Stony Brook University

Revolutionizing Literature:

Anarchism in the Lives and Works of Emma Goldman, Dorothy Day, and Bernard Shaw

A Dissertation Presented

by

Virginia Mary Costello

to

The Graduate School

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

Stony Brook University

December 2010

Stony Brook University

The Graduate School

Virginia Mary Costello

We, the dissertation committee for the above candidate for the
Doctor in Philosophy degree, hereby recommend
acceptance of this dissertation.

Adrienne Munich - Dissertation Advisor
Professor, Department of English, Stony Brook University

Celia Marshik - Chairperson of Defense
Professor, Department of English, Stony Brook University

E. Ann Kaplan
Distinguished Professor, Department of English, Stony Brook University

Miriam Brody
Associate Professor, Department of Writing, Ithaca College

This dissertation is accepted by the Graduate School.

Lawrence Martin
Dean of the Graduate School

Abstract of the Dissertation

Revolutionizing Literature:

Anarchism in the Lives and Works of Emma Goldman, Dorothy Day, and Bernard Shaw

by

Virginia Mary Costello

in

English

Stony Brook University

2010

My dissertation seeks both to discover and analyze a current of anarchism present in the autobiographies and other works of two early-twentieth-century radical and radically different women: Emma Goldman and Dorothy Day. Both activists sought to express their anarchism, not primarily through political theory or through anarchist political action but through an explicit form of living: their radicalism was an aesthetic anarchism in that they advocated and exemplified a practice of radical self-creation. For Goldman this meant she synthesized politics, sexuality, and aesthetic sensibility. In her lectures and essays she employed drama, particularly George Bernard Shaw's, to convey her anarchist message. Whereas Goldman became a leading force in the anarchist movement, Day founded the Catholic Worker movement, which combined two apparently disparate ideas: Catholicism and anarchism. To explain the contradictory elements in these ideas, Day employed Fyodor Dostoyevsky's work, particularly his description of a harsh and dreadful love. This aesthetic anarchism practiced by Goldman and Day can be fruitfully contrasted to the tradition of aesthetics that privileges literary work such as that found in T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land,* over the work of living day-to-day.

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, fed by a handful of acts of political violence committed by self-declared anarchists, sensationalized press coverage of those acts, and government surveillance of anarchist meetings and anarchists themselves, anarchism in the United States became virtually synonymous with political violence. Theoretically, however, anarchism is nonviolent; at the same time, its reputation for violence is not entirely undeserved. Viewed not as a political theory but as a form of life, anarchism requires a revolution that would dismantle the existing political state. This ideal anarchism, this aesthetic ideal, advocates the dismantling of every form of political power as necessary step to a more profound and challenging way of life. Thus I employ the notion of aesthetic anarchism both to describe its relation to and also to distinguish it from the various anarchisms, political and otherwise, that were current during the period of my concern and that influenced both Goldman and Day.

This dissertation attempts to avoid the literature/theory hierarchy by focusing on the socio/historical/political moment as expressed through autobiography. Thus, the autobiographies of Goldman and Day are read as literary works as well as historical documents. Grounded in evidence from these autobiographies, personal and political correspondence, particularly correspondence between Goldman and Shaw, essays, lectures, a novel, and archival documents including Secret Service files, my dissertation seeks to show that Goldman and Day's aesthetic vision of anarchism was based on their belief in and commitment to the capacity of human goodness.

Dedication

To my mother Virginia Huerter Costello,
my sister Anne Mary Johnson,
and
my son Owen Xavier Costello Thorp

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want to recognize the patience, guidance, and knowledge of my dissertation committee: Adrienne Munich, Celia Marshik, E. Ann Kaplan, and Miriam Brody. They inspired me with their dedication and scholarship.

Many members of the International Shaw Society helped me identify obscure references and encouraged my scholarship.

I am exceedingly grateful for the companionship and support of fellow graduate student Jenna Kightlinger.

My sister, Anne Mary Johnson and my mother, Virginia Huerter Costello gave me their time and energy and I am indebted to them. I also received support from Bob Johnson, Monica Costello, Joe Costello and Cathy Park, John Costello and Noelle DeLage, and Daniel Costello. Finally, I appreciate the editing skills of my husband, Thomas Thorp and friend, Anne Balay.

