” E. G., “Police Education,” \textit{Mother Earth} 1:11 (Jan. 1907): 2-3.
\textsuperscript{32} These incidents included a deadly shooting of a Catholic priest in Denver in February 23, 1908, a shooting at the house of Chicago’s Police Chief in March 2, and a bomb explosion at Union Square in New York in March 28. For an in-depth historical analysis, see Robert J. Goldstein, “The Anarchist Scare of 1908: a Sign of Tensions in the Progressive Era,” \textit{American Studies}, 15:2 (fall 1974): 55-78. Also see \textit{Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II}, 297-299.
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shooting of a so-called anarchist in the police chief’s residence. Severe police measures against Goldman did not keep her from promoting anarchism and instead, drew more public attention to her. Her travelogues mocked police attempts to gag her as counterproductive. She had her undelivered lecture printed in a Chicago newspaper with a circulation of 50,000, alongside an appeal to local residents for support. In Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, Los Angeles, Seattle, and several other cities, police harassed Goldman, her comrades and her audiences in a similar manner. One after another, prominent citizens responded to Goldman’s appeals. Among them was C. E. S. Wood in Portland. An ex-State senator, attorney and poet, Wood offered Goldman timely assistance in May 1908 when the halls in Portland shut her out. Wood’s opening remarks for Goldman’s lecture stressed that local reverends, rabbis, editors, and writers were willing to lend her a helping hand. “Not, you will understand,” Wood told his audience, “that they accept the doctrines of Anarchy. The doctrine is not the point. Human liberty is the point.”

33 On March 2, the Chicago chief of police George Shippy shot and killed an assailant Lazarus Averbush (a Russian Jewish immigrant), who was identified by the police and reported by the press as “an avowed Anarchist and follower of Emma Goldman.” “Police Chief Kills Anarchist in Fight,” New York Times, March 3, 1908. For the newspaper reports, Ben Reitman’s narrative, Goldman’s reply to the Chicago police’s suppression of her talks in the aftermath of the incident, see Ben Reitman, “The Fight for Free Speech,” Mother Earth 3:2 (Apr. 1908): 72-75; Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II, 281-287, 290-294, 297-299.

34 Drinnon, Rebel in Paradise, 122-123.


free-speech campaign in convincing the public to support anarchy. Nonetheless, their limited support enabled her to continue spreading anarchist messages.

Goldman’s resistance to police suppression of her tours developed into a national free-speech movement that gathered nonsectarian support from middle-class intellectuals and influenced public opinion. In January 1909, Goldman started the first of her eight lectures in San Francisco. The police arrested her and Reitman on charges of conspiracy to riot for each of their eight scheduled meetings. The Free Speech League promptly set up a Committee that raised sufficient funds to bail them out.\(^\text{39}\) Goldman’s civil liberties were in further jeopardy after the government annulled her U.S. citizenship in April. The police stopped Goldman from public speaking on eleven different occasions in the month of May.\(^\text{40}\) The police’s forcible dissolution of Goldman’s drama lecture on May 23 in New York provoked great public indignation, above all from bourgeois audiences who suffered rude treatment from law enforcement.\(^\text{41}\) Goldman seized the opportunity to launch a nationwide free-speech movement in cooperation with the Free Speech Committee.\(^\text{42}\) A statement and an appeal in the June 1909 issue of *Mother Earth* made the case for their


\(^{40}\) These eleven venues were in New Haven, Brooklyn, Yonkers, East Orange, and New York. In addition to prohibiting Goldman from speaking, the main method that the police adopted was bullied and threatened the hall keepers with arrest and ruin, so to prevent her from renting the venues to lecture. Emma Goldman, “Our Friends, The Enemy,” *Mother Earth* 4:4 (June 1909): 110-111.


\(^{42}\) The Committee provided important financial, legal, and promotional assistance to the magazine for the movement. In return, *Mother Earth* solicited funds for and paid tributes to the Committee. In April 7, 1911, the Free Speech League was incorporated with the Committee at Albany, New York. “Editorial: The Free Speech League Incorporated,” *The Twentieth Century Magazine* IV:21 (June 1911): 274-275.
movement. The magazine’s “Free Speech Fund” displayed the multicultural and cross-class character of its contributors. Freethinkers, single taxers, trade unionists, progressive liberals, and individual socialists defended Mother Earth’s members through activities of the Free Speech Committee. In 1910, Theodore Schroeder reported that there were three groups waging national free-speech campaigns: the socialist Wobblies; the Free Speech League that he led in defense of freedom of sex-discussion; and Goldman, who was conducting an “effort to secure a hearing for Anarchism.”

Alden Freeman, son of the treasurer of the Standard Oil Company, contributed to Mother Earth’s free-speech fight with individual direct action. Freeman was one of the respectable victims chased out of Goldman’s drama lecture by the police in New York. He offered Goldman his stable as an alternative site after the police prohibited her scheduled lecture in East Orange, New Jersey on June 8, 1909. A crowd of “close upon 1,000 persons” including noted citizens, curious residents, and policemen jammed into Freeman’s barn. Standing on a chair by the light of oil lamps, Goldman delivered the lecture on modern drama that had already been stopped twice. A New York Times reporter described the episode in East Orange as a “triumph” for Goldman despite the police’s initial obstructions.

---

43 A “(General) Free Speech (Defence) Fund” first appeared in December 1906 and last for a few months. It came back in February 1909, first regularly and later sporadically till 1912. Also see Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III, 763-764.


47 “Miss Goldman Talks in Freeman’s Barn.”

*Mother Earth* featured two kinds of narratives to showcase their campaign against police violation of people’s constitutional rights. One narrative contrasted the police’s ruthless suppression with anarchists’ orderly activities. Readers learned how the police had “practiced the habit of stopping meetings, clubbing audiences, bullying speakers and hall keepers.” *Mother Earth*’s writers conjured up an absurd picture of dozens of armed policemen fiercely manhandling a middle-age woman like Goldman and her orderly audiences. The other kind of narrative underscored anarchists’ achievements, even if temporary or limited, in demanding free speech. Goldman stated in 1909 that “the

---

49 Other than the list of names appended to *The Fight for Free Speech*, the editorial of Mother Earth in July 1909 also listed twenty five names of supporters. See “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 4:5 (July 1909): 136.
demand for free speech, signed by a hundred public-spirited men and women and circulated all over the country, worked like magic.”

Mother Earth’s national free-speech movement was fruitful but temporary. For a while, police violence subsided slightly after liberal and radical ranks waged surging protests. Theodore Schroeder reported in May 1910: “I am glad to see that the hysteria over Miss Goldman and Anarchism is subsiding a little.” As Goldman summarized in July 1911, the “most remarkable event” of her tour that year was “few police interferences.” For a while, Mother Earth’s free-speech fight settled into a provisional truce with the police. But police had never stopped interfering with Goldman’s lectures.

The police’s common tactic was to intimidate hall keepers to prevent her from accessing

---

57 Wexler, Emma Goldman, 179.
lecture venues. Even her lectures on private property could not escape police harassment.\textsuperscript{59} Another wave of protests occurred after the police interfered with Goldman’s scheduled talks at Philadelphia in September 1909. Prominent figures like publisher Horace Traubel, journalist Charles Edward Russell, socialist Rose Pastor Stokes, Anna Strunsky Walling, Alden Freeman, and William Marion Reedy “joined hands with the Anarchists in defense of free speech,” reported Goldman.\textsuperscript{60}

Goldman’s appeal to civil liberty highlighted individual freedom of speech and conscience in the face of violence; for the same reason, she attacked patriotism as “the menace of liberty.”\textsuperscript{61} She believed law enforcement infringed on the free speech of political dissidents and patriotism violated everyone’s free conscience. Patriotism, she argued, manipulated civilians’ minds via education while disciplining soldiers into “wholesale murderers.”\textsuperscript{62} In 1908, a soldier received a dishonorable discharge for shaking hands with Goldman after he attended her lecture. His military trial and its aftermath provided Mother Earth members with a good case to denounce patriotic violence. They presented this case as the man’s conversion from militarism to anarchism and welcomed the ex-soldier to join their ranks. To Goldman, his action was a powerful condemnation of the militant nature of patriotism.

\textbf{A Converted Soldier: Denouncing Patriotic Violence}

Goldman met with First-class Private William Buwalda in San Francisco in April 1908 when she was enduring police suppression from coast to coast. As soon as she and

\textsuperscript{61} Goldman, “Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty.”
\textsuperscript{62} Goldman, “Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty.”
Reitman arrived in town, the local police kept them under close surveillance. Goldman recalled that the San Francisco police chief informed her of the rumors that she had come to “blow up the American fleet now in the harbor.” Those kinds of rumors helped fuel the tension in San Francisco during her visit. Buwalda, who had served in the U.S. army for fifteen years, was then stationed at the Presidio in San Francisco. He was one of the five thousand people who attended Goldman’s final lecture in town on “Patriotism.”

Alexander Horr’s tour review captured the scene of Buwalda’s public encounter with Goldman:

The crowning episode…took place when Miss Goldman, in receiving the greetings and congratulations of friends after the lecture, found herself face-to-face with a soldier lad in the uniform of the Engineering Corps, who came up to shake hands with her and thank her for the pleasure he experienced in listening to her lecture. The remarkable spectacle affected every one present; it was grand, and the audience rose to the occasion. Someone suggested three cheers for Miss Goldman, and pandemonium reigned just long enough for the Police Department to get its breath.

The contrast between Goldman, the anarchist lambasting patriotism, and Buwalda, the uniformed soldier symbolizing patriotism, made their amicable interaction conspicuous. Goldman later remembered this occurrence as “a dramatic ending to a highly dramatic situation” during her stay in San Francisco.

The real drama had only just begun. After the lecture, several plainclothes policemen followed Buwalda to his base and informed the military authorities of his behavior. The military soon arrested and court-martialed him on the charge of violating the 62nd Article of War. In short, he was guilty of disrespecting the U.S. army by showing sympathy to Goldman. General Frederick Funston, Buwalda’s commanding officer, publicly blamed

---

66 For the Buwalda case and trial, see George B. Davis to William Howard Taft, June 19, 1908, cited from *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years*, Vol. II, 328-331.
Goldman for luring Buwalda “to commit the worst crime an American soldier could.”\textsuperscript{67} After a trial that gained nationwide attention, Buwalda received a dishonorable discharge and a five-year sentence at Alcatraz prison.\textsuperscript{68} President Roosevelt pardoned Buwalda in July for the reason that the too severe imprisonment might evoke public sympathy for him.\textsuperscript{69} Buwalda was released on December 31, 1908.

*Mother Earth*’s coverage soon established Buwalda as a victim of patriotic violence that deprived him of his freedom of speech and conscience. Berkman’s editorial in June 1908 criticized military authorities for committing “a most unheard-of incident,” an “outrage…in our free country.”\textsuperscript{70} He ridiculed the “extreme growth of militarism” under the leadership of Roosevelt, who had won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906. Berkman concluded that “An energetic anti-militarist propaganda is the need of the hour. The case of Buwalda is well adapted to initiate the movement.”\textsuperscript{71} C. E. S. Wood, when presiding at Goldman’s lecture in Portland in May, stated that Buwalda’s trial exposed the military’s breach of civil rights and human freedom.\textsuperscript{72} Goldman, in an article entitled “What I Believe,” utilized Buwalda’s case to articulate her stance on free speech and anti-militarism.\textsuperscript{73} When the MEPA issued the pamphlet version of Goldman’s *Patriotism*

\textsuperscript{67} “Funston Says Buwalda is a Lucky Man,” *East Oregonian* [Pendleton, OR], evening edition, May 27, 1908.
\textsuperscript{68} Buwalda’s sentence was soon reduced to three years in deference to his exemplary military service. The media coverage of Buwalda’s case ranged from coast to coast, including periodicals published in Minnesota, Florida, Nebraska, Washington, Oregon, New York, even Hawaii, and more. For examples, see “Penalty May be Severe,” *The Bemidji Daily Pioneer* [Bemidji, MN], May 13, 1908. “He Sympathized With Anarchist,” *The Pensacola Journal* [Pensacola, FL], May 20, 1908, p. 8. “Buwalda Will be Freed,” *The Spokane Press* [Spokane, WA], July 21, 1908. “Asiatic Labor is Discussed,” *The Hawaiian Star* [Honolulu, HI], August 11, 1908.
\textsuperscript{69} Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. II, 335-338.
\textsuperscript{70} “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 3:4 (June 1908): 179.
\textsuperscript{71} “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 3:4 (June 1908): 179.
\textsuperscript{72} C. E. S. Wood, “In Portland,” 197-203.
\textsuperscript{73} Goldman condemned General Funston’s public statement that Buwalda’s action was “worse than desertion” and “equal to treason.” Funston’s opinion that Buwalda would not be charged if he had had attended the socialist, instead of anarchist, meetings also triggered Goldman’s anger. Goldman, *What I Believe*; originally
in late 1908, she added details of the Buwalda case to illustrate the incompatibility of patriotism and free speech.74 She argued that although Buwalda lost his military position and pension, “he regained his self-respect” and ultimately his freedom to think and express his opinions.75 Goldman also raised funds for Buwalda and appealed to her readers to protest on his behalf.76

*Mother Earth*’s coverage portrayed Buwalda’s encounter with Goldman as the turning point in his conversion to anarchism. The magazine omitted the fact that Buwalda denied being an anarchist and that he did not agree with Goldman’s views during his trial as reported in other presses.77 Rather, *Mother Earth*’s narratives emphasized that his dishonorable discharge was clear evidence of his rejection of the military and its values. That said, Buwalda’s life had no doubt changed after meeting and shaking hands with Goldman. Reports in *Mother Earth* continued to depict Buwalda as a “born again” anarchist and to update readers about his life. After his release from prison, Buwalda showed up at Goldman’s lecture in San Francisco in January 1909 and gave a statement. The next evening, he called on Goldman and accompanied her to the Victory Theatre for her second lecture. The police arrested not only Goldman and Reitman but also Buwalda, who tried to stand up for the former.78 Berkman’s editorial in May 1909 celebrated the first

---

75 *Patriotism: a Menace to Liberty* was revised from Goldman’s lecture and issued by Mother Earth Publishing Association in 1908. It was later included in Goldman’s essay collection. See Emma Goldman, “Patriotism: a Menace to Liberty,” in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, 127-144.
77 For examples of news report about Buwalda’s trial and how he denied sympathizing with anarchism, see “Buwalda Declares He’s No Anarchist,” The San Francisco Call, May 15, 1908, p. 20. “He Sympathized With Anarchist,” The Pensacola Journal [Pensacola, FL], May 20, 1908, p. 8. “Accused Soldier Says He is Not an Anarchist,” The Labor World [Duluth, MN], May 23, 1908.
78 While Goldman and Reitman’s charges were dropped, Buwalda’s case was dismissed in January 22. “Balked at Frisco,” Rock Island Argus [Rock Island, IL], January 15, 1909. “Emma Goldman Arrested,”
anniversary of Buwalda’s “resurrection into the world of Anarchy.” His editorial cheered on “Comrade” Buwalda’s decision to return a medal awarded to him for faithful service in the Philippine-American War to Washington as “a fitting finale to his emancipation from the military nightmare.” The editorial ended with a quote from Buwalda, which displayed the intellectual effect of anarchist propaganda:

How true was Buwalda’s reply to the question the police recently asked him: “What have the Anarchists ever done for you that you should turn against the government?” “They made me think,” said Buwalda.

The issue also included Buwalda’s letter to the Secretary of War, dated April 6, 1909, explaining the reason he decided to return his medal. The letter was both a confession for Buwalda and his condemnation of the military for committing violence on behalf of the state.

In the following years, Goldman continued to tell the uplifting tale of this soldier-turned-anarchist. She took pleasure in tracking Buwalda’s development for her readers. In March 1911, she reported that it was “doubly pleasant” for her to lecture in Grand Rapids, Michigan for the first time and to be reunited with Buwalda, who lived there with his aged mother. Goldman spun a narrative that implied that Mother Earth had been the source of Buwalda’s anarchistic conversion. She related that Buwalda, while taking care of his mother, had used his time for extensive reading and “for absorption and assimilation of our ideals.” Buwalda kept on organizing Goldman’s lectures in Grand Rapids.

---

80 “Observations and Comments,” Mother Earth 4:3 (May 1909): 68.
81 Buwalda’s letter stated that, while his medal spoke to him of “faithful service, of duty well done, of friendships inseparable,” it also spoke to him of bloodshed, of “raids and burnings,” and “of War—legalized murder, if you will—upon a weak and defenseless people.” “Wm. Buwalda’s Letter to the United States Government,” Mother Earth 4:3 (May 1909): 83.
Rapids after the outbreak of WWI. “He is a shining example for the power of character that will survive all odds,” praised Goldman in 1915.\textsuperscript{83}

*Mother Earth* presented the individual conversion of Buwalda as a witness to anarchism’s power to challenge patriotic violence. Core members observed that the effects of patriotic violence influenced both the military and civilians. Many people with vested interests condemned anarchists and labor activists for threatening the social order and national security. Propertied businessmen and patriotic citizens resorted to violence in response to mounting demands for free speech from political-economic dissidents. Anti-socialist middle class citizens formed vigilante groups in the West Coast were the epitome of the civilian violence against anarchists and labor. In 1912, Goldman and Reitman suffered harsh treatment from vigilantes during their visit to San Diego. The vigilantes effectively prevented Goldman from lecturing and deported Reitman from their city. Goldman, however, refused to succumb to anti-anarchist threats made by vigilante groups, the local press and the police. Three years later, she successfully returned to San Diego to give her lectures. While her victory was only symbolic, it demonstrated the anarchist resolve of *Mother Earth*’s members to confront violent vigilantes with peaceful means.

