

An Anarchist Revolution?

Emma Goldman as an Intellectual Revolutionary

When the Russian Revolution changed Russia in February 1917, turning it from an autocratic monarchy into a supposedly democratic republic, the well-known Russo-American anarchist Emma Goldman was cheering—not only because the revolution had ended a political system that was repressive and undemocratic, but also and especially because the masses of people that had taken their fate into their own hands.¹ Regardless of her joy, Goldman, who in December 1919 was deported from the United States to Soviet Russia—with other radicals, due to the Palmer Raids—had hoped for a revolution on American soil rather than to be a revolutionary in exile.² It was her work as a leading figure of the anti-militarist No-Conscription League that had brought her to trial, together with her friend and former lover Alexander Berkman, and once both had served a prison sentence until late 1919, they were deported as foreign radicals who had opposed the government and the U.S. war effort by conspiring with others, as the accusation and sentence would claim respectively.

Goldman had also supported the Russian Revolution since early 1917, as well as Lenin and the Bolsheviks, whom she considered to be fulfilling the revolutionary ideals that had been expressed by the Russian masses during the protests that led to the end of the Czarist regime.³ For Goldman, a revolution, in accordance with her anarchist ideals and theoretical considerations, needed

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

Goldman's life and works have been discussed in a number of biographies that basically follow her story from Czarist Russia to the United States, and eventually to exile.⁴ Recent works have begun to look at different aspects of Goldman's life and thought in more detail, including her struggle against the U.S. state during the First World War,⁵ her views on the Russian Revolution,⁶ and her identity as an early or kind of proto-feminist,⁷ as well as an anti-Fascist in the interwar period.⁸ All these works analyzed a specific aspect of her life and impact and are in their sum important to critically question the role Goldman had played as a public intellectual in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The following analysis continues to this growing body of specialized Goldman literature, by considering and putting a special focus on her identity as an anarchist revolutionary who, although she did not develop a concrete theory of revolution of her own, through her experiences and writings established an anarchist understanding of revolutionary processes and expressed a demand for its democratic nature, that is, a grassroots democracy, in the future.

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

A Revolutionary on American Soil

Goldman, like many other radicals, was considered an immigrant who had brought such radical ideas with her, but in reality, and as she would later emphasize very often, two things made her an anarchist. First, it was her experience of exploitation in the U.S. garment industry and the related sweatshops where she had to work long hours for low pay, observing the dehumanization of so many other immigrants who, like her, had dreamed of a better future in the United States when they had left their homes in Europe.⁹ The German, Italian, Russian, and Jewish communities were consequently seedbeds for radical ideas, as the numerous exploited individuals would turn toward those who promised a better future, namely, socialists or anarchists.¹⁰ The New York Lower East Side was a particularly vivid environment for anarchist ideas, linking the German- and Yiddish-speaking anarchist agitators. Second, for Goldman, her experience of the Haymarket Tragedy was an important aspect of her own radicalization. She would emphasize the role of these events in 1886/1887 when later recalling the roots of her own political radicalism. In her autobiography *Living My Life*, she wrote the following about one night in 1889: “That night I could not sleep. Again I lived through the events of 1887. Twenty-one months had passed since the Black Friday of November 11, when the Chicago men had suffered their martyrdom, yet every detail stood out clear before my vision and affected me as if it had happened but yesterday. . . . The reports in the Rochester newspapers irritated, confused, and upset us by their evident prejudice. The violence of the press, the bitter denunciation of the accused, the attacks on all foreigners, turned our sympathies to the Haymarket victims.”¹¹

Goldman’s anarchism would eventually determine her whole further life, and although Goldman was not as dogmatic as many radical men around her, she demanded an emotional anarchism of freedom, due to which she also demanded a free and self-determined life for women, including, especially, sexual freedom.¹² Only if women and men were truly equal would they be able to work together for a better future, so it was women whose role in a future revolution needed to be stressed, including by Goldman. She therefore demanded that the liberation of women be a precondition for a revolution in the future.¹³ The “woman question” could therefore not wait, but was instead a necessary step toward the beginning of a truly revolutionary process. When

Goldman had fought for years for free speech and the female right for abortion, to name just two important elements that determined Goldman's life in the United States before her later deportation, she turned all her energy toward the criticism of the First World War in general and voices that demanded U.S. preparedness for this global war in particular.