Introduction

> "The Plutocratic Society which we Socialists are attacking, though an anarchy, is nevertheless an organised anarchy; an anarchy, too, which is sustained even by the efforts towards reform of those who are contented with it . . . ."
>
> ~William Morris, *Justice*[1]

Anarchism lends itself to misunderstanding. It advocates for productive chaos while relying upon sophisticated political and social organizing; it advocates on behalf of humanity's essential goodness while having recourse to revolutionary violence. These parallel tensions are apparent in the life and philosophy of the intellectual founder of the anarchist movement, Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876). Bakunin asserts that in order to be free and happy, people must organize themselves in "independent associations, without governmental paternalism though not without the influence of a variety of free individuals and parties" (328). Organization that begins with individuals and independent associations is based on the premise that everyone wants what is best for the collective; it must come from a trust or faith that humans want to be and do good. Yet, contrary to the fundamental principles of anarchism, in order to achieve this organization, there must be a time of chaos, revolution, and the "extensive and widespread destruction, a fecund and renovating destruction" that brings about fundamental change in political structures (Bakunin 334). As a collectivist anarchist, Bakunin thought that once the political system was dismantled, workers would create a new system in which they owned the means of production and received salaries according to the amount of time and effort they put in to production. According to historian Peter Marshall, Bakunin advocated "propaganda by the deed" which

[1] 9th February 1884, p. 2.

promotes physical violence against powerful and oppressive individuals; such acts are meant to catalyze the revolution. Bakunin "went as far as to recommend the selective killing of individuals as a preliminary to social revolution" (Marshall 285). For Bakunin, the ends justified the means. In this light, it is difficult to view anarchism as also advocating any kind of human goodness.

Although like Bakunin, anarchist Prince Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) believed in voluntary cooperation and that workers should own the means of production, he did not call for individual acts of violence. As an anarcho-communist, Kropotkin argued that moral principles should replace state law, and he developed a "systematic social philosophy based on scientific principles" (Marshall 5). To support his claims, he pointed to a long history of peaceful cooperation of groups: "fishermen, hunters, travelling merchants, builders, or settled craftsmen - came together for a common pursuit" (Kropotkin *Mutual Aid* 171).[2] Theses groups did not have or need a governing body imposing organization upon them; they governed themselves. Further, in his definition of anarchism published in the 1910 *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Kropotkin virtually ignored the violence associated with anarchism. He pointed to historically successful anarchist or free societies, outlined the principles of an anarchist society, and proposed an economic system that did not rely on money or tokens. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* editors found it necessary to add a footnote to his entry that mentioned past incidents of anarchist violence. Bakunin and Kropotkin represent two of the many iterations of anarchism. A third direction, Kropotkin wrote in *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1910), "Christian-anarchism, was added by Leo Tolstoy, and a fourth, which might be ascribed as literary-anarchism, began amongst

[2] Other famous anarchist philosophers include Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and William Godwin.

some prominent modern writers" ("Anarchism").[3] All of these currents of anarchism center on the same basic premise: establishing a just order would require replacing an established—but unjust—order with a new an-archic ideal. That ideal establishes order without any organizing principle other than freedom and the affirmation of life. Dolgoff clarifies the contradiction: "Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, and their successors . . . understood that freedom (paradoxical as this may seem) must be organized, must systematically permeate every cell of the social body" (9).

Even the mundane contemporary dictionary definitions register a fundamental ambiguity. The Greek root, *arche*, means "rule" or "order" (as in "command") but also "a beginning" or "origin" ("'APXH" def. 1, 2).[4] Classicists refer to the initial alpha in "anarchy" as an alpha privative: a prefix to an existing noun or substantive term. An alpha privative undoes the meaning of the root; that is, meaning has been achieved through the undoing of something. Consequently, the term anarchy can achieve two meanings depending on how we define the initial, Greek term *arche*. If the original *arche* were defined as consolidated authority in a single hereditary leader or independent state, then anarchy would mean the reversal of that or chaos. But if the initial term did not refer to a single hereditary leader or independent state, then anarchy could refer to the establishment of authority through the cooperative agreement or consent of those being governed. This is not a contradiction. These two opposing meanings can both be contained in the univocal term. In the final analysis, the meaning of the term rests within the tension between the two interpretations. For example, the 1993 *O.E.D.* offers this: anarchy is the "absence of government in a society (orig. as a source of civil disorder, later also a political

[3] A few other currents of anarchism include collectivism, syndicalism, and mutualism. More recently, anarchist currents have multiplied: anarcho-capitalism, anarcha-feminists, Green anarchism (eco-anarchism), and anarcho-pacifism to name only a few.