**The Power of Perseverance: Resisting Civilian Violence**

Goldman publicly denied that she personally advocated violence, and she sought nonviolent means to challenge unconstitutional forces depriving anarchists of their free

speech.\textsuperscript{84} She showed great determination to restore her right to speak in the cities that barred her lectures. She and Reitman mobilized leftist radicals and liberals, even some conservatives, to resist legal and civilian attempts to halt their activities wherever they went.\textsuperscript{85} They worked closely with local Free Speech Leagues that they helped to organize along the road.\textsuperscript{86} Reitman proudly announced that Goldman was able to reinstate her right to speak in Chicago by 1910 within two years of initiating their free-speech campaign. He summed up Goldman’s lecture tours from 1908 to 1911: “We have won successful free speech fights in Chicago, Buffalo, Indianapolis, Cheyenne, Columbus, New Haven, and many other towns.”\textsuperscript{87} However, the “successes” claimed in \textit{Mother Earth} provoked more animosity from citizens in other communities who detested anarchism.

Goldman’s frequent touring to the Pacific Coast involved her and Reitman in escalating vigilante violence against labor, which would culminate in San Diego in 1912. From the late 1900s, migrant and immigrant Wobblies had waged free-speech fights with local authorities in Spokane, Washington and Fresno, California. \textit{Mother Earth}’s editorials endorsed the Wobblies’ street speaking and labor activism.\textsuperscript{88} In January 1911, Berkman

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{84} Candace Falk has aptly argued that Goldman “may have harbored more violent sentiments during the first decade of the twentieth century than many historians previously assumed.” Falk also pointed out that \textit{Mother Earth} “was a convenient cover for concealing her [Goldman’s] role as messenger and defender of the underground movement as well as strategizer for crafting the cadence of a public message that would keep them out of jail.” But in public, Goldman had insisted that neither she nor anarchism advocated violence. Falk, “Raising Her Voice,” 1-3, 41.
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Mother Earth} members had condemned the municipal authorities and vigilante forces for suppressing the Wobblies. For examples, see “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 5:9 (Nov. 1910): 274-275; “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 5:11 (Jan. 1911): 338; Charles Ashleigh, “To the Gentlemen of the Press,” \textit{Mother Earth} 11:12 (Feb. 1917): 772-774. For a comprehensive scholarly study of these IWW’s free speech fights, see Matthew S. May, \textit{Soapbox Rebellion}.  
\end{flushleft}
editorialized the IWW’s free-speech fight in Fresno, CA, which turned out to be strikingly similar to what happened in San Diego the following year:

A mob of “respectable citizens” took the law into their own hands. Incited by the Fresno papers, which has been suggesting a “Vigilance Committee” for weeks, this mob attacked the I. W. W. headquarters, burned the same, and assaulted and tried to drive out of town all I. W. W. members they could get their hands on. The mob even attempted to storm the jail with threats to lynch the fifty or more union men held therein. The masters, defeated in their attempts at legal trickery, resorted to open violence.89

Before 1912, Wobblies in San Diego had resisted the suppression of San Diego authorities and the vigilante force for years.90 In early 1912, the local Wobblies in San Diego adopted “passive resistance” to a new ordinance restricting their free speech by continuing public speaking, flooding the jail when they were arrested, and demanding individual trials to congest the courts and paralyze the community’s legal machinery.91 On March 18, some property owners, commercial bodies, and patriotic residents formed a vigilante committee targeting the IWW. Inflammatory editorials from local newspapers incited the vigilantes to use violence to avenge their “outraged honor” against the unruly

89 “Observations and Comments,” Mother Earth 5:11 (Jan. 1911): 338
91 The local Wobblies had started organizing in 1906, had suffered police violence for their soapbox oratory and labor protests. On January 8, 1912, the City Council of San Diego passed an ordinance forbidding street meetings and speeches. Theodore Schroeder, “History of the San Diego Free Speech Fight,” 117. According to the IWW official website, the IWW first used the terms “passive resistance” in IWW publications in 1910. See “Chronology (1904-1911),” accessed Dec. 17, 2015, http://www.iww.org/about/chronology/1. Also see Melvyn Dubofsky, We Shall be All: A History of the Industrial Workers of the World, ed. Joseph A. McCartin (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 92. A Report of Harris Weinstock, Commissioner to Investigate the Recent Disturbances in the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego, California to His Excellency Hiram W. Johnson, Governor of California (Sacramento: Superintendent of State Printing, 1912), 8-9, 12.
Wobblies. The armed vigilantes kidnapped, tortured, threatened, and ejected the free-speech fighters from town with help from local police. Goldman reported in *Mother Earth* that by April 1912, San Diego was “in the grip of a veritable civil war.” She raised some funds during her tours to support their persecuted comrades in San Diego.

Goldman and, above all, Reitman suffered from civilian violence in San Diego in May 1912. It was so severe that the incident warranted a special issue of *Mother Earth* to expose the “Cossack Regime” there. *Mother Earth* had previously called national attention to the Wobblies’ deadly free-speech fight in San Diego. After San Diego police killed a Wobbly Joseph Mikolasek in May 7, Goldman and Reitman insisted on going there to join the Wobblies’ battle. Goldman chose to lecture on Henrik Ibsen’s *An Enemy of the People*, a subject that she deemed apropos to the situation. In response, the San Diego vigilantes treated Goldman and Reitman as enemies of the people. They detailed their experiences in *Mother Earth*’s June 1912 issue — “the San Diego Edition.” Its front cover revealed the violent conspiracy of socially respectable people against labor under the pretext of patriotism. (Image 26) The illustration features a stout man, in a suit and top hat with a cigar between his teeth, trampling on a half-naked worker tethered to the ground. The man in the suit gags the worker by inserting an American flag pole into his mouth. The portrait, with the respectable-looking man wearing a mask, indicated the conflicting mixture of banditry and respectability that characterized the behavior of bourgeois

---

92 *A Report of Harris Weinstock*, 17-19. Also see “San Diego’s Fight is the Fight of the Whole Union,” *San Francisco Call*, 111:170 (May 18, 1912): 14; “San Diego’s ‘Free Speech’ Troubles,” *The Literary Digest* [New York], XLIV: 22 (June 1, 1912): 1146.
97 This illustration was by courtesy of the Warheit, (the Truth), a Yiddish socialist, pro-Zionist paper. (See Image 19)
vigilantes. Nearby, there is a smoking kettle heating over a fire, which implies the burning tar being prepared to torture the workers.


The illustration demonstrated the privileged class’s self-righteous civilian violence against labor. Berkman emphasized that the articles in the Edition contained nothing but “the plain, unvarnished facts.” The editorial account opened with a description of the vigilantes’ “ruthless murder and unspeakable outrages perpetrated against the workers” in San Diego. In order to show its objectivity, the account cited Colonel H. Weinstock’s account of the incident. He was the commissioner appointed by the Governor of California to investigate the situation in San Diego. Focusing on Weinstock’s denunciation of vigilante violence, *Mother Earth*’s account left out his criticism of the Wobblies’ anti-capitalistic militancy. The editor quoted Weinstock as saying that each vigilante “has in the eyes of the law, made of himself a criminal—a far greater criminal than those

---

100 A Report of Harris Weinstock, 5-8.
whom he brands as ‘Anarchists,’ ‘revolutionist,’ ‘dynamiters’ and ‘the scum of the earth.’”\textsuperscript{101} A list of twenty five leading vigilantes’ names and occupations followed the account; they included banker, reporter, realtor, rancher, businessmen, and contractor, among others.\textsuperscript{102}

The “San Diego Edition” exposed the police, vigilantes and the local press’s conspiracy to commit violence and to counter the apathetic news response to Reitman’s suffering. The editor chose the title “Patriotism in Action” to underline the close connection between patriotism and civilian violence. According to Goldman, the vigilantes lured her and Reitman into separate rooms in their hotel, abducted Reitman, and forced her out of town.\textsuperscript{103} Reitman recounted the “cruel and inhuman treatment” he suffered from “the respectable mob” of fourteen vigilantes. They kicked, beat, bit, and poked him, stripped off his clothes, burned “I.W.W.” on his buttocks with a lit cigar, and tarred and sage-brushed him. Then they forced him to kneel down and kiss the American flag, sing the national anthem, and run the gauntlet. Finally, they gave him his underwear and vest back with his money and a train ticket to Los Angeles.\textsuperscript{104} The “San Diego Edition” provided a major corrective to the versions of events presented in some non-anarchist newspapers.\textsuperscript{105}

The capitalist *Washington Times* and the socialist *The Masses* both mocked Reitman for

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{101} “The Cossack Régime in San Diego.” The passage was quoted from *A Report of Harris Weinstock*, 20.
  \item \textsuperscript{102} “Leaders of Murderous Vigilantes Pilloried,” *Mother Earth* 7:4 (June 1912): 108.
  \item \textsuperscript{103} Emma Goldman, “The Outrage of San Diego,” *Mother Earth* 7:4 (June 1912): 115-122.
  \item \textsuperscript{104} Ben L. Reitman, “The Respectable Mob,” *Mother Earth* 7:4 (June 1912): 109-114.
  \item \textsuperscript{105} *Mother Earth* was a rare example of a labor-inclined publication that reached a sizeable non-anarchist and international audience. According to Candace Falk, Goldman’s testimony, entitled “The Outrage of San Diego,” was extensively circulated among English-speaking anarchists. It was also translated into Italian in June 1912. See *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III*, 373. Most of the capitalist press did not join the papers of the anarchists and industrial unionists (like *Mother Earth*, *Solidarity*, and *The Industrial Worker*) in their denunciation of the San Diego outrages. Goldman and Reitman also revealed how the local newspapers, notably San Diego Union and Tribune, fueled the vigilante violence against them.
\end{itemize}
the way he suffered because of the “direct action” of vigilantes in San Diego. Max Eastman wrote his editorial in *The Masses* in a satirical tone:

> The treatment accorded to Dr. Ben Reitman by the San Diego vigilantes is unspeakable... But how about the anarchists? They believe in direct action... If any of them have a sense of humor, will they kindly tell us what was wrong with the directness of the action of these vigilantes, who evidently represented a majority of the people of San Diego? Or does this thing work only one way?106

Similarly, the reporter from *The Washington Times* scoffed at Reitman by noting that the San Diego vigilantes simply adopted the anarchist belief in “ignoring all the red tape of legal processes” to deal with them.107 In response, Berkman denounced socialist writers’ conflation of vigilante violence with anarchist direct action as either “sheer idiocy or calculated misrepresentation.” He continued, “For the benefit of those apt to be misled by the vicious misrepresentations of journalistic whores—be they capitalist or Socialist—it is necessary only to mention that the very essence of Anarchy is non-invasion.”108 His remark explicitly differentiated anarchy from the invasive nature of authorities’ use of violence. Other *Mother Earth* writers told the anarchist side of the events to defend their anti-militarist principles.

After the traumatic San Diego incident, Goldman outdid Reitman in her determination to reclaim anarchists’ right to speak in San Diego. Their first attempt together on May 20, 1913 failed. Local police arrested her and Reitman upon their arrival and forced them to leave the city with the excuse of protecting their safety. Several thousand residents under vigilante leadership showed up and threatened Reitman’s life. Reitman admitted to *Mother

---

Earth’s readers that they had been forced to leave San Diego. He mocked himself, saying “We are all cowards” in June 1912 and, a year later, “I am done with San Diego until I get ready to commit suicide.” Reitman only spoke for himself, for Goldman resolved to return to San Diego even if it took the rest of her life. She promised that she would conquer the “wild savagery” there and face the “mob” that repeatedly chased them out of town. While Reitman’s decision was understandable given the physical torture he had suffered, Goldman’s statement showed her uncompromising determination to stand against vigilante violence.

Goldman’s next visit to San Diego in June 1915 symbolically restored free speech for the city’s anarchists. Musician and anarchist sympathizer George Edwards reported Goldman’s success in San Diego. The local “Open Forum,” a group of free-speech defenders including Edwards, resisted ongoing vigilante threats by inviting Goldman to lecture. Edwards hailed June 20, 1915, when Goldman finally spoke in San Diego, as “the date of triumph” for free speech. The liberal attitude of the newly-elected Mayor Edwin M. Capps also facilitated their planned lectures. Berkman, who had moved to the West Coast with Fitzi, was in charge of arranging Goldman’s lectures on this occasion.

109 Reitman wrote that “I pointed out in my article in MOTHER EARTH of last June that the Vigilantes worked under the protection of the police. This year it looked as if the police worked under the guidance of the Vigilantes.” Ben L. Reitman, “San Diego Again,” Mother Earth 8:4 (June 1913): 111-113.
113 The Open Forum was organized by “a little band of indignant people” soon after the vigilantes drove Goldman and Reitman out of town in 1912. It held meetings every Sunday afternoon, with a Baptist minister A. Lyle de Jarnette as the chairman. George Edwards was one of the members. The Open Forum’s membership grew to several hundred in three years. George Edwards, “Free Speech in San Diego,” Mother Earth 10:5 (July 1915): 182-185.
115 Berkman and Fitzi were in Los Angeles when Goldman traveled there. Berkman went to San Diego two days before Goldman’s departure to arrange for her lecture activities. Fitzi accompanied Goldman to San
Goldman gave three talks, not specifically about anarchism, without any interruptions. Edwards argued that Goldman’s restored freedom to lecture in San Diego was the “intellectual salvation not only of the [free-speech] martyrs, but of all the inhabitants of the city.” Accordingly, Goldman left a large amount of anarchist literature, and collected “a goodly number of subscriptions” to *Mother Earth* there. Goldman’s return to San Diego affirmed her belief “that an ideal backed by determination, will overcome all obstacles, that the ideal alone is worth living and daring for.”

Similar triumphs for free speech, even those that were more symbolic than substantial, occurred in Philadelphia in 1914. Goldman was unable to lecture there from 1909 to 1914. She concluded that her lecture arranged by the local Free Speech League on March 9, 1914 was a “tremendous success”, “not only because of its size, but because of the complete backdown of the authorities, which is only another proof that perseverance in behalf of an ideal inevitably leads to recognition. Five years ago Anarchism was silenced in Philadelphia. On March 9, 1914, it rang out its clarion voice more powerful than ever.”

The propertied class’s violence against labor and anarchists sharpened class antagonisms; core members of *Mother Earth* responded with direct action to fight the capitalists. They focused on exposing the militaristic nature of capitalism, which not only...
exploited workers, but also violently infringed on their right to unionize and protest. Contrary to the SPA’s parliamentary method, these anarchists advocated syndicalism as the direct means to organize labor and to facilitate a class war. Countering intensified corporate violence, a few of the members chose to retaliate against capital to show their solidarity with labor victims.

**From Syndicalism to Retaliation: Struggles against Corporate Violence**

Goldman and her comrades had identified labor as the main force to carry out the social revolution while promoting their cause among intellectual supporters. The inner circle endorsed Kropotkin’s claim that only “the collective work of the masses” could make the new social forms possible. They believed that the general strike was the key for shaping labor into a united force to overthrow wage slavery and the state. The industrial general strike, its concept and practices originated before the organized anarchist movement. Beginning in the late 1880s, anarchist communists replaced earlier individualist means of terrorist assassination with collective tactics like sabotage, boycott, and the general strike. *Mother Earth*’s anarchists inherited this tendency to uphold labor’s direct economic action and denounce any indirect political action. The magazine’s first issue specified that “Capitalism has expropriated the human race, the General Strike aims to expropriate capitalism.” Tactically, the general strike channeled labor’s everyday

---

123 Kropotkine, “(no title),” *Mother Earth* 1:2 (Apr. 1906): 42.
125 Berkman repeatedly criticized the negotiations between labor and capital held by the American Federation of Labor (AFL). For him, the AFL’s craft unionism was “spineless” in its compromise with employers at the expense of workers’ class consciousness. Instead, *Mother Earth* endorsed “the intelligent co-operation of all the workers of any given industry,” such as the IWW’s Wobblies. “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 4:3 (May 1909): 71; “Observations and Comments,” *Mother Earth* 4:7 (Sept. 1909): 194.
direct action and single union strikes into a formidable force to create a class war.\textsuperscript{127} “Direct action,” Berkman proclaimed, “began with small, insignificant local strikes and is developing into a tremendous world movement of the cooperation of all workers for the final General Social Strike.”\textsuperscript{128} The kind of general strike that Max Baginski envisioned could paralyze the production and distribution lines to give capital and the state a serious blow.\textsuperscript{129}

Core members’ emphasis on labor’s direct, autonomous participation in the social revolution contributed to their advocacy of syndicalism. Syndicalism had its roots and early organization in France around 1895.\textsuperscript{130} By 1910, syndicalism drew the attention of the American press.\textsuperscript{131} Syndicalists’ objective was to replace capitalism with federated sets of syndicates (unions) managed by workers. As the “revolutionary philosophy of labor” as Goldman defined it, syndicalism sought to inspire workers’ solidarity and spontaneous action to take back their autonomy from their employers.\textsuperscript{132} Goldman


\textsuperscript{128} “Observations and Comments,”\textit{Mother Earth} 7:12 (Feb. 1913): 398.