The European Left was very often divided about the question of war and which position to take with regard to the violent conflict, leading to serious splits between those who demanded support for a supposedly "defensive war" and those who demanded its end and did not comply with demands by their national governments.¹⁴ The latter group usually ended up in jail, and European prisons were filled with representatives of the pacifist left. Goldman, together with others, stated early on that the war could not and should not be supported. She also raised her voice against the nationalist demands for U.S. preparedness. In 1915 she published "Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter" in *Mother Earth* to raise awareness of the issue.¹⁵ She argued that "the human mind seems to be conscious of but one thing, murderous speculation. Our whole civilization, our entire culture is concentrated in the mad demand for the most perfected weapons of slaughter."¹⁶ The political economy of the war would only serve the "privileged class; the class which robs and exploits the masses, and controls their lives from the cradle to the grave." The workers, who would gain nothing from the war, would solely be exploited again, while "America grows fat on the manufacture of munitions and war loans to the Allies to help crush Prussians [and] the same cry is now being raised in America which, if carried into national action, would build up an American militarism far more terrible than German or Prussian militarism could ever be, and that because nowhere in the world has capitalism become so brazen in its greed and nowhere is the state so ready to kneel at the feet of capital." U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, "the historian, the college professor," was nothing more than a servant of the capitalist class, although the President himself had also criticized the nationalist cry for preparedness for war in some of his previous speeches. Ultimately, he and the U.S. government were not concerned with the interests of the common people and would only argue on behalf of capitalism, imperialism, and consequently militarism. Goldman warned of this trend, stating, "Militarism consumes the strongest and most productive elements of each nation. Militarism swallows the largest part of the national revenue. Almost nothing is spent on education, art,

literature and science compared with the amount devoted to militarism in times of peace, while in times of war everything else is set at naught; all life stagnates, all effort is curtailed; the very sweat and blood of the masses are used to feed this insatiable monster—militarism.”

However, when the U.S. government introduced the Selective Service Act in 1917, Goldman intensified her criticism and her activities against the war. With her lifelong friend Alexander Berkman and some others, she founded the No-Conscription League and began to publicly argue against this new law.¹⁷ The conscription of young American men represented nothing more than another form of exploitation. These men would be sent to Europe to die for the capitalist elites of the United States. Goldman, at a meeting of the No-Conscription League at Hunts Point Palace, New York, on June 4, 1917, summed up her critical position toward this new law: “I actually believed that this [the United States] was the promised land, the land that rests upon freedom, upon opportunity, upon happiness, upon recognition [sic] of the importance and the value of the young generation. . . . I have come to the conclusion that when the law for conscription was passed in the United States the Funeral March of 500,000 American youths is going to be celebrated tomorrow, on Registration Day.”¹⁸

Instead of complying with the governmental demands, Goldman proposed that U.S. workers should take a closer look at Russia, where a revolution had swept away the ruling class and, for the first time in history, had made the masses responsible for their own future. In her public speeches, Goldman stressed that the United States had during the First World War turned more autocratic than Czarist Russia and that it was time for the working class to take the torch from Russia to spark the revolutionary fire on this side of the Atlantic as well. For this criticism of the new law, Goldman and Berkman were arrested and brought to trial, where they were accused of leading an antigovernmental conspiracy.¹⁹ While both anarchists used the possibility to present their ideas to a wider public, it was clear from the beginning that the trial as such was nothing more than a farce. It ended with no surprise: Goldman and Berkman were sentenced to 2 years in prison and a \$10,000 fine.²⁰ Before she had to go to prison in early 1918, however, Goldman once again highlighted the role of the Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviks and published a short pamphlet that aimed to motivate the U.S. working class, and her anarchist readers in particular, to stand up for their rights in revolution.²¹

Yet nothing happened. Goldman spent her time in prison until late September 1919, and was handed her deportation papers shortly before her release date.²² She and Berkman were supposed to be deported, according to legal possibilities the government had been preparing in the last few months. Now facing deportation, Goldman had to be ready for an unknown fate. While she herself considered her U.S. citizenship a solid right, the court did not accept her marriage to Jacob Kershner in the early 1880s to be a legitimate act of naturalization to U.S. citizenship, especially since there was no proof for the marriage, which had taken place following a Jewish procedure.²³

In December 1919, Goldman and Berkman, with close to 250 other radicals, were sent away on board the transport ship *Buford*, or the “Soviet Arch,” as it was later called. Only a few days after their journey began would they be told that Soviet Russia was their destination.²⁴ At least the two anarchists could thereby help the establishment of a new world, a world born by revolution. Although Goldman had had no interest in going back to Russia, she was now, with no other choice, looking forward to becoming part of the revolution she had previously praised so much in the United States. However, the postrevolutionary realities would turn her admiration of the Russian Revolution into bitter frustration.