[4] The punctuation here is correct even though it looks odd. The term APXH includes what appears to be an apostrophe before the A and a straight mark after the H.

ideal); a state of political or social confusion; *absolute freedom of the individual*" ("Anarchy" def. 1, my emphasis). The concluding element of this definition documents the reason for, or the result of, a revolt: to gain individual freedom. The parenthetical information points to the expanding meaning of anarchy to include both disorder and a political ideal. Even today the commonly understood meaning of anarchy, whether one is a contemporary modernist scholar or a member of the common folk, is the second definition: " . . . a state of disorder; chaos" ("Anarchy" def. 2).

In the section of the O.E.D. definition that provides examples of the historical use of the word "anarchy," five of the six sentences define the term in a negative light, using words like "a hateful thing" or simply "chaos."[5] But the sentence written by G.K. Roberts describes anarchy as "the organization of society on the basis of voluntary cooperation, and especially without the agency of political institutions, i.e. the state." So within this single *O.E.D* definition of anarchy, the nuances of meaning reinforce the original contradictions.[6] Anarchy has been used both as a pejorative term, as in chaos (although chaos is not by nature negative), and an affirmative one, as in freedom. Neither anarchy's connection to chaos, nor to organization—to the act of creating order—can be dismissed.

A recent (and extended) definition of anarchy in the online *O.E.D.* seeks to achieve an objective tone and, more significantly describes a political ideal. The first line echoes what has

[5] The definition of anarchy in Wikipedia bends in the opposite direction, primarily focusing on the positive with links to articles about successful anarchist states like the Iceland Commonwealth ("Anarchy").

[6] Also worthy of note are the following definitions of anarch, anarchist, and anarchy from the 1993 *O.E.D.*. Anarch is defined as "an instigator of anarchy, a leader of revolt, an anarchist." "A leader of revolt" is the only phrase that does not use some variation of the term to define anarch, so the emphasis tends to be on this phrase. Notice also that the term "instigator" takes on a negative connotation. An anarchist, again according to the 1993 *O.E.D.*, is "an advocate of anarchy; a person who believes that all government should be abolished." The first phrase of this definition mirrors the first phrase of the definition of anarch, with the word "advocate" replacing "instigator" and thereby making the tone more positive. Neither of these definitions indicate any specific reason for a revolt nor suggest what happens after a government is abolished.

already been discussed,[7] but the second phrase in this definition adds something new: "a theoretical social state in which there is no governing person or body of persons, but each individual has absolute liberty (without implication of disorder)" ("Anarchy" def. 2a).[8] Here, anarchy is not merely a revolt but a "theoretical social state" in which individual freedom exists *without* chaos.

To the public mind in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, however, anarchism was virtually synonymous with violence. This definition derived from a handful of violent acts committed by self-declared anarchists, sensational press coverage of these acts, government surveillance of anarchists and anarchist meetings, and an adventure-starved public. The public knew little of the pacifism central to an anarchist society;[9] instead, the public associated anarchism "with street politics, mass demonstrations, chaos, violence, and terror" (Diggins 63).[10] This reputation for violence was not entirely groundless.

Viewed not as a political theory but as a way of life, anarchism requires a revolution that dismantles the existing political state. This ideal anarchism, this aesthetic ideal, advocates the dismantling of every form of political power as a problematic but necessary step to a more profound revolution. Thus I employ the term "aesthetic anarchism," which both describes the relation to and also distinguishes it from various anarchisms, political and otherwise, that populate the social imagination of the time. Aesthetic anarchism is grounded in the power of creative self expression, particularly literature and art, to transform people. More than a

---

[7] The first line reads, "Absence of government; a state of lawlessness due to the absence of inefficiency of the supreme power; political disorder" ("Anarchy" def. 1).