\textsuperscript{129} “Should Labor cease to produce,” Max Baginski assured, “the entire structure of our society would crumble to ashes.” Max Baginski, “Aim and Tactics of the Trades-Union Movement,”\textit{Mother Earth} 1:5 (July 1906): 27-32.

\textsuperscript{130} Goldman stated that Robert Owen had spread similar ideas of syndicalism in mid-nineteenth-century England. The convention of the First International in 1867 also incorporated the idea of syndicalism, which, after the Marx-Bakunin split, was continued by the anarchists. While the idea of syndicalism sprang much earlier, its practice was prominently known in fin-de-siècle France, led by the Confédération générale du travail (General Confederation of Labor), formed in 1895. Emma Goldman, “Syndicalism: Its Theory and Practice,”\textit{Mother Earth} 7:11 (Jan. 1913): 373-378; Emma Goldman, “Syndicalism: Its Theory and Practice,”\textit{Mother Earth} 7:12 (Feb. 1913): 417-422.


introduced syndicalism in her 1907 lecture as “a new phase of the labor struggle.”

Syndicalism was, she wrote, “in essence, the economic expression of Anarchism.”

Through syndicalism, anarchists prepared the workers for “the task of reconstructing
society along autonomous industrial lines.” They considered the syndicate to be one of
several forms of voluntary association for collective production that could materialize in
a stateless, master-less and egalitarian anarchy.

Mother Earth’s syndicalist approach highlighted the anti-militarist nature of the
general strike. Syndicalists shared similar tactics with anarchists by promoting economic
direct action, sabotage, boycotts, and the general strike as its combat tactics. Goldman
argued that syndicalism was instrumental in cultivating labor’s practice of everyday
direct action, sabotage in the workplace, single strikes and then the general strike to bring
down capitalism. Syndicalists’ anti-military agitation, argued Goldman, was “most
practical and far-reaching, inasmuch as it robs the enemy of his strongest weapon against
labor.” The most effectual “anti-military agitation” of syndicalism was none other than
the general strike. The general strikes in European countries had played a crucial role in
prompting workers to resist military conscription. Since the military was a critical
armed hindrance to their ultimate goal of waging social revolution, syndicalists (just like
anarchists) were by default all anti-militarists. Goldman’s editorial in June 1916
contrasted the “usually unarmed” strikers to the “well armed” “thugs of Mammon” who

136 R. D. Marmande, “Revolutionary Forces in France,” Mother Earth 3:2 (Apr. 1908): 100-107. This
article was translated from Le Courrier Européen.
137 Goldman, “Syndicalism.”
138 Rocker, Anarcho-Syndicalism, 70, 109-130.
served the ruling class. She and her comrades believed that the general strike would achieve labor’s plans to stop serving capital in the work force and stop serving the state in the military.

With regard to American syndicalism, *Mother Earth’s* members conditionally sanctioned the practices of the Wobblies. The IWW’s revolutionary industrial unionism stood for syndicalism in the U.S.; but not all of its members considered it a syndicalist organization. In its first issue, *Mother Earth’s* writers praised the IWW for giving American laborers a promising alternative to the AFL’s trade-union methods. But Berkman and other anarchists disapproved of the IWW’s preamble, which advocated an economic and political dual approach to class struggle. Berkman considered the dual approach inappropriate for the IWW’s proclaimed militant and revolutionary character. Though the IWW removed the reference to political action in its preamble in 1908,

---

142 The second paragraph of the preamble of IWW read: “Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the political, as well as on the industrial field, and take hold that which they produce by their labor, through an economic organization of the working class without affiliation with any political party.” See “Preamble as adopted by the 1905 I.W.W. Convention.”
Berkman and Goldman continued to point out its gradual tendency toward centralization, press censorship, sectarianism, and antagonism towards skilled organized labor.144

A few core members of *Mother Earth* formed the Syndicalist League on October 11, 1912 as an alternative solution to promote syndicalism under a wider, cross-class foundation.145 Harry Kelly explained the rationale for such an organization in *Mother Earth*.146 He addressed three flaws of the IWW (lack of autonomy of trades, power in the hands of a few, and exclusion of skilled laborers) and the need to fix them. Intriguingly, Kelly also saw their proposed Syndicalist League as a remedy to *Mother Earth*’s existing approach. He thought that English-language anarchist propaganda “has been carried on largely among the small middle class” and lost touch with labor.147 Although he did not specify a particular magazine, Kelly was implying *Mother Earth*. He had criticized (Goldman-led) U.S. anarchist propaganda for putting too much emphasis on self-expression and not enough on humanitarian endeavor.148 What Kelly proposed, however, was not ignoring the middle class, but rather incorporating their personal anti-authoritarian impulses into the collective movement for socioeconomic equality. The Syndicalist League that he had in mind would organize the “small middle class, writers, teachers, doctors, lawyers, etc., and furnish an outlet for their activity.”149 In a way,

---

145 The Syndicalist League, with Hippolyte Havel as secretary and Harry Kelly as treasurer, was not the same as The Syndicalist League in North America (SLNA) founded by the labor activist William Z. Foster. For the founding of SLNA, see Johanningsmeier, *Forging American Communism*, 56-87. I appreciate Dr. Barry Pateman’s information.
Kelly and Goldman both wanted to revolutionize intellectual proletarians to join the ranks of labor. But while Goldman adopted an inclusive approach where she wooed them by explicating anarchism, Kelly stressed the role of collective actions that would lead to social revolution.

The Syndicalist League’s manifesto declared its goal to maximize syndicalism’s revolutionary effects on all wage-earners for the sake of creating a social revolution. With two core members, Hippolyte Havel and Harry Kelly, as the secretary and the treasurer respectively, the Syndicalist League was categorically anarcho-communist. Appearing in *Mother Earth*’s November 1912 issue, the manifesto explained how the League intended to help unorganized laborers to organize themselves into unions/syndicates. Furthermore, the League intended to enlighten the entire class of wage earners—including intellectual professionals—about the importance of syndicalism and its use of direct action and the general strike. In a way, the League intended to be a bridge between physical laborers and intellectual laborers so they could collaborate to bring down capitalism.

In line with their syndicalist tactics, *Mother Earth*’s members heightened their resistance to the intensified violence against labor. The dreadful San Diego free-speech fights overshadowed the IWW’s victory in the Lawrence Textile Strike in early 1912. Several months before the formation of the Syndicalist League, Havel and Kelly joined Berkman to issue an open letter protesting the editorial silence of the New York press over

---

150 “The Syndicalist League,” its manifesto announced, “represents the modern revolutionary labor movement in its aim of expropriating the possessing class and of establishing a free economic society based on voluntary cooperation and the principle: To each according to his needs, from which according to his ability.” “The Syndicalist Educational League,” *Mother Earth* 7:9 (Nov. 1912): 307-308.

151 The League was not “a new rival to the existing labor organizations,” its manifesto stressed. Rather they were fighting against all the “indirect political tactics” that misled, corrupted, and compromised the labor movement. “The Syndicalist Educational League,” *Mother Earth* 7:9 (Nov. 1912): 307-308.

the San Diego terror. The letter underscored the severe persecution and vicious physical violence that American anarchists endured despite the reality that they had propagated their ideas in a “peaceful manner” for years. “Terror from above breeds terror below;” warned the letter. It showcased the anarchist logic of justified violence. They believed that the capitalist system conspired with the government to create wage slavery. Through wage slavery, laborers were deprived of the means of production, proper earnings, freedom, and dignity. Since laborers were being exploited, they could not be blamed for rising up and demanding that the situation change. When the government responded to their demands with violence, they could justly resist it in kind. Hence violence (from the top down) begets violence (from the bottom up) as “a matter of self-defense,” declared Berkman, Havel, and Kelly. The self-defense sanctioned by the three anarchists was retaliatory in nature. It was telling that there were no liberals who endorsed this letter as they had endorsed the manifesto of the Free Speech League. The anarchists’ open letter included a tactical, if not ideological, line that most non-anarchists were reluctant to cross even for the cause of free speech.

Corporate violence—joined by the police, civilian, and state forces—against labor peaked in 1914, fanning some Mother Earth members’ militancy. Early that year, the surge of unrest by unemployed people in New York and elsewhere gave anarchists and the IWW causes for agitation. Berkman defended the unemployed workers’ “church invasion” led by Frank Tannenbaum. Soon, corporate violence at the mines of the

---

154 In February 1914, the unemployed workers staged a “church invasion.” They would tramp from church to church and ask for food and shelter. Frank Tannenbaum, the leader of the “church invaders,” frequented Mother Earth’s office and the Ferrer Center. The arrest and conviction of Tannenbaum (a year in prison) in March 4 for inciting to riot provoked protests from his anarchist and IWW comrades and many radicals. Alexander Berkman, “The Movement of the Unemployed,” Mother Earth 9:2 (Apr. 1914): 36-43;
Rockefeller-owned Colorado Fuel and Iron Company in Ludlow, Colorado escalated the class confrontation between labor and capital. The inner circle of *Mother Earth* held John D. Rockefeller, Jr. responsible for the mass killing of coal strikers and their families in Ludlow on April 20, 1914. The magazine and many other presses denounced the incident as the “Ludlow Massacre.” The public condemned the murderers. In reaction to the massacre, Hippolyte Havel exclaimed that, “If there ever was a time when labor had cause to proclaim a general uprising, now is such a time.” Earlier that month, the U.S. military occupation of Veracruz, Mexico also heightened *Mother Earth*’s anti-militarist tone. The May issue discussed how the “Ludlow Massacre” and the invasion of Mexico were both evidence of American plutocratic militarism. When war with Mexico was imminent, Berkman demanded that workers first assist the Colorado strikers and then go on a general strike to thwart Wilson’s war efforts. His cry to “answer the enemy’s challenge in the proper spirit” had both militant and retaliatory connotations.

---


157 Hippolyte Havel, “The Civil War in Colorado.”


Berkman and Goldman time after time editorialized that militarism revealed the
plutocratic and hypocritical nature of the American government. Although Congress
passed antitrust laws during the Progressive Era, anarchists had no trust in the government
to represent the interests of labor. They believed that various agents of the government
(the national guards, militias, and law and judicial enforcement) served corporate interests.
They spoke from experience when they discussed the ways that official agents were
deployed to inflict militarist violence upon laborers, strikers, and anarchists. To back up
Goldman and Berkman’s claims, Kathy Ferguson assembled a long list that describes
incidents of state and corporate violence against labor in the U.S. from 1874 to 1940.
Writing in 1908, Goldman stated that “The spirit of militarism has already permeated all
walks of life” in America; “because of the many bribes capitalism holds out to those
whom it wishes to destroy.”

*Mother Earth* anarchists’ objection to aggravated militarism at home and abroad
crystallized in the formation of the Anti-Militarist League in April 1914 in New York.
Berkman, Leonard Abbott, Becky Edelsohn, and Fitzi were the main organizers. The
League shared office space with that of *Mother Earth.* In the pages of *Mother Earth,*
Berkman stated the League’s objectives and updated the readers on its activities. “It was
for the purpose of calling public attention to Colorado,” he explained, “as well as to stem
the fever of jingoism fanned by the capitalist press,” that the League came into being.
Berkman felt that “no propaganda is more urgently needed in this patriotically drunken

---

160 The legislative efforts of the U.S. government to regulate competition amid the rapidly developed big
corporations during the Progressive Era included the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890, the Federal Trade
Commission Act and the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914. See Herbert Hovenkemp, *Federal Antitrust Policy,
162 Goldman, “Patriotism,” in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, 127-144.
163 *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III*, 735-737. Berkman was the
Secretary-Treasurer of the Anti-Militarist League.
land than an effective anti-militarist agitation."164 The Anti-Militarist League held daily meetings in various places, nightly sessions, and weekend mass rallies as its means of agitation. It distributed anti-militarist literature, soliciting funds for the Colorado striking miners, and formed local chapters among groups of different nationalities and in other cities.165 Local chapters of the Anti-Militarist League in Denver and Patterson, New Jersey held mass meetings to protest the military outrages in Colorado.166

While Goldman continued to reclaim her right to speak in different cities on the tour, Berkman planned a string of retaliatory actions in New York. The Ludlow Massacre enraged anarchists, Wobblies, and the unemployed in New York and inspired them to protest. A group of Wobblies and anarchists protested in front of Rockefeller’s downtown office and his mansion in Tarrytown. The police broke up their meetings in Tarrytown on May 30 and 31 and prohibited their public demonstrations. In *Mother Earth*, Leonard Abbott reported that the police arrested and wrongly accused a dozen anarchists of disorderly conduct, blocking traffic, and endangering public health.167 Tarrytown residents also joined the police in assaulting peaceful protesters. These attacks drove Berkman to conclude, “with machine guns trained upon the strikers, the best answer is—dynamite.”168

For Berkman, the term “dynamite” represented both real bombs and the explosive effect

---


of the general strike. Using dynamite symbolized the extreme and targeted form of revenge that he wanted to exact for all the murdered and suffering workers. The result, as Chapter 1 explained, was the loss of three IWW anarchists who made a bomb and died after it accidentally exploded on July 4. At the funeral for the three deceased comrades, Berkman stated that the “capitalist society [i]s guilty of creating the spirit which can find expression only in such violent methods.” He honored his three late comrades as “the conscious, brave and determined spokesmen of the working class.” Berkman’s retaliation resulted in the death of his comrades, but he did not give up on agitating labor to take action. Goldman was upset about the imprudent operation (in a crowded tenement house) and dismayed by the “violent character” of Mother Earth’s July issue. Nonetheless, she incessantly raised funds for both her East Coast comrades and the Ludlow strikers when touring in the West.

The outbreak of WWI in August 1914 instantly excited jingoism but it also incited antiwar pacifism from various groups including Mother Earth. Goldman described the Anti-Militarist League in October as an “international family of anti-militarists.” She called for international proletarian solidarity to oppose militarism. She and her comrades’ intensified antiwar activism from 1914 on aroused public sympathy for anarchist causes but lead to the demise of the magazine.

Antiwar at Home and Abroad: Climactic Anti-Militarism against State Violence

---

The inner circle’s free-speech and anti-militarist activism during WWI epitomized their anarchist-specific fights against the Establishment and the state. For them, the threat of U.S. militarism loomed large in the invasion of Mexico, in its support for capital in the labor war of Ludlow, and in its violation of individual freedom in the name of war. Unlike pacifists, *Mother Earth*’s anarchists promoted labor’s general strike to replace capitalistic militarism and disable international warfare. Nonetheless, except for the Wobblies who also suffered government suppression, the majority of American workers refused to participate in the general strike as a response to the imminent war. Core members’ anti-state ideology prevented them from forming coalitions with other pacifist groups. Many pacifists gradually capitulated to the intense patriotism that ensued after America entered WWI in April 1917, while Goldman and Berkman escalated their antiwar campaign. Kropotkin’s defection in support of the Allies stood in contrast to *Mother Earth*’s activism against conscription. It turned out to be Goldman and Berkman’s last battle on U.S. soil.

Before Goldman returned to New York in September 1914, Becky Edelsohn managed to boost the anarchist morale against militarism by waging a personal battle against legal injustice. Police arrested her for “disorderly conduct” when she spoke at an antiwar meeting on April 22, 1914. She acted as her own attorney in court, “making a splendid

---

173 Stephen M. Feldman, *Free Expression and Democracy in America: A History* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008), 230-234. There was actually a wave of antiwar sentiment among U.S. workers after the outbreak of WWI; but the coalition of the American Federation of Labor and the Wilson administration prevented the workers from successfully rebelling against the government via labor unrests or the general strike. For a comprehensive study of the relations among the labor organizations, the socialists, the IWW, and the Wilson administration during WWI, see Elizabeth McKillen, *Making the World Safe for Workers: Labor, the Left, and Wilsonian Internationalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013).

174 Edelsohn organized an antiwar meeting to protest the U.S. invasion of Mexico at Franklin’s Statue in the Lower Manhattan of New York City. At her trial, the court sentenced her either a $300 bond (but was subject to the police order whenever she spoke publicly) or 90 days in jail. Unwilling to be deprived of her
defense of free speech and advocating anti-militarism,” praised Berkman. Edelsohn was the first person in America to openly declare *in court* that she would go on a hunger strike to protest her unjust conviction and sentence. Her hunger strike from July 20 to August 21 received great attention from radical groups and the mainstream press. Berkman, as an anarchist leader and Edelsohn’s ex-lover, dramatized her actions to boost momentum for their anti-militarist cause. He invited New York radicals to Edelsohn’s “pending funeral” on the day she began to fast. “Berkman,” wrote a reporter of New York Times, “in explaining his reason for sending out the announcement, said he had complete faith in Miss Edelsoh[n] and in her determination to starve herself to death ‘as a protest against the abrogation by the courts of the right of free speech in America.’” Berkman made Edelsohn, a twenty-three year old Russian immigrant, into a new anarchist martyr. He hoped to arouse public sympathy for her heroic resistance to the unjust judicial treatment she had received.