Observing the Postrevolutionary Order

Goldman was not the only one who was able to gather information and experience from Soviet Russia while living there.²⁵ But it is important to consider her life there to better understand her development as a revolutionary intellectual whose image of the Russian Revolution was tremendously transformed by her firsthand impressions. After a transatlantic journey that was marked by anxiety, hunger, a fear of diseases, and overcrowded cabins, Goldman, together with the other radicals, reached the Soviet Russian border in January 1920. The anarchists consequently found shelter in the land of the utopian revolution and met with those who had left the United States immediately after the news of the February Revolution, such as Bill Shatov. Like many international anarchists, he had supported the revolution from its start and was dogmatically flexible enough to tolerate the leading position of the Bolsheviks. Goldman, in contrast, realized early on that the postrevo-

lutionary reality of Soviet Russia was far from anything she had hoped for while hailing Lenin and his followers for their revolutionary role in 1917 and 1918, when she had still been in the United States.

In Soviet Russia, the anarchists would soon become an opposition force against Lenin's leadership and would attempt to organize a centralized state led by the Bolshevik party. In April 1919, the first violent clashes between the two parties took place and Goldman witnessed how anarchist ideas were suppressed, especially when they were critical of the new postrevolutionary order. The U.S. anarchist was in an awkward position. Other anarchists, including Berkman, were willing to accept these developments as a consequence of international intervention and as a necessary evil that needed to be tolerated for the final achievement of a new social order. Goldman considered a revolution to be something else, namely, a change that needed to be supported by the masses and that should guarantee freedom for the people, even if they had different and maybe even critical opinions about the transformation process the revolution had caused. A revolution that denied freedom—and here she shared her theoretical perspective with one of the other leading figures of the international left, Rosa Luxemburg—could not be a true revolution. Goldman consequently had realized early on that the revolution had been corrupted by the Bolsheviks in general, and by Lenin in particular.

Nevertheless, there were several reasons for her to remain inactive with regard to possible criticism: (1) She hoped that Lenin would return to his claim that the soviets should be in power; (2) she agreed with other anarchists that the revolution would be doomed if one attacked it while international interventionist forces were attacking Soviet Russia; and (3) she believed that the revolution could still be saved if the masses were defending their rights to determine their own future. Her concerns were there early on, but the sense that her own security could not be guaranteed if her criticism was too harsh and too open while she was herself in Soviet Russia was also a reason to remain rather quiet.²⁶ On the other hand, that made her and Berkman's immediate criticism after leaving the land of revolutionary utopia in December 1921 more surprising for representatives of the international left, because it seemed to come relatively abruptly.²⁷

Regardless of this impression, Goldman struggled with the revolution and what it had eventually created. Maxim Gorki, with whom she met to

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

Maxim Gorki, he would surely tell me which side of the Russian face was the real one and which one false. He would help me, he the great realist, whose clarion voice had thundered against every wrong and who had castigated the crimes against childhood in words of fire. I dispatched a note to Gorki, requesting him to see me. I felt lost in the labyrinth of Soviet Russia, stumbling constantly over the many obstacles, vainly groping for the revolutionary light. I needed his friendly, guiding hand, I wrote him. . . . Maxim Gorki stood before me, his peasant face deeply lined with pain. . . . I had looked forward with much anticipation to the chance of talking to Gorki, yet now I did not know how to begin. "Gorki knows nothing about me," I was saying to myself. . . . "He may think me merely a reformer, opposed to the Revolution as such. Or he may even get the impression that I am just fault-finding on account of personal grievances or because I could not have 'battered toast and grapefruit for breakfast' or other material American blessings." . . . [N]ow I was upset by the apprehension lest Maxim Gorki consider me also a pampered bourgeois, dissatisfied because I had failed to find in Soviet Russia the flesh-pots of capitalist America. . . . Surely the seer who could detect beauty in the meanest life and discover nobility in the basest was too penetrating to misunderstand my groping. He more than any other man would grasp its cause and its pain. . . . I continued: "I also hope you will believe me when I say that, though an anarchist, I had not been naive enough to think that anarchism could rise overnight, as it were, from the debris of old Russia." He stopped me with a gesture of his hand. "If that is so, and I do not doubt you, how can you be so perplexed at the imperfections you find in Soviet Russia? As an old revolutionist you must know that revolution is a grim and relentless task. Our poor Russia, backward and crude, her masses, steeped in centuries of ignorance and darkness, brutal and lazy beyond any other people in the world!" I gasped at his sweeping indictment of the entire Russian people. His charge was terrible, if true, I told him. . . . [H]e replied that the "romantic conception of our great literary geniuses" had entirely