[8] The newer definitions of anarch also have a less judgmental tone. For example, "instigator of anarchy" becomes "advocate of anarchy" (*O.E.D.* 1993, 2009).

[9] Several anarchists interviewed in the documentary film "Anarchism in America," (1983) claim that they are peaceful people involved in a peaceful movement.

[10] The image of the anarchist haunting the public imagination was usually a man in a dark overcoat holding a round bomb with a lit fuse.

theoretical ideal, it attends to lived experience as a site for aesthetic inquiry. Activists Emma Goldman and Dorothy Day sought to express their anarchism not primarily through political theory or through political action but through an explicit form of living: their radicalism was an aesthetic anarchism in that they advocated and exemplified a practice of radical self-creation.

Of the three primary writers I focus on in this dissertation, Emma Goldman, George Bernard Shaw, and Dorothy Day, only Goldman was formally involved in the anarchist movement, but all three were influenced by it. They grappled with their own understanding and practice of anarchism. For example, in her late teens, Goldman began her lecturing career by repeating the arguments of anarchist Jonathan Most; as the initial excitement of giving her first lecture waned, she realized that she did not agree with his interpretation of anarchism (Goldman, *Living My Life* 63). Instead, Goldman scholar Bonnie Haaland writes, "Goldman embraced the work of Kropotkin and Ibsen arguing that individuality requires organization and, in reciprocal fashion that organization requires individuality" (7).

To claim that Shaw embraced anarchism would be an overstatement, and yet he was clearly influenced both by the Haymarket event and the anarchist arguments of William Morris, Peter Kropotkin, Leo Tolstoy, and Oscar Wilde; however, he ultimately rejected anarchism, opting for socialism instead. In contrast to both Goldman and Shaw, Day founded the Catholic Worker movement, which brought together two apparently disparate ideas—Catholicism and anarchism.

Goldman and Day's aesthetic anarchism can be fruitfully contrasted to the tradition of aesthetics that privileges literary work, such as that found in T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land,* over the work of living day-to-day. The traditional masculinist approach to aesthetics as expressed by European writers beginning with Immanuel Kant defines aesthetics as a form of judgment that

transcends merely empirical and material reality. Kant's *Critique of Judgment*, for example, focuses on "reflective judgments" including the good, sublime, beautiful, and agreeable. This view of aesthetics tended to underscore distinctions between the spiritual and the material, and thus it tended to reinforce the split between mind and body. *The Waste Land* represents poetry as a traditional site on which aesthetic sensibility and judgment are located.

I argue that Goldman and Day respond to the Kantian aesthetic in their practice of aesthetic anarchism. Ironically, both writers also use a traditional aesthetic site—namely literature—to support their arguments. Goldman believed that literature, and Shaw's drama in particular, produced an emotional experience within the audience member and was therefore a way in which that audience member might be transformed. While Shaw blends art and life in his work and in his life, he stays within particular political boundaries, and yet his work often attempts to radicalize his audience. One might argue that his work bridges the gap between traditional aesthetics and Goldman and Day's aesthetic anarchism.

Friedrich Nietzsche developed a broader sense of the Kantian aesthetic that took aesthetics in a more political direction. Feminists' works such as Hélène Cixous's "The Laugh of the Medusa," Luce Irigaray's *Speculum of the Other Woman* and *Elemental Passions,* and Julia Kristeva's *Revolution in Poetic Language* build on this broader sense of the aesthetic. They bring the body back into ideas of art and philosophy so that art becomes more of an active process and emphasizes the individual as artist. It is this broader sense of the aesthetic that I employ when I use the term aesthetic anarchism.

Irigaray writes that woman is "flowing everywhere without boundaries—deathly boundaries" (18) and without imposed boundaries she *is* herself. Cixous declares that woman must create herself through the act of writing: "Woman must write her self: must write about

women and bring women to writing, from which they have been driven away as violently as from their bodies—for the same reasons, by the same law, with the same fatal goal. Woman must put herself into the text—as into the world and into history—by her own movement" (875). Through their construction of anarchism, both Goldman and Day practiced a feminist aesthetic that blurred boundaries between the mind and body and between politics and the mundane acts of everyday living. They wrote themselves into history through their autobiographies and used art to intervene in the world in a way that would make a difference.