Edelsohn’s hunger strike was theatrical in two respects. It dramatized both her intention to sacrifice her life for the cause and her “battle” with Katherine B. Davis, the Commissioner of Correction, whom Edelsohn derided as the “Commissioner of

free speech, Edelsohn refused to pay the bond and started her first hunger strike in prison, which lasted 48 hours before she was bailed out for a retrial thanks to the Free Speech League and Leonard Abbott, who took up her case. Her second hunger strike began at July 20, after the retrial of her April 22 arrest maintaining the same verdict and she was sent to prison. This time her hunger strike lasted 31 days. James McLane (one of the penname of Alexander Berkman), “Anti-Militarist Activities in New York,” *Mother Earth* 9:3 (May 1914): 82-85; Berkman, “Becky Edelsohn;” Rebecca Edelsohn, “Hunger Striking in America,” *Mother Earth* 9:7 (Sept. 1914): 232-236.  


176 In Berkman’s article, he explained the history of the hunger strike, from the Russian political prisoners’ protesting the inhuman prison treatment to the English suffragettes who protested to political injustice by waging hunger strike. Becky Edelsohn, Berkman wrote, was the first American hunger striker for the political cause. Berkman, “Becky Edelsohn”  


Corruption.”¹⁷⁹ Fifty-four years old in 1914, Davis was a self-made woman with a doctorate in political economy. She was the first woman cabinet member in New York and she would not give in to Edelsohn’s hunger strike.¹⁸⁰ The mass media became the battlefield for the two women from different generations. The mainstream press covered Davis’s account of the hunger strike, charging Edelsohn with secretly taking a tablet form of food and water.¹⁸¹ *Mother Earth* and a few radical journals told Edelsohn’s side of the story. Berkman was her spokesman to the public; her letters were smuggled out of the prison to him. Margaret Sangers’ *The Woman Rebel* included reprints of some of these letters along with editorial support.¹⁸² Max Eastman censured Davis’s “high-handed inhumanity, both toward her prisoner and the public” in the way that she dealt with Edelsohn’s hunger strike and the press’s inquiries.¹⁸³ *The Woman Rebel* and *The Masses* both echoed Berkman by personifying Davis and Edelsohn as “the thousand-year struggle between the Old and the New.”¹⁸⁴ Edelsohn showed no sign of giving in, but her deteriorating physical condition began to worry her comrades. Eventually, Edelsohn ended her 31-day hunger strike after her comrades decided to pay the bond on her behalf and get her out of jail. Later, in *Mother Earth*, Edelsohn compared her experience with

¹⁷⁹ Edelsohn, “Hunger Striking in America.”
¹⁸³ In early August, Davis issued a decision that hereafter “no information would be given to the public as to the ‘health and conduct of Miss Edelsohn.’” Max Eastman, “Two Women,” *The Masses* 5:12 (Sept. 1914): 18. According to Edelsohn, “It was the numerous letters and telegrams of protest, as well as several mass meetings in various parts of the country, that frightened Commissioner Davis into inducing the press to suppress all reference to the hunger strike.” Edelsohn, “Hunger Striking in America.”
¹⁸⁴ Berkman, “Becky Edelsohn.”
those of English suffragettes. She accused Davis of intending to kill her because Davis did not forcibly feed her. Edelsohn’s hunger strike, in spite of the negative coverage it received in the mainstream press, demonstrated yet another kind of female resolve among *Mother Earth*’s members to further the anarchist cause.

The outbreak of WWI in August 1914 soon refocused core members’ attention on agitation against warfare and conscription. The magazine had drawn lessons from Europe to reveal the inhumanity of both warfare and the military draft from its beginning. Goldman, Baginski, and other delegates to the 1907 International Anarchist Congress urged international anarchist comrades to collectively or individually “revolt and refuse to serve” their countries. The “International Notes” column repeated news about the anti-militarist propaganda and anti-draft practices across Europe. Without exception, the inner circle opposed every U.S. military intervention in foreign affairs. In the wake of WWI, Berkman’s editorial proclaimed “insurrection [workers’ social revolution] against the war.” Two essays by prominent European anarchists followed Berkman’s

---

185 Edelsohn wrote: “The other [such as British] governments have either resorted to forcible feeding in an attempt to keep the hunger-striker alive, or else waited a certain length of time and then let the prisoner go. But the ‘free’ American government was quite ready to jeopardize the life of the prisoner, because it was too cowardly to resort to forcible feeding, afraid of the condemnation of thinking people both her and abroad. It also was too petty to rise to the situation and release me, because it featured the bellowing of the pharisees.” Edelsohn, “Hunger Striking in America.”


editorial with similar opinions. Berkman and Goldman argued that the state and capitalism were the evil twins that bred warfare. The only solution to stop warfare and remove its ultimate twin causes, they believed, was in labor’s collective defiance through a general strike. Berkman made his case in August 1914:

Collectively, the working class has it in its power to stop war when it chooses. The logical reply of the workers to militarism is organization along class lines. If workingmen refused to produce the implements of war, war would come to an end. If workingmen declined to transport soldiers and supplies, war would be impossible. A General Strike, consciously declared by workingmen who refused to be embroiled in disputes with which they were not concerned, would be an invincible argument against war.\textsuperscript{192}

Goldman, resuming editorship in September, continued Berkman’s earlier criticism of socialists while adding cultural and ideological analysis to her antiwar discourse. Berkman had underlined the double blow struck by socialists against the working class and the anarchist movement. To Berkman, the votes of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) in favor of war proved that they had sided with the jingoistic government. He condemned the SPD for setting the worst example in international socialist politics.\textsuperscript{193}

Likewise, Goldman denounced socialists in the belligerent nations for consenting to attack foreign nations with their own militarism. She mocked U.S. socialists for being confused about the betrayal of their European comrades to proletarian internationalism.\textsuperscript{194}

Additionally, Goldman argued that “murderous patriotism” led nationalist civilizations to destroy universal culture. To her, whatever real culture the warring European nations developed was “common to all of them, in spite of [their national] civilization.” The great

\textsuperscript{193} William English Walling, a socialist writer, held different, more sympathetic view towards the SPD’s votes (for German government’s declaration of war) from Berkman. William English Walling, “Hurrah for the German Socialists!” \textit{The Masses} 5:1 (Oct. 1914): 11.
thinkers or writers—Kant, Spencer, Byron, Pushkin, Voltaire, among others—were “products of world experience and culture, of the spirit of universal humanity” in her view.\textsuperscript{195} She ridiculed the patriotic appeal of each warring country to save its own civilization from the invasion of others. “Philosophy, science, art do not depend on geographic or national boundary lines” she wrote; “nor is any culture ‘protected’ by the slaughter of human beings.”\textsuperscript{196} Moreover, she censured some anarchists, including Harry Kelly, who favored “‘defending the higher civilizations’ against Prussian militarism.” Goldman made it clear that \textit{Mother Earth} had no sympathy for anyone “whose philosophic internationalism somersaults into rankest chauvinism the moment it is put to the practical test.”\textsuperscript{197}

Goldman’s clear objection to all warring nations’ militarism was in surprising contrast to the shifting attitude of Peter Kropotkin, who chose to side with the Allies. The rapidly intensifying war in Western Europe changed Kropotkin’s original antiwar stance before the outbreak of WWI. In November 1914, \textit{Mother Earth} reprinted Kropotkin’s letter describing his stance on the Great War.\textsuperscript{198} With Germany’s militarism damaging France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Finland and Britain, he considered it crucial to “crush down the invasion of the Germans into Western Europe.” Kropotkin distinguished the “invader” Germany from its “invaded” nations, appealing to all nations to defeat the Prussian militarism. Near the end of his letter, Kropotkin expressed sentiments that sounded like a harsh criticism to \textit{Mother Earth}’s members. Neither could war be

\textsuperscript{195} “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 9:8 (Oct. 1914): 243-244.
\textsuperscript{198} Kropotkin’s letter, to a Swedish Professor Gustav Steffen, was first published in the London \textit{Freedom}. \textit{Mother Earth}’s editorial note indicated that it had ignored the rumors circulating about Kropotkin’s shifting attitude in expectation of his direct statement. The reprinted letter of Kropotkin’s, to \textit{Mother Earth}, sadly confirmed the rumors. Peter Kropotkin, “Kropotkin on the Present War,” \textit{Mother Earth} 9:9 (Nov. 1914): 273-280.
combated by “pacifist dreams,” he wrote, “nor can it be combated by that sort of antimilitarist propaganda which has been carried on till now. Something much deeper than that is required.” The letter showed that Kropotkin did not alter in his general opposition to war. He, however, deemed it imperative to protect the labor movement and civilization in Western Europe from the destructive Prussian militarism.

Goldman and Berkman unequivocally opposed Kropotkin and strengthened ties with their European comrades who continued to oppose every warring country. Berkman raised two points in his essay to refute Kropotkin’s changed views. First, the international solidarity of labor would be crushed, not strengthened, by continuing warfare. Second, the menace of Prussian militarism would not be destroyed by the militarism of the Allies. Mother Earth, Berkman clarified, “unconditionally condemn[s] all capitalist wars” that duped and coerced workers. He and Goldman insisted that militarism prevailed in both the “invaders” and the “invaded.” In January 1915, Mother Earth reprinted Errico Malatesta’s article and his open letter to his longtime comrade Kropotkin. Malatesta stressed that anarchists should weaken, not strengthen, any state at any time. His letter criticized Kropotkin for prioritizing “the national questions” over “the social question.”

The inner circle of Mother Earth adopted a stronger stance against militarism in their “International Anarchist Manifesto on the War.” Thirty-six anarchists across the Atlantic

---

cosigned it in 1915. Five core members—Goldman, Berkman, Havel, Abbott, and Kelly—were among the signers. The Manifesto called on international anarchists to “foment insurrection, and to organize the revolution to which we look to put an end to all social wrongs.”

Not only did Goldman and Berkman part ways with Kropotkin once he favored the Allies; they also had no interest in partnering with other U.S. pacifist and feminist groups to oppose war. While the antiwar outcry came from all ranks of American society, *Mother Earth* distinguished itself from other antiwar groups by its anti-state attitude and defiance of authorities. Goldman stated the difference simply: “The ordinary pacifist merely moralizes; the anti-militarist acts.”

American peace organizations before 1914 had no intention of challenging U.S. domestic politics or foreign policies. For respectable pacifists, it was European powers’ militarism, secret diplomacy and nondemocratic regimes that potentially jeopardized world peace. Most feminists (including suffragists), believed pacifism was more consistent with women’s “nature” than militarism. After August 1914, many of the peace groups called for the U.S. government’s arbitration of, rather than

---

203 The Manifesto was firstly published in the London *Freedom* and *Cultura Obrera* in March 1915. It was reprinted in *Mother Earth* in May, as well as in several languages and issued in leaflet form. “International Anarchist Manifesto on the War,” *Mother Earth* 10:3 (May 1915): 119-122. See *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III*, 515-519.

204 The biographical introduction of Kelly in *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III*, states that “As a Ferrer Association dinner in October 1914 Kelly and AB [Berkman] quarreled over the question of what the anarchist position on war ought to be. Kelly defended Kropotkin’s position in support of the Allies, although he would eventually sign the International Anarchist Manifesto on the War.” *Emma Goldman: a Documentary History of the American Years, Vol. III*, 703.

205 “International Anarchist Manifesto on the War.”


participation in, the European warfare.\textsuperscript{210} Mother Earth’s anarchists rejected the political tactics of the socialist, feminist, and liberal pacifist groups. They viewed petitions, lobbies and political objection to war as futile. They did not even appreciate women’s organizations passionate public demonstrations for peace.\textsuperscript{211} Core members relied solely on economic anti-militarist tactics, which impeded their collaboration with the similarly antiwar SPA.\textsuperscript{212}

Despite Goldman’s advocacy of women’s emancipation, her antiwar narratives were more (male) labor-oriented than gender-specific, as was the case with Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s \textit{The Forerunner}. Published and exclusively written by Gilman, \textit{The Forerunner} (1909-1916) was an outlet for her social feminism and antiwar pacifism.\textsuperscript{213} Gilman’s gendered rhetoric regarded war as the extreme expression of what she termed “androcentric culture.”\textsuperscript{214} Gilman opposed war for three reasons: it destroyed world peace; it was the worst expression of “unbridled” masculinity; and it wasted lives, labor, property, and supplies.\textsuperscript{215} She saw WWI as a critical sign of men’s failure to govern and she


\textsuperscript{211} Alonso, \textit{Peace as a Women's Issue}, 56-84. For Mother Earth’s comment on Woman’s Peace Party’s plea to the government as futile, see “Observations and Comments,” \textit{Mother Earth} 10:3 (May 1915): 98-103.

\textsuperscript{212} Breckenridge, “Down with Militarism! Up with the Rights of Man.”


\textsuperscript{214} Gilman expanded on the concept of the “Androcentric culture” in her serial non-fiction \textit{The Androcentric Culture, or The Man-made World}. It was serialized in \textit{The Forerunner} from November 1919 to December 1910.

proposed a feminist solution to restore peace. Women, Gilman argued, would be the key to world peace and universal prosperity, once they gained a preventive and punitive power over male militarism. Essentially, Gilman believed that the nature of war was masculine and demanded that women help to end wars. By contrast, Goldman argued that the nature of war was capitalistic and demanded that laborers end the capitalists’ war. The proletarian solidarity advocated in Mother Earth was primarily male-oriented. In its texts, core members proposed that laborers insurrection was the solution to international militarism.

That said, Goldman did value women’s daily resistance to capitalism and appealed to them to create a “Mother’s Strike,” as indicated in one of her lecture titles, to help end the war. In her speech on “Women and War” in 1915, Goldman urged women’s antiwar action via birth control. “Women must refuse to bring children into the world to become soldiers and destroyers,” she said. Women, she continued, “must cease to croon their children to sleep with war songs and must teach them that the military virtues are the cheapest kind of valor. Women must free themselves from the spook of nationalism and the superstition of patriotism.” Goldman’s appeal to women at wartime was in tune with her advocacy of their everyday revolution during peacetime. But her antiwar rhetoric highlighted class, rather than gender, confrontation. Thus, her appeal to create a

\[\text{219 Reb Raney, “Emma Goldman’s Visit to San Francisco,” Mother Earth 9:7 (Sept. 1914): 221-226.}\]
“mother’s strike” differed from Gilman’s expectation of “the new mothers,” who would create a new world devoid of male violence.221

The call for proletarian solidarity across national borders in *Mother Earth* also diverged from Gilman’s proposal of constructive internationalism in *The Forerunner*.222 Gilman argued for the development of a comprehensive system of international arbitration administered from a “World Center.” Built with the funds originally designated for the military, the World Center would function as “a great Common City of All Nations” with “a set of world legislators and executives to carry out the world’s will.”223 Gilman’s state-oriented vision of internationalism conflicted with the anarchists’ ideal of stateless internationalism.224 She never approved of the anarchist tactic of direct action and the general strike. She even labeled the states that arbitrarily invaded other nations as “anarchistic states.”225 All in all, Progressives’ vigorous antiwar outcry did not facilitate an alliance between middle-class pacifists/feminists and *Mother Earth*’s core members. These anarchists persisted in their antiwar work after America entered WWI on April 6, 1917. Many socialists and suffragists strategically stopped calling for the end of the war to get leverage and gain political rights.226 Even though a few respectable women such as

221 Gilman, “The New Mothers of a New World.”
223 Charlotte Perkins Gilman, “Why Don’t We Stop It?,” *The Forerunner* 6:9 (Sept. 1915): 244
226 In April 2, 1917, Woodrow Wilson asked Congress for “a war to end all wars” despite the slogan of his presidential reelection campaign “He Kept Us out of War.” Four days later, the U.S. Congress voted overwhelmingly to declare war against Germany. Howard Jones, *Crucible of Power: A History of American
Jane Addams continued to oppose the war, for which she received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931, she did not sanction the political vision of the anti-war anarchists.\textsuperscript{227} \textit{Mother Earth}'s members lacked common ground to oppose state violence—in this case WWI—alongside progressive elites or even radicals.