misrepresented the Russian and had wrought no end of evil. The Revolution had dispelled the bubble of the goodness and naïveté of the peasantry. It had proved them shrewd, avaricious, and lazy, even savage in their joy of causing pain. . . . The roots were inherent in Russia's brutal and uncivilized masses, he said. They have no cultural traditions, no social values, no respect for human rights and life. They cannot be moved by anything except coercion and force. All through the ages the Russians had known nothing else. . . . I protested vehemently against these charges. I argued that in spite of his evident faith in the superior qualities of other nations, it was the ignorant and crude Russian people that had risen first in revolt. They had shaken Russia by three successive revolutions within twelve years, and it was they and their will that gave life to "October."²⁸

Goldman and Berkman, on the other hand, were relatively free, so they were able to gather different opinions about the revolution, whether these be from intellectuals or from ordinary people. For the Museum of the Russian Revolution, the two anarchists were allowed to tour postrevolutionary Soviet Russia to collect data and evidence of the greatness of the new Soviet Russia.²⁹ Before their journey throughout the country officially began, they also met Pjotr Kropotkin in Dmitrov in July 1920. The famous anarchist had been exiled from the political centers of power, but he helped Goldman with a discussion of the revolutionary events and the current order, encouraging the latter to divide the revolution and its ideals, that is, the scenario in February 1917, from the current situation, that is, a centralized state under Bolshevik rule:

There was no reason to despair, he had urged. He understood my inner conflict, he had assured me, but he was certain that in time I should learn to distinguish between the Revolution and the regime. The two were worlds apart, the abyss between them bound to grow wider as time went on. The Russian Revolution was far greater than the French and of more potent world-wide significance. It had struck deep into the lives of the masses everywhere, and no one could foresee the rich harvest humanity would reap from it. The Communists, irrevocably adhering to the idea of a centralized State, were doomed to misdirect the course of the Revolution. Their end being political supremacy, they had inevitably become the Jesuits of socialism, justifying all means to attain their purpose. Their methods, however, paralyzed the energies of the masses and

terrorized the people. Yet without the people, without the direct participation of the toilers in the re-construction of the country, nothing creative and essential could be accomplished.³⁰

This advice was well taken by Goldman, who, after having experienced all the suffering in the postrevolutionary order all over the country, determined the Bolsheviks to be the most dangerous Marxist force for the revolution, the ideals of which it had already corrupted. The “Jesuit order in the Marxian Church,”³¹ as Goldman would refer to them later on, had sacrificed the revolutionary dreams of the masses and taken over a rule that was even more autocratic than that of the Czars had been in the past. Foreigners who visited Soviet Russia during international congresses and conferences could hardly see what she and Berkman had observed because they were well “protected” by the Bolsheviks, who translated for them and only showed them the good sides of Soviet life. Yet Goldman also struggled with Berkman, who, in contrast to her, was unwilling to believe that the revolution was dead and that Bolshevism had replaced the revolutionary dreams with another Marxist police state in which the Cheka, the secret police, was the tool that kept Lenin in power.³²

The events related to the Kronstadt Rebellion in March 1921, this “portent”³³ of the postrevolutionary process, were needed to awaken Berkman from the spell the Bolsheviks had put upon him. The sailors who had initially supported the February Revolution in 1917 had now turned against Lenin and his followers. The latter, instead of seeking a discussion with the newly established soviets and their representatives in Kronstadt, just crushed the rebellion in a very violent manner, especially since they could not afford criticism at this time, when all power needed to be secured to prevent both further invasion attempts and a victory of the white forces within Soviet Russia.³⁴ However, the events eventually forced Berkman to accept what Goldman had emphasized before: The revolution was dead and the Bolsheviks only ruled in the name of communism; in reality, they had established a centralized capitalist party state backed by the violence threatened and inflicted by their secret police, the Cheka.

Goldman and Berkman could no longer stay in Soviet Russia, especially since the government had executed anarchists in the summer of 1921 without any trial. The danger for the two anarchists from the United States consequently also increased, and they prepared their escape, which eventu-

ally was possible in December of that year. They moved to Sweden, which would become only the first station of their further exile in Europe and would be where they began their anti-Bolshevist “crusade” that demanded all their attention in the following years, although it seemed hard to get any support for it. Regardless of her experiences, however, Goldman remained a revolutionary intellectual, demanding and hoping for a better revolution, as she divided between the revolutionary masses and the morally corrupted Bolsheviks who acted in the name of a perverted Marxism, not in the name of a revolution.