By its nature and history, aesthetic sensibility has been specifically gendered. Thus it is no accident that I have chosen women who wrote autobiographies and lived lives that redefine the site of the traditional aesthetic. Although Shaw had faith in human goodness, Goldman and Day had far more. Unlike Goldman, Shaw never believed humans and could/would from groups of voluntary cooperation and function without a governing body. Most significantly, I seek to show that Goldman and Day's aesthetic visions of anarchism were based on their belief in and commitment to the capacity of human goodness.

Although I have grouped them together in this introduction, Goldman and Day's aesthetic anarchism differed socially and politically. For example, Day eventually chose celibacy while Goldman viewed sexuality as creative expression, fundamental to the human spirit and inextricable from her anarchism. Goldman's well-attended lectures were connected to the social conditions of the early-twentieth century: the appearance of the new woman, interest in and new tolerance for speaking about sex, free-love, birth control (emphasis on tolerance not social acceptability), dissatisfaction of the common folk with their position, and the threat of censorship.

Day's work, particularly her autobiography, offer a glimpse into the literary scene through the eyes of a sensitive and intelligent young woman, insight into the historical moment and, more profoundly, a personal example of the move from thoughtful engagement with political theory to anarchism as an everyday practice. Day writes, "The greatest challenge of the day is: how to bring about a revolution of the heart, a revolution which has to start with each one of us" (*Loaves and Fishes* 215). In one of the many ways Day sought to encourage that revolution within her Catholic readers (or anyone else for that matter), she made herself an example and was arrested for revolutionary acts of nonviolence. She found that fundamental changes did not happen through theory but through questioning and refusing to obey unjust laws. It happened through practical anarchism.

I ground my argument in evidence from two sets of primary texts: those written by Goldman, Day, and Shaw and those that place the first group in a historical and cultural context. Thus, in the first group I include autobiography, personal and political correspondence, particularly correspondence between Goldman and Shaw, diaries, and essays. Newspaper headlines and articles, FBI files, Secret Service files, police warrants, and advertisements comprise the second group. I examine the second group of historical documents as a way to understand the production of a public perception and the narrative surrounding her in the social imaginary—an author's reception and her public persona—analyzing ways in which the public perception of individual activists and of anarchism as a political movement are formed.

Through analysis of both groups of documents, the ways in which anarchism becomes a way of life emerge. The aesthetic anarchism I am tracking is not primarily about a literary production, although that is an integral part of it; aesthetic anarchism defines the terrain on which anarchism becomes a way of life. My approach also includes close readings of literary texts and

an analysis of anarchist theory. I attempt to avoid the literature/theory hierarchy by focusing on the socio/historical/political moment as expressed through autobiography. Thus, I read autobiographies of Goldman and Day as literary works as well as historical documents. Their works offer insight into their political movements and their connections to literary figures and literature.[11] Both Goldman and Day, for example, found profundity and personal satisfaction in the writings of Fyodor Dostoyevsky. William Morris and Prince Peter Kropotkin influenced all three writers, to a greater and lesser degree.[12]

Literary figures such as Eugene O'Neill, Theodore Dreiser, Michael Gold, and Upton Sinclair crisscross and occasionally intermingle with Goldman, Day, and Shaw. Collectors and promoters of modern literature such as Peggy Guggenheim and Margaret Anderson also play a role.[13] While Guggenheim's "life long patronage of Djuna Barnes and her famous collection of paintings now in Venice" is well known (Rainey 67), her patronage and friendship with Emma Goldman is not. Lesser-known figures such as Emily Coleman and Frank Harris serve to enrich the wider historical narrative and draw connections between my original writers.