Core members’ last campaign for the free expression of anti-militarism led to the formation of the No-Conscription League on May 18, 1917.\textsuperscript{228} On that day, the Selected Service Law authorized the U.S. President to raise a national army through a compulsory draft.\textsuperscript{229} On the same night, a mass anti-conscription demonstration took place in Harlem River Casino, New York with Goldman, Berkman, Abbott, and other labor activists as speakers. The anarchists presented each attendee with the No-Conscription League’s manifesto and an appeal to the American workers.\textsuperscript{230} According to the \textit{New York Times}, the speakers urged enlisted men to defy conscription and prepare for a national strike to paralyze the socioeconomic order.\textsuperscript{231} Another report in the \textit{Times} noted that the No-Conscription League and the Anti-Militarist League were “actively at work to nullify

\begin{footnotesize}\begin{enumerate}
\item “Selected Service Law,” in \textit{Selective Service Regulations} (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918), 349-355. The newly enacted Selective Service Act only recognized the right of enlisted men from some religious denominations (such as Quakers, Mennonites, and Dukhobors) to claim conscientious objector status (which allowed them to be exempted from combat duty, but not on any other basis. Early, \textit{A World Without War}, 93-94.
\item “Anarchists Demand Strike to End War,” \textit{New York Times}, May 19, 1917.
\item “Anarchists Demand Strike to End War.” According to the news report, the nationalities of the speakers included the U.S., Russia, and Italy, among others.
\end{enumerate}\end{footnotesize}
Both of the Leagues, the same article noted, were headquartered in the office of *Mother Earth*. The No-Conscription League set up branches in Chicago, San Francisco, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, Detroit, and Buffalo. Its Chicago branch claimed to have 4,000 members by the end of May.233

Unlike other anti-militarist organizations, the No-Conscription League members wanted to channel individualized acts of conscience against the war into collective action against the state. The anarchists’ mindset was different from the Civil Liberties Bureau, an establishment of the American Union against Militarism (AUAM). Roger Baldwin, the leader of the Bureau, admired Goldman and, like her, was dedicated to the cause of freedom.234 Both the Bureau and the AUAM pledged support to conscientious objectors as did the No-Conscription League.235 But the Bureau’s political tactics (like lobbying or petition) to aid conscientious objectors departed from the militant antiwar means of *Mother Earth* members. These anarchists’ call for labor militancy against war through the general strike further departed from the nonviolent new masculinity that the Civil Liberties Bureau worked to construct for conscientious objectors.236 The rationale that the No-Conscription League used to appeal to the enlisted men was individualistic and libertarian. The refusal to be conscripted, as the League framed it, was a declaration of free conscience and free expression against militarism. Moreover, anarchists believed that

---

235 The “conscientious objector” referred to the person who objected to serving in the armed forces for any reasons of conscience. For the discussion of the cases of the U.S. conscientious objectors during WWI, see Walter Guest Kellogg, *The Conscientious Objector* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1919).
236 For the gendered rhetoric and discourse applied by the Civil Liberties Bureau and the Bureau of Legal Advice in challenging the close tie between conventional masculinity and patriotism with new ideals of “New Man,” see Early, *A World Without War*, 90-121.
an individual resisting the draft symbolized the first step towards collective insurrection against the State. Their adamant assertion of anti-militarism during wartime made anarchists even more dangerous than they were in peacetime.

Image 27 (left): The Front Cover of *Mother Earth* 12:4 (June 1917); Image 28 (right): The illustration of the manifesto and the open letter of the No-Conscription League

Goldman staged a conspicuous protest against state violence in the June 1917 issue of *Mother Earth*, which created a national backlash against conscription. The first registration on June 5 enlisted all men between the ages of 21 and 31. In response, the cover image of *Mother Earth* was a tomb with the inscription: “June 5th In Memoriam American Democracy” draped in black. (Image 27) Goldman later recorded in her autobiography, “The somber attire of the magazine was striking and effective. No words could express more eloquently the tragedy that turned America, the erstwhile torch-bearer of freedom, into a grave-digger of her former ideals.” Goldman’s opening piece expressed her grief over the triumph of “the Moloch Militarism.” She contrasted the

---

saddened sentiment in Europe on the day of military registration to the joy conveyed in the
United States. The No-Conscription League’s manifesto appeared in the same issue. It
stated their objection to “the militarization of America” and to compulsory conscription.
The League was created for “encouraging conscientious objectors to affirm their liberty
of conscience and to translate their objection to human slaughter by refusing to
participate in the killing of their fellow men.” Goldman recalled that she strained the
capital of *Mother Earth* to run an extra-large number of copies of this issue for the sake of
increasing anti-draft sentiment. She reported that 8,000 people attended the first public
meeting of the No-Conscription League on May 18. The No-Conscription League had
circulated 100,000 copies of its manifesto nationwide. According to the *New York
Times*, the No-Conscription League also mailed a letter urging antiwar agitation to more
than 15,000 people. Both the manifesto and the open letter inserted a picture of a man
naked from the waist up standing in front of cannon tearing his draft paper in two. (Image
28) The illustration encouraged individual men to stand (even if alone) against militarism
in the face of the state’s deadly threat.

The nationwide news coverage of the No-Conscription mass meeting at Hunt’s Point
Palace, Bronx on June 4 attested to the volatile antiwar ferment that core members
created. Prior to that day, some arrests of anti-conscription protesters in New York and
elsewhere had taken place; pro-draft propaganda emphasized that to agitate against draft

---

Times*, May 30, 1917.
244 “Plotters Here Against Draft under Watch.” This piece of news reprinted parts of the letter, which
started as: “We are sure that you are interested in the anti-war agitation. You cannot fail to realize that the
patriotic claptrap which is now propagated on such a huge scale by the press, the pulpit, and the authorities
only represents a desperate effort to blind the people to the real issues confronting them. The main issue
now is the Prussianizing of America.”

336
registration was treason. While some pacifist groups cautiously called off their meetings, Goldman had no intention of canceling the June 4 mass meeting. Leonard Abbott reported in *Mother Earth* that “tens of thousands of people clamored for admittance” and the meeting was “one of the most remarkable demonstrations that New York has ever seen.” Other mainstream newspapers offered detailed account on their front pages. Three hundred patrolmen and detectives surrounded the building; scores of government agents and angry soldiers mingled with anti-draft supporters. Hoots and jeers at both the police and the speakers came from opposite camps. Outside of the building, a roaring battle occurred between a “small army of police” and “several thousand men and women” who could not enter and “packed in solid phalanxes for four blocks back from the hall.” Jane Heap, the co-editor of *The Little Review*, wrote about the crowd’s preoccupation with whether or not Goldman would be arrested that night. Heap also recorded the violent episode that she witnessed outside of the meeting:

Suddenly in the densest part of the crowd a woman’s voice rang out: “Down with conscription! Down with the war!” Several other women took it up. The police charged into the crowd. The crowd made a slight stand. The soldiers joined the police, and with raised clubs, teeth bared and snarling, they drove the crowd backward over itself, beating and pushing. Three times the crowd stood. Three times

---


246 In May 30, agents of the Department of Justice were under orders to launch a national surveillance of the meetings held by the No-Conscription League, the Anti-Militarist League, and other pacifist societies. Orders from the government had been given that the stenographic transcript of the speeches at the June 4 meeting and other similar meetings would be used “as the basis for the arrest of the speakers wherever utterances are calculated to discourage registration or to influence individuals into attempting to evade the provisions of the registration law.” “Roundup in Draft Plot Nationwide,” *New York Sun* LXXXIV:27 (May 31, 1914): 2.


they were charged. Women were beaten down and run over. Men were clubbed in the face and escaped, staggering and bleeding. How much of this treatment will it take to obliterate every element of individuality amongst us?249

Without speaking explicitly against conscription, Heap’s account disclosed the crowd’s anti-authoritarian impulse which Goldman inspired. While Heap did not share Goldman’s view that “art (is) for life’s sake,” she admired Goldman’s fight to preserve individuality which she treasured.

The government considered the anti-conscription activism of Mother Earth’s anarchists treasonous during wartime. More than inspiring thoughts in defiance of the authorities at peacetime, they were encouraging actions against the state’s will. As anti-conscription sentiments grew, the police, soldiers, and civilian patriots threatened Goldman and her comrades for their anti-militarism. The June issue of Mother Earth justified a warrant for U.S. Marshals to raid its office on June 15. The arrest of Goldman and Berkman, along with the forcible closure of Mother Earth, was evidence of their danger to the state.

Conclusion

From 1906 to 1917, core members demonstrated the strategies and extent to which anarchists fought for universal freedom against various incursions from the state and capitalists. While Goldman tried to hold peaceful meetings, the police and patriotic civilians freely subjected anarchists to violence. The anarchists’ alleged advocacy of violence was deemed more dangerous than the use of violence against them. To counterattack the various forms of violence inflicted on them, Mother Earth’s anarchists succeeded in rousing extensive sympathy across America. On numerous occasions,

native-born intellectuals lent their support to the free-speech fights waged by anarchists and the Wobblies. State suppression, law enforcement, corporate force, and vigilante violence mutually sought to crush the anarchist campaign against militarism. Goldman and her comrades inevitably fell into a dilemma of whether or not to strike back with force when fighting against authorities. Their lawful attempts to spread their propaganda stopped neither the police nor the local vigilantes from assaulting them. Resorting to retaliation as Berkman had schemed, however, risked unexpected sacrifices and drawing stricter government attention to anarchists.

Goldman and Berkman’s anti-militarist (including anti-conscription) campaign did not lack supporters, but it also did not lead to any political change. Goldman’s native-born intellectual friends admired her courage and provided her with moral and financial aid. Before the trial of Goldman and Berkman on June 27, 1917, Jane Heap and Margaret Anderson issued an open protest on their behalf. The letter pointed out the government’s intention to criminalize the two anarchist leaders:

T H E Y [Goldman and Berkman] face trial: there are millions of other people in this country who are against this [conscription] bill. Protesting became a crime overnight. They kept on protesting. Emma Goldman and Berkman are not conciliators, nor will they be conciliated…They should be saved if for no other reason than for the conservation of courage in this country.  

Goldman and Berkman’s supporters showed up at their trials and praised their self-defense speeches. The July 1917 issue of *Mother Earth* carried several intellectuals’ protests on their behalf. Even Max Eastman solicited funds to support Goldman and

---

Berkman in *The Masses*, calling them “friends of American freedom.”

Despite mounting protests and public support for them, however, they could not escape being convicted and imprisoned.

The State punished Goldman and Berkman for their nonviolent anti-draft activities and not for their militant advocacy of the general strike. It was the influence of their anti-state rhetoric on individuals that was really threatening to authorities. Their anti-conscription work openly clashed with the U.S. government’s determination to convince people to support their militarism and safeguard American democracy. The disturbance that they made by discouraging young men from enlisting was more immediate and thus more dangerous than their agitation for labor’s general strike. The American government espouses individual freedom while viewing a person’s refusal to serve the country during wartime as desertion of the state. Even though *Mother Earth’s* anarchism inspired Americans to rebel against suppressive authorities and unjust systems, it failed to make them relinquish their patriotic attachment to the state itself.

---

CONCLUSION

“By anarchist spirit I mean that deeply human sentiment, which aims at the good of all, freedom and justice for all, solidarity and love among the people; which is not an exclusive characteristic only of self-declared anarchists, but inspires all people who have a generous heart and an open mind.”

—Errico Malatesta, 1922

_Mother Earth_ was not just a publication created by a remarkably engaged anarchist named Emma Goldman. It was an organization of social revolutionaries who produced multifaceted propaganda to convince Americans that anarchism was relevant to their lives and had the power to liberate them. This study furthers our understanding of radical culture in Progressive America by broadly examining anarchist communists’ interactions with the non-anarchist public. Coming together with shared causes, this heterogeneous collective with the identity of “Mother Earth Family” broke boundaries everywhere. Malatesta’s characterization of the “anarchist spirit” encapsulates the major achievement of _Mother Earth_’s twelve-year (ad)venture. As Berkman wrote in its tenth anniversary issue, “MOTHER EARTH seeks to voice the various expressions of the Anarchist spirit.” This spirit was prevalent in an extraordinary variety of activities across a wide geopolitical spectrum in the early twentieth century. Core members used speeches, journalism, publications and activism to build popular support for anarchist ideas and to counter their public reputation as violent lawbreakers. None of their predecessors spoke to

---

2 In 1917, Goldman reviewed her magazine by stating that _Mother Earth_ “was not merely a venture but an adventure.” “Observations and Comments,” _Mother Earth_ 12:1 (Mar. 1917): 2.
as diverse an audience across ethnic, class, national, and cultural divides as they did. Nor had previous anarchist papers united their members as a family, coordinating the creation of various publications and launching numerous campaigns to spread anarchism. Furthermore, *Mother Earth’s* anarchists outperformed other radical groups (feminism, single tax, or socialism) in championing/defending divergent agendas as high end as modern drama and as disorderly as labor strikes. *Mother Earth’s* audiences, most of whom were not anarchists, gained a sense of liberation from its propaganda. They embraced the core members’ liberating philosophy and helped carry an anarcho-communist magazine through twelve years of constant challenges. Their generosity and open mindedness to *Mother Earth’s* campaigns, despite their political differences with the anarchists, spoke to the reality that the inner circle created a widespread anarchist spirit among their readers and supporters.

This dissertation also illuminates how a group of anarchist communists carried out their propaganda work with innovative design and diversified spatiotemporal practices. The birth of a *Mother Earth* counterfamily in New York’s metropolitan setting created a unique anarchist commune that stood in contrast to other idyllic anarchist communities located in the countryside. While other anarchist communes worked to get away from capitalist and industrialized environments, *Mother Earth’s* inner circle spread anarchism in various urban spaces where they competed with other radical groups for supporters. Out of New York, the members managed to draw a growing national audience over the years even with incessant local resistance and government suppression. Goldman’s annual tours gave rise to an unusual diversity in the work of anarchists including the topics discussed, the people who attended and the activities in which they engaged. Utilizing the general
public’s curiosity about her “dangerous” elements, she conflated entertainment with enlightenment. During WWI, her audiences continued to grow in spite of the government’s intensified efforts to censor her work; a sign of their genuine interest in her ideas rather than their passing interest in her person. “Anarchism was fairly important during the Mother Earth years,” concluded a junior anarchist Mark Schmidt, “but afterwards it didn’t amount to anything.”⁴ The “fair importance” of anarchism during “the Mother Earth years” was manifest in increasing sympathy, particularly from white, young middle-class intellectuals, for the magazine. Goldman’s audiences exhibited the “deeply human sentiment” that Malatesta called the anarchist spirit in places that ranged from the reputed Carnegie Hall and the “Open Forum” of San Diego to the barn of Alden Freeman and the open-air Union Square. Whether core members were in their headquarters, social spaces, and event venues or ideologically contested places, they vigorously diffused the “anarchist spirit.”

Beyond Progressive America, Goldman and her comrades made anarchist communism a source of international proletarian solidarity and intellectual inspiration for non-anarchists. These anarchists’ steady transatlantic networks and new transpacific contacts fostered an imagined anarchist community across the globe. Their nonsectarian defense of international revolutionaries furthered a borderless comradeship. The circulation of Mother Earth and its literature, coupled with that of the London Freedom, amplified anarchist communism’s worldwide influence both as an ideology for socioeconomic revolution and as a philosophy of radical culture. Especially in East Asia, the translation of Mother Earth publications—represented by Goldman’s

⁴ Mark Schmidt was a member of the anarchist Vanguard Group in New York City during the 1930s. The monthly organ of the Vanguard Group, Vanguard (1932-1939), represented the anarchist endeavors in New York in the 1930s. Avrich, Anarchist Voices, 453.
works—advanced the reception of anarchist communism among modernizing elites. In Japan, China, and even Korea, anarchist communism inspired anti-authoritarian impulses among non-anarchist intellectuals, who expressed them through anti-imperial and nationalist militancy. The fact that, for instance, Mao Zedong supported anarchism before becoming the leader of Chinese communism implies that the anarchism spearheaded by leading periodicals like *Freedom* and *Mother Earth* had a transnational intellectual influence.

A considerable number of thinking people in Progressive America witnessed the intellectual influence of *Mother Earth*, despite that anarchism as a political initiative made little headway. The messages delivered through *Mother Earth*’s propaganda publications inspired non-anarchist cultural elites to defy inculcated ideas, official censorship, and social injustice. Margaret Anderson’s comment on the intellectual persuasiveness of Goldman and Berkman challenges Genevieve Madden’s conclusion that “*Mother Earth* never converted the American middle class.” After her daily attendance, along with other Bohemian intellectuals, at the trial of Goldman and Berkman in June-July 1917, Anderson wrote:

One newspaper reporter told me that this trial was making a good Anarchist of him though he had never dreamed of needing to be one before; a university professor who came to all the hearings told me that he had always had a respect for the law until now; one of the biggest lawyers in the city laughed in a kind of fierce derision because, as he said, the prosecution hadn’t a leg to stand on; one of the recognized intellectuals of the country remarked that Russia has never had cause for such rebellion as we are now facing; an artist said that he figures there were about a hundred perfectly good new Anarchists made during these ten days because of the court’s asininity; and a student said: “Until this trial I have been against these Anarchists, even afraid of them. Now

---

7 Madden, “‘Home of Lost Dogs,’” iv.
I’m afraid of the law, of the judges, and of his kind. I’m going to study the philosophy of Anarchism.”

Anderson observed that intellectuals’ views of anarchism changed as they watched the trial. They went from thinking of anarchism as a threat to society to viewing the Courts and the law as a threat to society. Their enthusiasm for anarchism, however, was neither enduring nor full enough to convert them into anarchist communists. The “hundred perfectly good new Anarchists” made during the trial in the artist’s assessment would be philosophical anarchists rather than political adherents in practice.