Against Bolshevism, but for Revolution

In Sweden, Goldman worked on her first articles about the Russian Revolution that she sent to the United States to draw public attention to the events in Soviet Russia. While Berkman did not want to publish in the so-called “capitalist press,” it was hard to get attention outside of it, while Goldman simply wanted to get the greatest possible audience.³⁵ Her works appeared in the *New York World* and would later be published in a collected form. She was, however, criticized by other left intellectuals for her anti-Bolshevist attitude, which she seemed to sell at the highest price. When Goldman and Berkman eventually had to leave Sweden, they were not sure where and how they would spend their further exile, but they ended up in Berlin, where both worked on their first works about the Russian Revolution. Goldman was initially very melancholic,³⁶ but published a short German pamphlet about her experiences³⁷ and later also sent a longer manuscript to Doubleday, Page & Co. This, however, caused some problems.

On the one hand, Berkman had provided a lot of material for Goldman’s work, a fact that limited the chances for his own manuscript to get some attention. While he supported his friend, Berkman was obviously angry about Goldman exploiting his material. In October 1922, he remarked in a letter to a friend: Goldman’s “forte is the platform, not the pen, as she herself knows very well. . . . As her book will be out first, what interest could my book . . . have. . . . It is a tragic situation. Of course, my writing is different in style, and to some extent in point of view, but the meat I have given away. And yet I could not do otherwise.”³⁸

On the other hand, the publisher had not only changed the manuscript's title to *My Disillusionment in Russia*, but had also only published the first 12 chapters. Goldman's manuscript was torn into pieces, but, even worse, almost nobody realized.³⁹ Only two reviewers actually read the book carefully enough to remark on the missing chapters. The rest of the manuscript later appeared as *My Further Disillusionment in Russia*,⁴⁰ but, like Berkman's book, was not a real bestseller.⁴¹ Both anarchists seemed to be unable to intrigue the American readers in their view of the Russian Revolution. Conservative readers were not interested in a left critique of the events, and leftist readers were also not interested in reading something negative about it from another left intellectual. The hoped-for impact never realized, and Goldman and Berkman must have felt more than frustrated that the truth about Soviet Russia was not of interest to many.

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

What I actually found was so utterly at variance with what I had anticipated that it seemed like a ghastly dream. I found a small political group . . . —the Communist Party—in absolute control. . . . Labour conscripted, driven to work like chattel-slaves, arrested for the slightest infringement . . . the peasants a helpless prey to punitive expeditions and forcible food collection . . . the Soviets . . . made subservient to the Communist State . . . a sinister organisation, known as the "Cheka" (Secret service and executioners of Russia), suppressing thought . . . the prisons and concentration camps overcrowded with men and women . . . Russia in wreck and ruin, presided over by a bureaucratic State, incompetent and inefficient to reconstruct the country and to help the people realise their high hopes and their great ideals.⁴²

However, she was not allowed to speak in front of larger audiences, nor was she able to persuade leading left intellectuals to take a stand against the Bolsheviks. Bertrand Russell, whom Goldman thought very highly of, was willing to talk with Goldman, yet he would not support her activities as he deemed them unsuitable, considering the higher aims at stake. In February 1925, Goldman would send a letter to Russell expressing her disappointment about his unwillingness to join her for a series of lectures about Bolshevism.

She wrote: “[A] series of lectures on various phases of the Russian Revolution [is going] to take place in different parts of this City, in Town Halls. I am telling you this, not because I think you have any interest but simply that you may know that there are a few people in this country who feel the need of light on Russia. I had hoped that you would be among the first to see that need. I confess I am painfully disappointed that you, who so bravely and brilliantly stand out for the truth, should find it necessary to keep aloof from any critical work of the regime which has crushed the truth.”⁴³ Russell, however, declared a few days later in some detail why he had denied Goldman’s request:

I am prepared to . . . protest to the Soviet Government, on documented statements as to the existing evils; . . . But I am not prepared to advocate any alternative government in Russia: I am persuaded that the casualties would be at least as great under any other party. And I do not regard the abolition of all government as a thing which has any chance of being brought about in our lifetimes or during the twentieth century. I am therefore unwilling to be associated with any movement which might seem to imply that a change of Government is desirable in Russia. . . . I think ill are the Bolsheviks in many ways, but quite as ill as their opponents. I feel that your movement, even against your wishes, will appear as political opposition to the present Soviet Government.⁴⁴

The frustration continued, and Goldman remained unable to unite a larger number of leftists, whether anarchists or socialists, to resist the lies from Moscow. In the end, she had to witness the rise of other evils, namely, Fascism and National Socialism, although she considered them only to be mimicking Lenin, the first totalitarian ruler of the 20th century, who had abused an ideology to control the minds of his people.

Regardless of her experiences, Goldman never gave up her hope for another revolution. It must have been tragic that the Spanish Revolution and the Civil War again crushed this hope, as the anarchists, like the Bolsheviks 2 years before, seemed unable and too morally corrupted to develop a united front, backed by the masses of the people, and lead a revolutionary process to success. In the end, Goldman’s revolutionary experience of the 20th century must have been a bitter one, but the anarchist never gave up hope. For her, a revolution was the only way to achieve a better future and to build a better world:

Revolution is the negation of the existing, a violent protest against man's inhumanity to man with all the thousand and one slaveries it involves. It is the destroyer of dominant values upon which a complex system of injustice, oppression, and wrong has been built up by ignorance and brutality. It is the herald of NEW VALUES, ushering in a transformation of the basic relations of man to man, and of man to society. It is not a mere reformer, patching up some social evils; not a mere changer of forms and institutions; not only a re-distributor of social well-being. It is all that, yet more, much more. It is, first and foremost, the TRANSVALUATOR, the bearer of new values. It is the great TEACHER of the NEW ETHICS, inspiring man with a new concept of life and its manifestations in social relationships. It is the mental and spiritual regenerator.⁴⁵

Conclusion

Emma Goldman was an idealist, an emotional anarchist, and a true revolutionary. Early on, she had emphasized the value of emotions and freedom for a revolution, as without emotions they could not happen, and without freedom they could not succeed. When Goldman began to criticize Woodrow Wilson and the military-industrial complex during the First World War, leading to her foundation of the No-Conscription League, she was also hoping for an American revolution in which the working class would be inspired by the events in Russia. However, this revolution did not happen, and Goldman was sent to jail before being deported in late 1919. Arriving in Soviet Russia in January 1920, she had hoped to help to build a new world and a new social order, but soon realized that the revolution in Russia had been betrayed by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Once it was no longer possible to remain there, she and Berkman left and began to openly take a stand against Bolshevism. Goldman, in this period, nevertheless continued to argue for a revolution while warning her readers that every revolution could be morally corrupted. What she theoretically demanded was a revolution leading to a grassroots democracy, just as would have been represented by the soviets immediately after February 1917.

Such an anarchist structure in the postrevolutionary order would be necessary to secure two things: (1) for the masses to remain in charge of the

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

Notes

1. Bini Adamczak, *Beziehungweise Revolution: 1917, 1968 und kommende* (Berlin, Germany: Suhrkamp, 2017), 13. Goldman was cheerful for those who left for Russia, but only supported their preparations and did not seem to have the intention to actually follow them herself: "A contingent of Russian exiles and refugees was preparing to leave for their native land, and we helped to equip its members with provisions, clothing, and money. Most of them were anarchists, and all of them were eager to participate in the upbuilding of their country on a foundation of human brotherhood and equality." Emma Goldman, *Living My Life* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1931), <http://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-living-my-life>, ch. 42. For a more detailed discussion of Goldman's views about the Russian Revolution and how they changed from admiration to frustration, see Frank Jacob, *Emma Goldman and the Russian Revolution: From Admiration to Frustration* (Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2020).
2. Andrew Cornell, *Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the Twentieth Century* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016), 62; Marshall S. Shatz, "Review:Wexler, Emma Goldman in Exile," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 83, nos. 3–4 (1993): 458.
3. See among other publications, Emma Goldman, "The Russian Revolution," *Mother Earth Bulletin* 1, no. 3 (1917), http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/ME/mebulv1n3.html; and Emma Goldman, *The Truth About the Bolsheviki* (New York, NY: Mother Earth, 1918), http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/truthaboutbol.html.
4. The main works, in chronological order, are Richard Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*, Phoenix edition (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982 [1961]); Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life* (New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1984); Kathy