Essentially, intellectuals’ anti-authoritarian impulses stirred by Mother Earth’s propaganda for sociopolitical change were at once potent and transient. Margaret Anderson’s three-year experience as an anarchist duly exemplified a sensational, yet limited, conversion to anarchism. The trial of Goldman and Berkman deeply enraged and—even more importantly—disheartened Anderson.9 A month after the conviction of Goldman and Berkman, Anderson bade farewell to her short-lived anarchist identity in The Little Review.10 The aggravated suppression of political dissent during war time distanced most intellectuals from radical politics. As a member of the bohemian avant-garde, Anderson assumed the posture of a romantic aestheticist who took in all or nothing of a belief system. Goldman and Mother Earth had revealed the beautiful ideal of anarchy to Anderson, who commented that “life in her [Goldman] has a great grandeur” in 1914 and “Anarchism and art are in the world for exactly the same kind of reason” in 1916.11 But soon enough, Anderson’s belief in “Life for Art’s sake” drove her away from anarchism. In

9 For some narratives of Anderson and Heap in attending the trial of Goldman and Berkman in June-July 1917, see Anderson, My Thirty Years’ War, 195-196; Heap and Reynolds, Dear Tiny Heart, 46-53.
addition to Anderson, quite a few intellectuals confessed their limited conversion to anarchism and their great admiration for the bravery of *Mother Earth*’s core members. William Marion Reedy wrote that “if all those who are tentatively Anarchists, would pay the price as Emma pays it or Berkman, or Reitman, or as Voltairine de Cleyre paid it, the ideal of Anarchism would come very close to realization in this world.” Reedy did not seem to be willing to pay the same price as Goldman and her comrades to help make anarchism a political reality despite his praise of them.

Reedy and other partially converted intellectuals’ remarks illustrated two features that they drew from *Mother Earth*’s propaganda. First, they viewed anarchism as an ideal, rather than a danger, to the existing society. *Mother Earth*’s propaganda publications revised their prior understanding of anarchism as terrorism, an image to which the capitalist and socialist press contributed. Second, they highly commended the “unearthly courage” of *Mother Earth*’s core members, as did Robert Minor, a radical cartoonist coming from a prominent family. “When all is summed up and many spectacular fighters are found missing, having compromised, sought cover for a quieter day, leaving the field undisputed by them to Tyranny, “ Minor wrote, “it is little old MOTHER EARTH, or its founders, that I see in the centre of the field, ready to pay the price of courage.”

Intellectuals highly valued *Mother Earth*’s contribution to human freedom. C. E. S. Wood lauded *Mother Earth*’s teaching about the importance of liberty. Margaret Anderson, then still a disciple of anarchism, joined other social elites by paying tribute to “the re-creation of human beings, the awakening of sleeping souls, [and] the introduction of transvaluations in human ideals” that she found in *Mother Earth* in its tenth anniversary

---

The praises revealed these temporary adherents’ subconscious justification for their timidity and hesitation to commit to anarchist communism. Reedy’s description of *Mother Earth*’s anarchist ideal as a beautiful but impossible gospel was his rhetorical rejection of the violence that might be necessary to create anarchy. Even labor sympathizers like Hutchins Hapgood did not feel like taking part in labor’s use of force to resist the authorities. Hapgood specified that his anarchism was Jeffersonian from a political viewpoint and Tolstoyan in a moral sense. His intellectual anarchist stance was common among many radicals and liberals who Goldman defined as members of the *Mother Earth* family.

As it happened, *Mother Earth*’s extensive intellectual influence created two essential paradoxes that undermined its political impact. The first paradox lay in the fact that its audiences detached embracing *Mother Earth*’s anarchist messages as part of their personal philosophy from becoming political supporters of the stateless anarchy that its core members envisioned. Margaret Anderson’s understanding of anarchism translated into her belief that everyone’s “‘magnetic centre’ can do what it likes,” and so did most of her intellectual peers. *Mother Earth*’s inclusive propaganda inadvertently created philosophical anarchists who prioritized individual liberty and failed to support social solidarity. They considered anarchism a means for bettering their personal lives, but not a political revolution that would perfect their society. The second paradox was that, despite

---

16 For example, in his 1913 book, *Women as World Builders: Studies in Modern Feminism*, Floyd Dell praised Goldman of having “a legitimate social function—that of holding before our eyes the ideal of freedom. She is licensed to taunt us with our moral cowardice, to plant in our souls the nettles of remorse at having acquiesced so tamely in the brutal artifice of present day society.” Floyd Dell, *Women as World Builders: Studies in Modern Feminism* (Chicago: Forbes and Company, 1913), 60.
17 Reedy, “Anarchism-Limited.”
19 Anderson, *My Thirty Years’ War*, 149.
its growing middle-class audience, *Mother Earth*’s propaganda publications failed to mobilize U.S. workers to participate in a social revolution through the general strike. The inner circle did not gain ground for their ideas among native-born workers. The AFL had not only denounced using force as one of their tactics, but also worked to form an alliance between labor and the government during WWI. Migrant and immigrant Wobblies, though they supported anarchists’ direct-action tactics, were not powerful enough to create a national strike. The magazine’s inclusive agendas for social transformation also made it difficult to win a particular class’s allegiance. While efforts for free speech and birth control gained supporters for anarchism from various social ranks, no cross-class coalition was formed to wage strikes against the government.

Moreover, Goldman did not get an upper hand in competing with Progressive reformers by invoking the U.S. libertarian tradition. Goldman tried to highlight anti-statism and criticize socioeconomic inequality by aligning herself with leading philosophers of American individualism such as Jefferson, Thoreau, and Emerson. Progressives, for their part, claimed to stand for Jefferson’s faith in social progress and maximized democratization. Progressives established themselves as a higher authority than anarchists in political transformation by implementing the popular will through direct democracy and streamlining government mechanisms to regulate the tyranny of the minority. This mindset glossed tensions within Progressivism, as between direct democracy and granting power to the state and experts. Goldman’s criticism of the state

----

fell mostly on deaf ears, even among radical intellectuals, who preferred using the socialist evolutionary ideal of a cooperative commonwealth to reconstruct U.S. politics.\(^{25}\)

Anarchism’s limited political impact on U.S. intellectuals, who lacked militant revolutionary will for seeking social change, was apparent when considered via a cross-cultural, comparative lens. Intellectuals in France, Russia and China, for instance, did not eschew anarchist violence as their U.S. counterparts did. Despite their varied backgrounds, anarchist-inclined intellectuals in these three countries were more marginal, powerless, and rebellious toward their less democratic governments than intellectuals in the U.S. By contrast, the progress of higher education, political participation and professionalism granted American intellectuals more social resources and opportunities to influence the government. Many anarchist intellectuals in France (mainly in Paris) were bohemian déclassés, excluded from groups with a voice in government.\(^{26}\) Intellectuals in Russia endured the ruthless suppression of their human rights and free speech by the autocratic Czar. Chinese Han intellectuals, under the alien Manchu rule, were estranged from politics and social prestige after the abolition of the long-standing civil examination system in 1905. Intellectuals in France, Russia and China had more sociopolitical grievances, and yet fewer channels, to voice dissidence or realize themselves than those in the U.S. “Revolution,” be it a mere political formation or a socioeconomic one, had more purchase for intellectuals in these three nations as a radical solution to their plight than gradual reforms. Scholarly research has shown that a certain number of intellectuals in France, Russia and China did not shun violence because they believed it was necessary to create a social revolution. Their involvement in anarchist revolution was not only


\(^{26}\) Sonn, *Anarchism and Cultural Politics in Fin de Siècle France*, 34.
individualistic or aesthetic, as most U.S. intellectuals’ interest in anarchism was. It was explicitly political; at times even terroristic.\footnote{Steven Gary Marks, \textit{How Russia Shaped the Modern World: From Art to Anti-semitism, Ballet to Bolshevism} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 7-37; Edward S. Krebs, \textit{Shifu, Soul of Chinese Anarchism} (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998), 61-76; Sonn, \textit{Anarchism and Cultural Politics in Fin de Siècle France}, 21-30.} In spite of \textit{Mother Earth}’s severe criticism of American plutocracy, its democratic system and capitalist environment checked anarchism’s potential as a full-blown political initiative. Compared to their foreign peers, American intellectuals had too much to lose politically to advocate the violent overthrow of the government.

While \textit{Mother Earth}’s anarchist project as a political remedy lost to Progressive plans, its liberating, anti-authoritarian messages took root in the minds of the American Left. The majority of U.S. intellectuals embraced the value of individual self-realization via free and equal competition. Many believed this value would be realized in a well-ordered capitalist democracy. To quote Lewis L. Gould’s summary of the mainstream spirit in the Progressive Era, “If one accepts the legitimacy of democratic capitalism in the United States, the work of the Progressive Era demonstrated the society’s ability to ameliorate itself without revolution.”\footnote{Gould ed., \textit{The Progressive Era}, 8.} Most intellectuals subordinated their anti-authoritarian impulse, as a result of \textit{Mother Earth}’s propaganda, to their desire to better rather than destroy the system. The case of Roger Baldwin is exemplary. Baldwin “became a revolutionist though [I] continued to work at practical reforms” even under Goldman’s profound influence.\footnote{“The Left Stuff,” \textit{St. Louis Post-Dispatch}, July 25, 1990, p. 190.} He once stated: “In the years since I met Miss Goldman [in 1911], I have never departed far from the general philosophy represented in libertarian literature. That is, in the goal of a society with a minimum of compulsion, a
maximum of individual freedom and of voluntary association, and the abolition of exploitation and poverty.”

Baldwin’s philosophical absorption of revolutionary anarchism guided his reformative practice. He remarked that, “The anarchists, as I knew them, were always right and always ineffective” when he was participating in an interview with Paul Avrich in 1974. Baldwin appreciated anarchists’ ideas, but not their potentially violent and ineffectual methods. He took from anarchism “only what seemed relevant to the practical direction of aims of social justice.” U.S. intellectuals wanted to implement anarchist ideals within a society governed by the State; they did not see a need to create a stateless anarchy in order to adopt what they valued most from anarchism.

The far-reaching effects of Mother Earth’s inclusive, multiform propaganda enriched the legacy of American radicalism in the early twentieth century. Goldman’s artistic and sexological versions of anarchism, though not effectual in agitating labor to launch a revolution, expanded the intellectual influence of her messages. Her unorthodox fusion—and remarkable representation—of sexuo-ethical matters, education issues, free-speech rights, the woman question, dramatic creations, anti-militarism, and labor problems opened up a vast horizon for audiences to perceive and receive anarchism. The heterogeneous reception of anarchism amid a growing audience was a result of the core members’ collective effort. Although Goldman’s work was of vital importance in orchestrating the mechanism of Mother Earth’s propaganda, she could not have achieved its influence on her own. The division of labor, mass mobilization, and logistics management contributed by counterfamily members helped create the “Goldman effect” in

31 Avrich, Anarchist Voices, 62-65.
the Progressive Era. The counterfamily’s democratic principles liberated the minds of
Mother Earth’s public while stimulating their defiant impulses. After WWI, anarchism
lost ground as a political initiative; the anti-authoritarian spirit that marked Mother Earth’s
inclusive anarchism, however, persisted. Unbound by political ideology, party
organization, or any particular combination of ethnic/class/gender interests, Mother Earth’s
anarchism—epitomized by Goldman’s words and deeds—was available for recycling by
radicals in later generations. In the decades that followed the Progressive Era, Goldman’s
Anarchism and Other Essays was translated into Chinese in 1927, and there was
 correspondence among Goldman, Berkman, and a few Chinese anarchist intellectuals in
the 1920s and the 1930s. Some capitalist newspapers during Goldman’s three-month
visit to America in 1934 paid tribute to her intellectual influence on America.

Later representations of Mother Earth’s—ergo Goldman’s—anarchist spirit were as
inclusive and manifold as it was in the Progressive Era. In the culturally rebellious 1960s,
Goldman became a radical icon, reincarnated as a voice for sex radicalism, cultural
criticism, modernist aesthetics, civil liberties, and socioeconomic protests. Mother
Earth’s counterpublic was reborn as a new generation of Goldman adherents. The
majority of them was leftist liberals, feminists, socialists, sex radicals, or political
activists; simply put, non-anarchist intellectuals. Similarly to their Progressive era
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33 For the history of the Red Scare following WWI that successfully crushed the radical, labor, and
anarchist movements, see Regin Schmidt, Red Scare: FBI and the Origins of Anticommunism in the United
34 Rachel Hui-chi Hsu, “Alternative Discourse of Revolution: Emma Goldman’s translation in China and
the Anarchists’ Ideas of Sex and Love during the Northern Expedition,” in Jinxianpai baokan yu wenhua
yianjiu: diba jie guoji qingnian xueshe hanxue huiyi lunwenji (Early Modern Print Culture in China: Papers
from the Eighth International Junior Scholars Conference on Sinology), ed. Cheng Wen-huei (Taipei:
Huayi Chubanshe, forthcoming).
35 Emma Goldman, Ziyou de nüxing, trans. Lu Jianpo (Shanghai: Kaiming Bookstore, 1927). Also see
Marie Fauverlle, “When East Met West: Feminine/Feminist Correspondences Between the USA and the
USSR at the Turn of the 20th Century,” in Exchanges and Correspondence: The Construction of Feminism,
ed. Claudette Fillard, Françoise Orazi (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), 52-63; Drinnon,
Rebel in Paradise, 277-284.
counterparts, Goldman’s later adherents did not share her and her comrades’ sociopolitical goal of creating a stateless anarchy. It was her courage to defy inequality, injustice, and suppression that drew these later followers. As Candace Falk opined, Goldman “sparked the imagination of generations of free spirits” during the countercultural movements in the 1960-70s. Essayist Vivian Gornick, in late 2011, claimed: “If ever there was a life that embodied the spirit that is driving the [2011-2012] Occupy Wall Street movement it is that of Emma Goldman.” Goldman and her counterfamily’s spatiotemporal activities left their historical imprint on the memory of later radicals in the Lower East Side. Commenting on Occupy Wall Street’s use of New York’s physical space, freelance columnist David Ensminger wrote in 2012: “the placards and ideologies actually resemble much earlier agitprop from the mouth of East Village radicals, like Emma Goldman, that used to hunker down in the shabby streets decrying the unfettered fists of capitalism.” Political activist Jeremy Hammond, sentenced to 10 years by a U.S. federal court in 2013 for hacking private intelligence, “has molded himself after old radicals such as Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman” according to a journalist.

---

The diverse renditions of and references to Goldman in the year 2016 demonstrate the continuing influence of *Mother Earth*’s anarchism in American culture. In a presidential election year with a female candidate, columnist Marjorie Ingall reminisced about her female idols, including Goldman: “They fought relentlessly for women’s rights and a more just world. They are awesome, and we should talk about them in this election season so clouded with prejudice, hatred of immigrants, sexism, and bias.” In April, the non-profit Media Education Foundation released a film version of historian Howard Zinn’s play, *Emma*, first staged in 1976. Its official announcement read, “In keeping with Howard Zinn’s lifelong commitment to telling the story of American progressive struggle, this powerful play brings us face to face with a remarkable woman whose fierce wit, radical insights, and political courage continue to speak to injustice and inequality in our own time.” Donna M. Kowal, who just published her latest book on Goldman, gave a press interview where she compared Goldman and Bernie Sanders, one of the Democratic presidential candidates. In response to the interviewer’s question, she described Sanders “as a kind of nostalgic version of Red Emma.” Kowal said, “I think Sanders is tapping into this discourse. Obviously he is not an anarchist, but he is tapping into Goldman’s idealistic imagery that moved people.” Andrew Cornell’s 2016 book,

---

44 Benjamin Ivry, “What Emma Goldman Has in Common—With Bernie Sanders,” *Forward*, June 1, 2016, accessed June 20, 2016,
Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the Twentieth Century, reconfirmed the Progressive Era as the phase when, “US anarchist exerted an unprecedented social and political influence.” These manifold representations of Goldman and Mother Earth’s anarchism channeled their free, anti-authoritarian spirit in various forms of media. This “spirit” is marked by its unyielding defiance of institutional authorities and power hierarchies. A spirit of this sort has urged people to break free from their chains and continues to be an inspiration for all rebels beyond national and ideological borders.


### APPENDICES

**Appendix 1: Agents for Mother Earth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>M. N. Maisel,</td>
<td>194 E. Broadway/ 422 Grand St.</td>
<td><em>Mother Earth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>Progressive Library</td>
<td>106 Forsyth St.</td>
<td>1:5 (July 1906); 1:10 (Dec. 1906); 1:11 (Jan. 1907); 2:1 (Mar. 1907); 2:5 (July 1907); 2:6 (Aug. 1907); 2:7 (Sept. 1907); 2:8 (Oct. 1907); 2:11 (Jan. 1908); 3:2 (Apr. 1908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>E. C. Walker</td>
<td>244 W. 143rd St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>A. Wasserman</td>
<td>45 Clinton St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
<td>Ph. Belsky</td>
<td>282 S. 2nd St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>N. Notkin</td>
<td>Cor. E. Lehigh &amp; Thompson Sts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg, PA</td>
<td>Mrs. George Seldes</td>
<td>1801 Centre Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, O</td>
<td>R. Glickman</td>
<td>141 Osborn St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, O</td>
<td>P. Rovner</td>
<td>35 Putnam St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, O</td>
<td>Anton Ortner</td>
<td>1627 Pleasant St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, O</td>
<td>N. Shapiro</td>
<td>1321 Clay St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>S. Hershkowitz</td>
<td>817 N. 9th St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>M. A. Schmidt</td>
<td>1367 Jackson St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>S. Hammersmark</td>
<td>Norwood Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>H. Havel</td>
<td>45 N. Clark St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>J. M. Livshis</td>
<td>1245 Milwaukee Ave./100 Potomac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>R. M. Yampolsky</td>
<td>624 W. Twelfth St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>J. C. Hart</td>
<td>269 Dearborn St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>Leo Kopeczynski</td>
<td>941 Seventh St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MI</td>
<td>Max Brody</td>
<td>565 6th Ave. North.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MI</td>
<td>H. Kaufman</td>
<td>1137 Emerson Ave. N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>L. Finkel</td>
<td>208 Broadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, NY</td>
<td>Mr. Rubenfeld</td>
<td>65 Weld St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>K. Gissin</td>
<td>320 Cedar St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>Carl Nold</td>
<td>167 Hale St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica, NY</td>
<td>S. Bookbinder</td>
<td>94 Liberty St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ</td>
<td>M. Kisluck</td>
<td>410 Mediterranean Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td>Leo Malmed</td>
<td>92 Dallins St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Philip Trachtenberg</td>
<td>12 Willard St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>S. Ehrlich</td>
<td>165 Havre St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn, MA</td>
<td>Miss M. Boroiski</td>
<td>32 Amity St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn, MA</td>
<td>Robert Leitman</td>
<td>7 Tremont St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea, MA</td>
<td>S. Lampert</td>
<td>73 Sixth St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Max Koerner</td>
<td>2725 W. Colfax Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Rosa Fritz</td>
<td>537 Oak St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>G. Teltsch</td>
<td>1791 Mission St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Joe Edelsohn</td>
<td>248 Boutwell St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>S. Robinson</td>
<td>250 ½ N. Flower St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Alex. Horr</td>
<td>1247 King St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>A. Beyer</td>
<td>2228 First Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>Mr. Lazarus</td>
<td>408 St. Lawrence Main.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>Wm. Simons</td>
<td>24 Agnes St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg, Canada</td>
<td>S. B. Benedictsson</td>
<td>470 Main St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg, Canada</td>
<td>Sam Prasow</td>
<td>452 Manitoba Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

46 The Agents of *Mother Earth* listed in this chart included the names from whom *Mother Earth* once could be purchased or subscribed.
Appendix 2: The Thematic Categories and Titles of Goldman’s Propaganda Lectures from 1906 to 1917

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Category</th>
<th>Titles of Goldman’s Lectures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Concepts and methods of anarchism                 | “In Advocacy of Anarchist Principles”  
|                                                  | “Anarchism-Communism”  
|                                                  | “Misconceptions of Anarchism”  
|                                                  | “Anarchism, What It Really Stands For”  
|                                                  | “Do Anarchists Believe in Organization?”  
|                                                  | “Why I am an Anarchist”  
|                                                  | “The Message of Anarchy”  
|                                                  | “The Methods of Anarchism”  
|                                                  | “Anarchism and Why It is Misunderstood”  
|                                                  | “The True Significance of Anarchism”  
|                                                  | “On the Philosophical and Theoretic Side of Anarchy”  
|                                                  | “The Philosophy of Anarchism”  
|                                                  | “Personal Interpretation of Anarchy”  
| Anarchism from various perspectives               | “Anarchism and Literature”  
|                                                  | “Anarchism and Human Nature, Do They Harmonize?”  
|                                                  | “To honor the memory of Chicago Haymarket anarchists”  
|                                                  | “Why Direct Action Is the Logical Method of Anarchy”  
|                                                  | “The Place of Anarchism in Modern Thought”  
|                                                  | “Anarchism the Moving Spirit in the Labor Struggle”  
|                                                  | “The Psychology of Anarchism”  
|                                                  | “The Relation of Anarchism to Trade Unionism”  
|                                                  | “Woman under Anarchism”  
|                                                  | “Women and Anarchism”  
|                                                  | “The Influence of Drama on Anarchism”  
| Children development                              | “Crime against the Child”  
|                                                  | “The Education of Children”  
|                                                  | “Crimes of Parents and Education”  
|                                                  | “The Child and its Enemies: (The Revolutionary Developments in Modern Education)”  
|                                                  | “The Modern School and the Child”  
|                                                  | “The Family, its Enslaving Effect upon Parents and Children”  
|                                                  | “The Educational and Sexual Dwarfing of the Child”  
| Human nature and morality                         | “The Building of True Character”  
|                                                  | “Why Persons Commit Rash Acts”  
|                                                  | “The Eternal Spirit of Revolution”  
|                                                  | “Charity”  
|                                                  | “Vice, Its Cause and Cure”  
|                                                  | “The False Pretence of Culture”  
|                                                  | “Jealousy, its Cause and Possible Cure”  
|                                                  | “The Sham of Culture”  
| Labor activism                                    | “The Labour Struggle in America”  
|                                                  | “Syndicalism—A New Phase in the Labor Movement”  
|                                                  | “Socialism Caught in the Political Trap”  
|                                                  | “Communism, the Most Practical Basis for Society”  
|                                                  | “What is the Best Weapon for the worker?”  
|                                                  | “What is the Best and Most Successful Weapon in the Struggle of”  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor against Capitalist?</td>
<td>“Economic Efficiency”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The intellectual Proletarians”</td>
<td>“Why Strikes Are Lost”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“General Strike”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puritanism and criticism of the Church</td>
<td>“Puritanism, the Greatest Obstacle to Liberty”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Greatest Obstacle to Liberty, the Hypocrisy of Puritanism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Danger in the Growing Power of the Church”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Victims of Morality”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Corrupting Influence of Religion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Birth of Labor and Failure of Christianity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Our Moral Censors”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Philosophy of Atheism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women, gender, sexuality, and birth control</td>
<td>“Why Emancipation Has Failed to Free Women”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Marriage and Love”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Will the Vote Free Woman? Woman Suffrage”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“White Slave Traffic in This and European Countries”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Can Legislation Do Away with the White Slave Traffic”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Mary Wollstonecraft, the Pioneer of Modern Womanhood”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Woman's Inhumanity to Man”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Motherhood, Should the Poor Have Many Children?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Conflict of the Sexes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Misconceptions of Free Love”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The intermediate Sex (a Discussion of Homosexuality)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Man—Monogamist or Varietist?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“(The Follies of) Feminism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Right of the Child not to be Born”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Free or Forced Motherhood”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denunciation of current politics</td>
<td>“The Political Circus and Its Clowns”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Dissolution of Our Institutions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Minorities versus Majorities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Failure of Democracy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Dupes of Politics”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons and criminals</td>
<td>“The Spanish Inquisition in American Prisons”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Crime and criminals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Sex Sterilization of Criminals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence and war</td>
<td>“Violence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Psychology of Violence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Nietzsche, the Intellectual Storm Center of the European War”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Nietzsche and War”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Psychology of War”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Woman at War”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“War and Its Relation to Property”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“War and Our Lord”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Anti-Militarism: the Reply to War”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“War and the ‘Sacred’ Right of Property”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“War and Church”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Religion and the War”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Preparedness: A Conspiracy between the Munitions Manufacturers and Washington”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: The Thematic Categories and Titles of Goldman’s Drama Lectures from 1906 to 1917

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Titles of Goldman’s Lectures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>“The Revolutionary Spirit in Modern Drama”  \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Drama, the Most Forcible Disseminator of Radicalism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Modern Drama: The Strongest Disseminator of Radical Thought”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Drama, the Most Powerful Disseminator of Radicalism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Drama as a Disseminator of Revolutionary Ideas”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Social-Revolutionary Aspects of the Modern Drama”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Exoneration of the Devil”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“On Modern Drama”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>“French and German drama”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Scandinavian Drama: August Strindberg, the conflict of the sexes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Scandinavian drama: August Strindberg’s Facing Death, the Dance of Death, Creditors, and Comrades”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Ibsen’s Spector and Strindberg’s the Father and the Friend (Scandinavian Drama)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The German Drama: Gerhardt Hauptmann, the Social and Economic Struggle”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The German Drama (continued): Arthur Schnitzler, Frank Wedekind, and Others, the necessity of Sex Education”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“German Drama: Herman Sudermann’s Magda, St. John’s Fire; Gerhard Hauptmann’s The Beaver Coat, Lonely Lives; Gabriel Schilling’s Escape; and Otto Hartleben’s The Moral Demand”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The French Drama: Maeterlinck, Rostand, Mirbeau, and Brieux”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“French Drama: Maurice Maeterlinck’s Mary Magdalen and Monna Vanna, Brieux’s Maternity, and Wolfe’s The Lily”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The English Drama: George Bernard Shaw, Arthur Pinero, John Galsworth, Charles Rann Kennedy, and others”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Russian Drama: Tolstoy, Chekov, Gorky, and Adnreyev”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Irish Drama”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“American Drama: Mark E. Swan’s Her Own Money; William Hurlbut’s The Strange Woman; J. Rosett’s The Quandary and Middle Class; Edwin Davis Schoonmaker’s the American”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Italian and Spanish Drama”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Jewish Drama”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Dramatist</td>
<td>“On John Galsworthy’s new labor drama, Strife”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Strife, a Great Labor Drama”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Tolstoy, Artist and Rebel”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Tolstoy the Rebel”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“On Tolstoy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Maternity, a Drama by Brieux”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Rostand’s Chantecler”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Ibsen’s Enemy of the People”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Henrik Ibsen, the Struggle of the New against the Old”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The life of August Strindberg”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“August Strindberg, the Conflict of the Sexes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Andreyev’s King Hunger”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Damaged Goods. A Powerful Drama by Brieux Dealing with the Scourge of Venereal Disease”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Brieux’s Play Woman as a Sex Commodity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Wedekind’s the Awakening of Spring”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Books for sale by *Free Society* (1897-1904)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book List: All Orders for the Following Books Received at This Office (Those were also sold by <em>Mother Earth</em> appear in bold letters)</td>
<td><em>Essays on the Social Problem</em></td>
<td>H. Addis</td>
<td><em>Free Society</em>, Vol. X, No. 19, May 10, 1903, p. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The New Hedonism</em></td>
<td>Grant Allen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Plain Words on the Woman Question</em></td>
<td>Grant Allen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>God and the State</em></td>
<td>Bakunin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Same</em></td>
<td>London edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Whitman’s Ideal Democracy and Other Writings</em></td>
<td>Helena Born</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Love’s Coming-of-Age</em></td>
<td>Edward Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Prodigal Daughter: or, The Price of Virtue</em></td>
<td>Rachel Campbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Worm Turns</em></td>
<td>V. de Cleyre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Emancipation of Society from Government</em></td>
<td>Dallan Doyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarchism</em></td>
<td>Jay Fox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Crime and Criminals</em></td>
<td>C. Darrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Realism in Literature and Art</em></td>
<td>C. Darrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hilda’s Home</em></td>
<td>Rosa Graul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Moribund Society and Anarchy</em></td>
<td>Jean Grave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Motherhood in Freedom</em></td>
<td>Moses Harman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Origin of Anarchism</em></td>
<td>C. L. James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Government Analyzed</em></td>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>An Appeal to the Young</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anarchism Morality</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Expropriation</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Field, Factory and Workshop</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Law and Authority</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Memoirs of a Revolutionist</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolution</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Organized Vengeance</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Paris Commune</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The State: Its Historic Role</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Wage System. Revolutionary Government</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Resist Not Evil</em></td>
<td>Clarence S. Darrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Social Democracy in Germany</em></td>
<td>Gustav Landauer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>History of the Commune</em></td>
<td>Lissagaray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Conduct and Profession</em></td>
<td>Darrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Wind-Harp Songs</em></td>
<td>J. Wm. Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Economics of Anarchy</em></td>
<td>Dyer D. Lum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anarchy: Is It All a Dream?</em></td>
<td>Jas. F. Morton, Jr. &amp; Malatesta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A Talk about Anarchist</em></td>
<td>Malatesta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A Chambermaid's Diary</em></td>
<td>Octave Mirbeau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition</em></td>
<td>W. Nevill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Deistic Pestilence</em></td>
<td>John Most</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Pyramid of Tyranny</em></td>
<td>F. Domela Nieuwehuis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mating or Marrying, Which?</em></td>
<td>W. H. Van Ornum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Evolution and Revolution</em></td>
<td>Elisée Reclus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolstoy</td>
<td>Clarence S. Darrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pure Economy</em></td>
<td>J. H. Rowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pages of Socialist History</em></td>
<td>W. Tcherkesoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Slavery of Our Times</em></td>
<td>Leo Tolstoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Our Worship of Primitive Social Gusses</em></td>
<td>E. C. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Revival of Puritanism</em></td>
<td>E. C. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vice: Its Friends and Foes</em></td>
<td>E. C. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>What the Young Need to Know</em></td>
<td>E. C. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Ballad of Reading Gaol</em></td>
<td>Oscar Wilde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Life Without a Master</em></td>
<td>J. Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The New Dispensation</em></td>
<td>J. Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Coming Woman</em></td>
<td>Lillie White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anarchism and Outrage</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anarchy on Trial</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: The Publications of Mother Earth Publishing Association (1907-1918)\(^{48}\)
(The “Mother Earth Series”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year of 1st edition</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Tragedy of Woman’s Emancipation</em></td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>First published in ME in Mar. 1906; later the identical subject appeared in lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sex Union and Parenthood and What Is Seduction?</em></td>
<td>John Russell Coryell</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Modern Science and Anarchism</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>First published in ME in July-Dec. 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trade Unionism and Anarchism: A Letter to a Brother Unionist</em></td>
<td>Jay Fox</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>First published in ME in Nov. 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>McKinley's Assassination from the Anarchist Standpoint</em></td>
<td>Voltairine de Cleyre</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>First published in ME in Oct. 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pages of Socialist History</em></td>
<td>W. Tcherkesoff</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>First published by C. B. Cooper in 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Ego and His Own</em></td>
<td>Max Stirner</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Patriotism: A Menace to Liberty</em></td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>First presented as lectures; later also published in Anarchism and Other Essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>What I Believe</em></td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>First published in New York World in July 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anarchy versus Socialism</em></td>
<td>William C. Owen</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anarchism and American Traditions</em></td>
<td>Voltairine de Cleyre</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>First published in ME in Dec. 1908-Jan. 1909; it later appeared in her lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Modern School</em></td>
<td>Francisco Ferrer</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A New Declaration of Independence</em></td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>First published in ME in July 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The White Slave Traffic</em></td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>First presented as lectures and first published in ME in Jan. 1910; later published in Anarchism and Other Essays with many changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anarchism and Malthus</em></td>
<td>C. L. James</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>First published in ME in Apr.-Aug. 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anarchism and Other Essays</em></td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>First presented as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Dominant Idea</td>
<td>Voltairine de Cleyre</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>First published in ME in May-June 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Right To Disbelieve</td>
<td>Edwin James Kuh</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Punishment</td>
<td>C. D. Light</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Opponents and Conservative Friends of Unabridged Free Speech; being Notes of a Lecture Delivered March 13, 1910, before the Brooklyn Philosophical Association</td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>First published in ME in June 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is Worthwhile? A Study of Conduct from the Viewpoint of the Man Awake</td>
<td>Adeline Champney</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Identical version first published in ME in Nov. 1910-Jan. 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mexican Revolt</td>
<td>Voltairine de Cleyre</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Identical version first published in ME in Aug. 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchism: What It Really Stands For</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>First presented as lectures and first published in Anarchism and Other Essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and Love</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>First presented as lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Psychology of Political Violence</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>First presented as lectures and first published in Anarchism and Other Essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workingmen, Don’t Vote!</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Identical version first published in ME in Oct. 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist</td>
<td>Alexander Berkman</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Action</td>
<td>Voltairine de Cleyre</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of Morality and the Failure of Christianity</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>First presented as lectures; identical version first published in ME in Mar. &amp; April 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndicalism and the Cooperative Commonwealth</td>
<td>Emile Pataud and Emile Pouget; trans from by French by Charlotte and Frederic Charles</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndicalism: The Modern Menace to Capitalism</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>First presented as lectures; identical version first published in ME in Jan. 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Hunger</td>
<td>Leonid Andreyev</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Modern Drama: Its Social and Revolutionary Significance (Later became The Social Significance of the Modern Drama)</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>First presented as lectures; first published by MEPA and then Boston’s Richard G. Badger at the same year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre</td>
<td>Voltairine de Cleyre</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Edited by Alexander Berkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness: The Road to Universal</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>First published in ME in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 1915 and had substantial revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Atheism and the Failure of Christianity</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>First presented as lectures; identical version first published in ME respectively in Feb. 1916 and April 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God and the State</td>
<td>Michael Bakunin</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial and Speeches of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman</td>
<td>Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Partial content first published in ME in July 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Truth About the Bolsheviki</td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Published by Mother Earth Book Shop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6: Books to be had Through *Mother Earth* and *Mother Earth Bulletin* (1907-1918)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books to be had through <em>Mother Earth</em></td>
<td><em>Work and Wages</em></td>
<td>Prof. J. E. Thorold Rogers</td>
<td><em>Mother Earth</em>, 1:2 (Apr. 1906); 1:3 (May 1906); 6:4 (June 1911); 8:9 (Nov. 1913); 9:1 (Mar. 1914); 10:1 (Mar. 1915); 11:4 (June 1916); 12:4 (June 1917);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Civilization, Its Cause and Cure</em></td>
<td>Edward Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>England's Ideal, and Other Papers on Social Subjects</em></td>
<td>Edward Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Social Revolution</em></td>
<td>Karl Kautsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Origins and Growth of Village Communities in India</em></td>
<td>B. H. Baden-Powell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>American Communities</em></td>
<td>William Alfred Hinds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Sale of an Appetite</em></td>
<td>Paul Lafargue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Triumph of Life</em></td>
<td>Wilhelm Boelsche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Poems of Walt Whitman</em></td>
<td>Walt Whitman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Crime and Criminals</em></td>
<td>Clarence S. Darrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | *Katharine Breshkovsky—"For Russia's Freedom."
<p>| | <em>The Doukhobors: Their History in Russia: Their Migration to Canada</em> | Joseph Elkins | |
| | <em>Moribund Society and Anarchism</em> | Jean Grave | |
| | <em>Education and Heredity</em> | J. M. Guyau | |
| | <em>A Sketch of Morality—Independent of Obligation and Sanction</em> | J. M. Guyau | |
| | <em>American Communities: New and Old Communist, Semi-Communist, and Co-Operative</em> | W. A. Hinds | |
| | <em>History of the French Revolution</em> | C. L. James | |
| | <em>Origin of Anarchism</em> | C. L. James | |
| | <em>History of Civilization In England</em> | Henry Thomas Buckle | |
| | <em>England's Ideal and other Papers on Social Subjects</em> | Ed. Carpenter | |
| | <em>Civilization: Its Cause and Cure</em> | Ed. Carpenter | |
| | <em>Love's Coming of Age</em> | Ed. Carpenter | |
| | <em>Towards Democracy</em> | Ed. Carpenter | |
| | <em>The Chicago Martyrs</em> | | |
| | <em>Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History</em> | Antonio Labriola | |
| | <em>Wealth Against Commonwealth</em> | H. D. Lloyd | |
| | <em>Woman's Share in Primitive Culture</em> | O. Mason | |
| | <em>Superstition in All Ages</em> | Jean Meslier | |
| | <em>News from nowhere: or, An Epoch of Rest</em> | William Morris | |
| | <em>Thus Spake Zarathustra: A Book for All and None</em> | Friedrich Nietzsche | |
| | <em>Rights of Man.</em> | Thomas Paine | |
| | <em>The Martyrdom of Man</em> | Winwood Reade | |
| | <em>The Science of Life</em> | J. Arthur Thomson | |
| | <em>Pages of Socialist History</em> | W. Tcherkesoff | |
| | <em>The Slavery of Our Times</em> | Leo Tolstoy | |
| | <em>Behink Yourself</em> | Leo Tolstoy | |
| | <em>Church and State</em> | Leo Tolstoy | |
| | <em>Free Speech For Radicals</em> | Theodore Schroeder | |
| | <em>Voiney's Ruins; or, Meditation on the</em> | Oscar Wilde | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revolution of Empires and the Law of Nature</td>
<td>Oscar Wilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ballad of Reading Gaol</td>
<td>Oscar Wilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Soul of Man under Socialism</td>
<td>Oscar Wilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Profundis</td>
<td>Oscar Wilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions</td>
<td>Oscar Wilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays</td>
<td>Oscar Wilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Without a Master</td>
<td>J. Wilson, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Dispensation</td>
<td>J. Wilson, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Thoughts</td>
<td>J. Wilson, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris and the Social Revolution</td>
<td>J. Sanborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchism: Is It All a Dream?</td>
<td>J. F. Morton, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Is the Enemy: Anthony Comstock or You?</td>
<td>Edwin C. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of the Press and Obscene Literature. Three Essays</td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of Albert R. Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Basis of Trade Unionist</td>
<td>Emile Pouget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution and Revolution</td>
<td>Elisée Reclus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News from nowhere; or, An Epoch of Rest</td>
<td>William Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monopoly</td>
<td>William Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful Work Versus Useless Toil</td>
<td>William Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bomb</td>
<td>Frank Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Defense of Free Speech. Five Essays</td>
<td>B. O. Flower et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schopenhauer in the Air</td>
<td>Sadakichi Hartmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Talk about Anarchist Communism Between Two Workers</td>
<td>Errico Malatesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Free Speech in New York and New Jersey</td>
<td>Alden Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law-Breaking</td>
<td>Alden Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Social General Strike</td>
<td>Arnold Roller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The God Pestilence</td>
<td>John Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unabridged Freedom of Speech</td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opponents and Friends of Free Speech</td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Ferrer: His Life, Work and Martyrdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideals of Russian Literature</td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchism</td>
<td>P. Elzbacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Is Property?</td>
<td>P. J. Proudhon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches of the Chicago Anarchists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Duty of Civil Disobedience</td>
<td>H. D. Thoreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchism</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Eltzbacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Plays</td>
<td>Eugene Brieux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mexican Revolution: Its Progress, Causes, Purpose and Probable Results</td>
<td>Wm. C. Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Religion Been a Promoter or Retarder of Civilization</td>
<td>Rosa Markus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndicalism</td>
<td>Earl C. Ford and Wm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message of Anarchy</td>
<td>Jethro Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Life in Prison</td>
<td>Donald Lowrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannele</td>
<td>Gerhart Hauptmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunken Bells</td>
<td>Gerhart Hauptmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eldest Son</td>
<td>J. Galsworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pigeon</td>
<td>J. Galsworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Liberty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Terrible Meek</td>
<td>Charles Rann Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daughter of Jorio</td>
<td>Gabriele D’Annunxio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Chains</td>
<td>Paul Hervieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revolutionary Almanac for the Year 1914</td>
<td>Ed. by Hippolyte Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Smug Citizen</td>
<td>Maxim Gorki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowadays</td>
<td>George Middleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs of Rebellion</td>
<td>Adolf Wolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndicalism</td>
<td>Louis Levine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fires of St. John</td>
<td>Hermann Sudermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Science of Society</td>
<td>Stephen Pearl Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Right to Ignore the State</td>
<td>Herbert Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Origin and Ideals of the Modern School</td>
<td>Francisco Ferrer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Vindication of Natural Society</td>
<td>Edmund Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndicalism in France</td>
<td>Dr. Louis Levine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Poet in the Desert</td>
<td>Charles Erskine Scott Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon River Anthology</td>
<td>Edgar Lee Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War and Capitalism</td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lost War</td>
<td>George Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics of Liberty</td>
<td>John Beverley Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androcles and the Lion</td>
<td>Bernard Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman on Her Own; False Gods; The Red Robe</td>
<td>Eugene Brieux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Confession</td>
<td>Maxim Gorky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Spy</td>
<td>Maxim Gorky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanine</td>
<td>Michael Artzibashev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Little Angel</td>
<td>Leonid Andreyev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crushed Flower</td>
<td>The Crushed Flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelle, the Conqueror</td>
<td>Martin Andersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militarism</td>
<td>Karl Liebknecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A German Deserter’s War Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Fire</td>
<td>Henri Barbusse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bolsheviki and World Peace</td>
<td>Leon Trotsky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 7: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Books of Ernest Crosby</td>
<td>Garrison the Non-Resistant</td>
<td><em>Mother Earth</em>, 1:2 (April 1906), p. 64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garrison the Non-Resistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plain Talk in Psalm and Parable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captain Jinks, Here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swords and Plowshares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolstoy and His Message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolstoy as a Schoolmaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad-Cast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Carpenter, Poet and Prophet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Books of Bolton Hall</td>
<td>Free America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Game of Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Even as You and I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 8: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henrik Ibsen’s Plays: to be had through <em>Mother Earth</em></td>
<td><em>A Doll’s House</em></td>
<td><em>Mother Earth</em>, 2:12 (Feb. 1908).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Pillars of Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghosts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosmersholm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Lady from the Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Enemy of Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Wild Duck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Young Men’s League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedda Gabler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Master Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 9: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Memoirs of a Revolutionist.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Conquest of Bread</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fields, Factories, and Workshops</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Modern Science and Anarchism</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Terror in Russia</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The State: Its Role in History</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anarchist Communism</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Place of Anarchism in Socialist Evolution</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anarchist Morality</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Wage System</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Expropriation</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Law and Authority: An Anarchist Enemy</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>War</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>An Appeal to the Young</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 10: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Works of Friedrich</td>
<td><em>Beyond Good and Evil</em></td>
<td><em>Mother Earth</em>, 7:9 (Nov. 1912).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Birth of Tragedy</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nietzsche