- E. Ferguson, *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011); Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011); and Paul and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012). On her experience in exile, see Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1989).
5. Erika J. Pribanic-Smith and Jared Schroeder, *Emma Goldman's No-Conscription League and the First Amendment* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2019). Also see Frank Jacob, "Anarchistische Imperialismuskritik und staatliche Repression: Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman und die Kritik an der politischen Ökonomie des Ersten Weltkrieges in den USA, 1917–1919," *PROKLA: Zeitschrift für kritische Sozialwissenschaft* 50, no. 201 (2020): 681–95.
 6. Frank Jacob, "Der Anarchismus und die Russische Revolution—Emma Goldman und Alexander Berkman im Kampf gegen den Bolschewismus," *Ne znam: Zeitschrift für Anarchismusforschung* 7 (2018): 3–66; Jacob, *Emma Goldman*; Frank Jacob, "From Aspiration to Frustration: Emma Goldman's Perception of the Russian Revolution," *American Communist History* 17, no. 2 (2018): 185–99.
 7. Donna M. Kowal, *Tongue of Fire: Emma Goldman, Public Womanhood, and the Sex Question* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2016).
 8. Frank Jacob, "Emma Goldmans Blick auf Bolschewismus, Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus: Eine anarchistische Perspektive auf den Totalitarismus der 1920er- und 1930er-Jahre," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 68, no. 10 (2019): 833–47.
 9. Emma Goldman, "Why I Am an Anarchist," n.d., Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth EGP-IISH), No. 191, 10–13.
 10. For a detailed overview of New York's German–American anarchist milieu see Tom Goyens's works: *Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880–1914* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007), and "Johann Most and the German Anarchists," in *Radical Gotham: Anarchism in New York City from Schwab's Saloon to Occupy Wall Street*, ed. Tom Goyens (Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press, 2017), 12–32. For the Italian–American and Jewish–American anarchist milieu in the urban metropolis see Kenyon Zimmer, *Immigrants Against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America* (Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press, 2015), and Kenyon Zimmer, "Saul Yanovsky and Yiddish Anarchism on the Lower East Side," in *Radical Gotham: Anarchism in New York City from Schwab's Saloon to Occupy Wall Street*, ed. Tom Goyens (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2017), 33–53.
 11. Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 1.

12. Frank Jacob, "Anarchismus, Ehe und Sex: Emma Goldman (1869–1940) als Anarcha-Feministin," in *Geschlecht und Klassenkampf: Die "Frauenfrage" aus deutscher und internationaler Perspektive im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Vincent Streichhahn and Frank Jacob (Berlin, Germany: Metropol, 2020), 202–21. On anarcha-feminism in general, see Donna M. Kowal, "Anarcha-Feminism," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, ed. Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 265–79. Kowal defines anarcha-feminism, a label that did not yet exist in Goldman's own times, as "a distinct, albeit loosely formed, 'school of thought' that was reflected in the transnational activism of anarchist women, especially in Europe and the United States. Anarchist women tended to interpret the anarchist critique of authority through the lens of their experiences as women, especially constraints resulting from sexual double standards and the gendered division of labor." *Ibid.*, 265.
13. Emma Goldman, *Marriage and Love* (New York, NY: Mother Earth, 1911); Emma Goldman, "The Element of Sex in Life," n.d., EGP-IISH, no. 213; Emma Goldman, "The New Woman," *Free Society*, February 13, 1898: 2, in Emma Goldman: *A Documentary History of the American Years*, vol. 1: *Made for America, 1890–1901*, ed. Candace Falk et al. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 322; Emma Goldman, "The Tragedy of the Modern Woman," n.d., EGP-IISH, no. 266; Emma Goldman, "The Tragedy of Women's Emancipation," *Mother Earth* 1, no. 1 (1906): 9–18.
14. For some recent works on the European Left during the First World War see Frank Jacob and Riccardo Altieri, eds., *Krieg und Frieden im Spiegel des Sozialismus 1914–1918* (Berlin, Germany: Metropol, 2018), and Uli Schöler and Thilo Scholle, eds., *Weltkrieg - Spaltung - Revolution. Sozialdemokratie 1916–1922* (Bonn, Germany: Dietz, 2018).
15. With Mother Earth Goldman connected different anarchist groups and provided a central press organ for information. Peter Glassgold, "Introduction, The Life and Death of Mother Earth," in *Anarchy! An Anthology of Emma Goldman's Mother Earth*, ed. Peter Glassgold (Berkeley, CA: Counterpoint, 2012 [2001]), xvii.
16. Emma Goldman, "Preparedness, the Road to Universal Slaughter," *Mother Earth* 10, no. 10 (1915), <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-preparedness-the-road-to-universal-slaughter>. The following quotes are taken from this article.
17. For a detailed discussion of the work of the No-Conscription League and the legal issues it caused for Goldman, see Erika J. Pribanic-Smith and Jared Schroeder, *Emma Goldman's No-Conscription League and the First Amendment* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2019).
18. Stenographer's Minutes of Meeting of No-Conscription League, Hunts Point Palace, New York, June 4, 1917, Alexander Berkman Papers, Tamiment Library & Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, New York (henceforth ABP-TAM), Box 1, Folder 12, 24.