- *Case of Wagner; We Philologists, etc.; Nietzsche contra Wagner*
- *The Dawn of Day*
- *Early Greek Philosophy and Other Essays*
- *Ecce Homo (Nietzsche’s Autobiography)*
- *Human, All Too Human. Part I*
- *Human, All Too Human. Part II*
- *On the Future of Our Educational Institutions; and Homer and Classical Philology.*
- *Thoughts Out of Seasons. Part I.*
- *Same. Part II*
- *The Twilight of the Idols: The Antichrist*
- *Thus Spake Zarathustra: A Book of All and None*
- *The Will to Power. Books I and II.*
- *Same. Vol. II*
- *Various Essays and Fragments. Biography and Criticism*
- *The Gospel of Superman*

### Appendix 11: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August Strindberg</td>
<td><em>First Series: The Dream Play; The Link; The Dance of Death</em></td>
<td><em>Mother Earth, 9:1 (Mar. 1914).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Second Series: Creditors; Pariah; Miss Julia; The Stronger: There Are Crimes and Crimes</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Third Series: Advent; Simoon; Swan White; Debit and Credit; The Spook Sonata; The Black Glove</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Black Glove</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Creditors; Pariah</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Miss Julia; The Stronger</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lucky Pehr</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Easter</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>On the Seaboard</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Plays: Comrades; Facing Death; Pariah; Easter</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Married</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Outcast; Simoon; Debit and Credit</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Swanwhite: A Fairy Drama</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Motherlove</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rutherford &amp; Son</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Magda. By Hermann Sudermann</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Fires of St. John. By Hermann Sudermann</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 12: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (VI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Best Literature on Birth Control</td>
<td><em>Mother Earth April Issue</em></td>
<td>August Foret</td>
<td><em>Mother Earth, 11:2 (Apr. 1916).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Sexual Question</em></td>
<td>Dr. William Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Limitation of Offspring</em></td>
<td>Dr. C. V. Drysdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Small Family System</em></td>
<td>Moses Harman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Right To Be Well Born</em></td>
<td>Margaret Sanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>What Every Mother Should Know</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>What Every Girl Should Know</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 13: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (VII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Important Books on Sex</strong></td>
<td><em>Birth Control or The Limitation of Offspring by the Prevention of Conception</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td><em>Mother Earth</em>, 12:3 (May 1917).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Woman: Her Sex and Love Life</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Never Told Tales</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Stories of Love and Life</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sex Knowledge For Men and Boys</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sex Knowledge for Girls and Women</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sexual Problems of To-day</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Eugenics and Marriage</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Sexual Crisis</em></td>
<td>Grete Meisel-Hess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Uncontrolled Breeding or Fecundity versus Civilization</em></td>
<td>Dr. William J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td><em>The Sexual Life of the Child</em></td>
<td>A. Moll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Sexual Life of Woman</em></td>
<td>E. H. Kisch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Spring’s Awakening</em></td>
<td>Frank Wedekind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Leaves of Grass with Autobiography</em></td>
<td>Walt Whitman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>What Every Girl Should Know: What Every Mother Should Know</em></td>
<td>Margaret Sanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 14: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (VIII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anti-Military Literature</strong></td>
<td><em>Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter</em></td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td><em>Mother Earth</em>, 10:12 (Feb. 1916).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Patriotism, a Menace to Liberty</em></td>
<td>Emma Goldman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>War and Capitalism</em></td>
<td>Peter Kropotkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Last War</em></td>
<td>George Barrett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 15: Series of Books for sale by *Mother Earth* (IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series Name</th>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Free Press Anthology</em></td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Due Process of Law</em></td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Freedom of the Press and Obscene Literature</em></td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>In Defense of Free Speech</em></td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Liberal Opponents and Conservative Friends of Unabridged Freedom of Speech</em></td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Paternal Legislation</em></td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Our Vanishing Liberty of the Press</em></td>
<td>Theodore Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law-Breaking by the Police</td>
<td>Alden Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fight for Free Speech</td>
<td>Alden Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCHIVAL SOURCES

The Emma Goldman Archive, Berkeley, California, USA

International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Kate Sharpley Library, Berkeley, USA

Richard J. Daley Library, Special Collections, University of Illinois at Chicago, USA

Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamiment Library, NYU, USA

Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, MA, USA

PRIMARY SOURCES: PRINTED PAMPHLETS, BOOKS, AUTOBIOGRAPHIES, MEMOIRS, DIARIES, ARTICLES, AND MICROFORM SOURCES

_A Report of Harris Weinstock, Commissioner to Investigate the Recent Disturbances in the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego, California to His Excellency Hiram W. Johnson, Governor of California._ Sacramento: Superintendent of State Printing, 1912.


Periodicals (with the publication city and the years consulted)

America: a Catholic Review of the Week (New York, 1911)
Anaconda Standard (Anaconda, MT, 1908, 1914)
Baltimore American (Baltimore, MD, 1910)
Belleville News-Democrat (Belleville, IL, 1911)
Bisbee Daily Review (Bisbee, AR, 1912)
Boston Morning Journal (Boston, 1915)
Colorado Springs Gazette (Colorado Springs, CL, 1911, 1917)
Common Sense (Los Angeles, 1908)
Current Literature (New York, 1910-1911)
Denver Daily News (Denver, 1912)
East Oregonian (Pendleton, OR, 1908)
Funü zazhi (婦女雜誌, The Ladies’ Journal, Shanghai, 1924)
Free Society (San Francisco, 1900-1901)
Harper’s Weekly (New York, 1913)
Industry (Washington, D. C. 1920)
Los Angeles Herald (Los Angeles, 1909)
Los Angeles Times (Los Angeles, 1914)
Meriden Morning Record (Meriden, CN, 1914)
Min Sheng (民聲, Guangzhou, 1914)
Morning Olympian (Olympia, WA, 1917)
Morning Oregonian (Portland, OR, 1908, 1910)
Mother Earth (New York, 1906-1917)
Mother Earth Bulletin (New York, 1917-1918)
New York Call (New York, 1910)
New York Labor Bulletin (1908)
New-York Tribune (New York, 1910)
Norwich Bulletin (Norwich, CT, 1910)
Official Gazette (官報, Tokyo, 1900)
Plain Dealer (Cleveland, OH, 1906)
Rock Island Argus (Rock Island, IL, 1909)
San Francisco Call (San Francisco, 1908, 1912)
San Jose Mercury News (San Jose, 1906-1907)
Seitō (The Bluestockings) (Tokyo, Japan, 1913-1914)
Slavonic and East European Review. American Series (1944)
Springfield Daily Republican (Springfield, MA, 1910)
St. Louis Post-Dispatch Sunday Magazine (St. Louis, MO, 1897)
The Aberdeen Daily American (Aberdeen, SD, 1917)
The Bee (Washington, DC, 1914)
The Bellingham Herald (Bellingham, WA, 1908, 1910)
The Bemidji Daily Pioneer (Bemidji, MN, 1908)
The Boston Journal (Boston, 1906)
The Chicago Sunday Tribune (Chicago, 1908)
The Columbus Enquirer-Sun (Columbus, GA, 1911)
The Daily Capital Journal (Salem, OR, 1911, 1917)
The Duluth News Tribune (Duluth, MN, 1911-1912)
The Evening Star (Washington, DC, 1910)
The Evening Times (Grand Forks, ND, 1908)
The Evening Telegram (Salt Lake City, UT, 1908, 1910-1911)
The Evening World (New York, 1906)
The Grand Forks Daily Herald (Grand Forks, ND, 1908, 1917)
The Grand Rapids Press (Grand Rapids, MI, 1914)
The Hawaiian Star (Honolulu, HI, 1908)
The Independent and the Weekly Review (New York, 1912)
The International Socialist Review (Chicago, 1910-1912, 1915)
The Kansas City Star (Kansas City, MS, 1911, 1913-1914)
The Labor World (Duluth, MN, 1908)
The Literary Digest (New York, 1912)
The Little Review (Chicago, New York 1914-1917)
The Macon Daily Telegraph (Macon, GA, 1911)
The Masses (New York, 1911-1917)
The Methodist Review (New York, 1909)
The Oasis (Arizola, AZ, 1911)
The Ogden Standard (Ogden City, UT, 1910)
The Outlook (New York, 1908)
The Pensacola Journal (Pensacola, FL, 1908, 1911)
The Seattle Star (Seattle, 1908)
The Sedan Lance (Sedan, KS, 1908)
The Spokane Press (Spokane, WA, 1908)
The Sun (New York, 1906, 1909, 1914)
The Twentieth Century Magazine (Boston, 1911)
The Washington Times (Washington, D.C., 1912, 1917)
The Woman Rebel (New York, 1914)
The Woman's Standard (Des Moines, IA, 1901)
Tian Yi (天義, Tokyo, 1907)
Washington Herald (Washington, D.C., 1914)
Woman’s Journal (Boston, 1917)
Xin Qing Nian (新青年, The New Youth, Shanghai, 1917)
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Monk, Craig. “Emma Goldman, Mother Earth, and the Little Magazine Impulse in Modern America.” In “The Only Efficient Instrument”: American Women Writers & the
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