19. Harry Weinberger's documents related to the legal issues during the Red Scare that also involved the defense of Goldman can be found in the Harry Weinberger Papers (MS 553), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, Box 2, Folders 12–19.
20. Address of Harold A. Content to the Jury, July 9, 1917, *U.S. v Goldman and Berkman*, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 14, 93.
21. Goldman, *Truth*.
22. Paul Avrich and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 292; Alix Kates Shulman, *To the Barricades: The Anarchist Life of Emma Goldman* (New York, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1971), 194.
23. Deportation Hearings of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, Stenographer's Minutes, December 8, 1919, ABP-TAM, Box 1, Folder 3, 28 and 30.
24. Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman to Comrades, On Board the U.S. Transport Buford, January 10, 1920, in Letters from Berkman, U.S. Transport Buford, January 3–13, 1920, Alexander Berkman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth ABP-IISH, No. 127), 9. Also see Avrich and Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 296–97; Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 74. On the journey of the USAT Buford, see Torrie Hester, *Deportation: The Origins of U.S. Policy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 121–24.
25. Avrich and Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*, 291–302; Candace Falk, *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman*, rev. ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990 [1984]), 183–96; Shulman, *To the Barricades*, 203–13; Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1989), 57–91.
26. Emma Goldman to [Stella Comyn], Petrograd, November 4, 1920, Papers of Leon Malmed and Emma Goldman, MC 332, M-88, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA (henceforth LMP), Folder 26, 1.
27. Alexander Berkman, "Some Bolshevick Lies about the Russian Anarchists," February 1922, ABP-IISH, No. 183. The article was published in *Freedom* (April 1922), 24–26; Alexander Berkman, "The Russian Revolution: A Review and an Outlook," Stockholm, February 8, 1922, ABP-IISH, No. 182.
28. Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 52.
29. Emma Goldman, *My Disillusionment in Russia* (New York: Doubleday, 1923), <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-disillusionment-in-russia>, ch. 13.
30. Goldman, *Living My Life*, ch. 52.
31. Emma Goldman, *The Crushing of the Russian Revolution* (London, UK: Freedom Press, 1922), University of Warwick Library Special Collections, JD 10.P6 PPC 1684, 7.

32. Richard Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*, Phoenix edition (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982 [1961]), 235–36.
33. Helmut Bock, “Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921,” in *Das Menetekel: Kronstadt 1921—Kriegskommunismus und Alternativen*, ed. Helmut Bock et al. (Berlin, Germany: Helle Panke e.V., 2011), 5–20.
34. For a detailed description of the events see Paul Avrich, *Kronstadt 1921* (New York, NY: Norton, 1974 [1970]). For Berkman’s view see Alexander Berkman, *The Kronstadt Rebellion* (Berlin, Germany: Der Syndikalist, 1922), <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/alexander-berkman-the-kronstadt-rebellion#toc8>.
35. Alexander Berkman to Fitzie, Stockholm, February 10, 1922, Michael A. Cohen Papers, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, RG 313, Box 1, Untitled Folder, 1. Emphasis in the original.
36. Emma Goldman to Leon Malmed, Berlin, August 9, 1922, LMP, Folder 28, 1.
37. Emma Goldman, *Die Ursachen des Niederganges der russischen Revolution* (Berlin, Germany: Der Syndikalist, 1922).
38. Cited in Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 244.
39. Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 245; Vivian Gornick, *Emma Goldman: Revolution as a Way of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 118.
40. Emma Goldman, *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1924), <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-further-disillusionment-in-russia>.
41. Horace B. Liveright to Alexander Berkman, New York, June 17, 1925, ABP-IISH, No. 169.
42. Emma Goldman, “What I Saw,” Emma Goldman Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam (henceforth EGP-IISH), No. 284.
43. Emma Goldman to Bertrand Russell, London, February 9, 1925, Emma Goldman Papers, New York Public Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division, ZL-386, Reel 1, 1.
44. Bertrand Russell to Emma Goldman, London, February 14, 1925, EGP-IISH, No. 144, 2–3.
45. Emma Goldman, *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1924), <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emma-goldman-my-further-disillusionment-in-russia>.