Because anarchism in general and Goldman herself are associated with violence first and foremost in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century public imagination and even today, I address this issue first. Thus, in chapter one I analyze both the sensationalized press coverage of Goldman's activities and her ideas about the place of violence in political action, both of which

[11] Shaw's book *Sixteen Self Sketches* and many of the prefaces to his plays contain autobiographical elements, but Shaw never wrote an official autobiography. For this reason, while I include references to these texts, they are not central to this dissertation.

[12] For example, on 12 September 1917, T.S. Eliot wrote to his mother about the new classes he was preparing to teach: "One set covers very much the same ground as my lectures at Southall last year, but more broadly, beginning with 'The Makers of 19th Century Ideas,' lectures on Carlyle, Mill, Arnold, Huxley, Spencer, Ruskin, Morris – then the poets, and then the novelists" (V. Eliot 56).

[13] For an analysis of Margaret Anderson's anarchism, see Margaret S Marsh's *Anarchist Women:1870-1920.* Philadelphia, Temple UP, 1981.

contribute to her narrative in the social imaginary. In order to avoid romanticizing anarchist violence, I compare it to lynching, another phenomenon of violence prevalent in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The distorted image of Goldman and violence in the press overshadows her involvement in lesser-known and certainly less sensational activities, such as lecturing about literature, which is the focus of chapters two and three.

Goldman respected the revolutionary power of artistic responses to the social and political crises of her day, particularly those artistic responses that critiqued the political structure. I argue that her anarchist lectures often referenced literature and yet failed to gain press coverage or subsequent scholarly attention even though these literary references were a driving force behind Goldman's anarchist message. In chapter two I show that Goldman embeds traditional American ideals and literature in her definition of anarchism. Further, I assert that in a move toward radical self-creation she synthesized politics, sexuality, and aesthetic sensibility.

Chapter three addresses Goldman's critique of Bernard Shaw, his influence on her, and her appreciation for, and anarchist interpretation of, his play, *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. I build on previous chapters' arguments by drawing on Goldman and Shaw's letters, Secret Service files, a police warrant, *Mother Earth* essays, Goldman's autobiography, and newspaper articles. Shaw's flirtation with anarchism ended long before Goldman began lecturing on anarchism and literature and long before she wrote to him. Goldman and Shaw's acquaintance interweaves the tension between political and literary readings (as well as leanings), content and form, and art and propaganda. While Shaw blends art and politics, when he is analyzed through a feminist anarchist lens, he lands firmly on the side of art. In general, Shaw requested political reform and Goldman demanded revolutionary changes in the most fundamental political structure.

Chapter four follows the complex, sometimes contradictory, relationship between Dorothy Day and Catholicism, a relationship that I cast as a negotiation between anarchism, aesthetics, and Catholicism. The intersection of these doctrines and theories converged in the Catholic Worker movement and led Day to focus on the rights of people of color. Day implements aesthetic anarchism through Catholic and anarchist theory in everyday action, similar to what Dostoyevsky calls "a harsh and dreadful love." Day's religious self is interwoven with her contradictory political identity as a reporter surrounded and influenced by the New York literary crowd, particularly her relationship with Eugene O'Neill. In short, Day allows me to extend and to test my claim that anarchism, properly understood, defined much of the fundamental social upheaval to which modern literature is generally viewed as a response. My purpose is not to politicize Shaw, Goldman, and Day, but to recognize their struggles in the face of the changes defining the modern world.

As this dissertation centers on literature as a fundamental component of individual anarchism, and as the literary movement of the time, namely modernism, has components of anarchist thought, I attached an appendix that briefly discusses the term "modernism" and analyzes T.S. Eliot's relationship to the feminine in the quintessential modernist text, *The Waste Land.* A comparison between the drafts and Eliot's final version of the poem suggests that the increasing number of women in the literary workplace influenced their representation (or absence) in literary texts. This anarchic-social tension filters into the drafting of *The Waste Land*. The poem represents the masculinist aesthetic to which Goldman, Shaw, and Day respond.

In summary, then, I argue that while the relationship between literature, aesthetics, gender, and anarchism cannot be easily characterized, primary documents and the autobiographical writings of Goldman, Day, and Shaw offer a snapshot. Perhaps more

abstractly, I argue for a more complex definition of anarchy, one that includes a “faith” in the human capacity for goodness.

Chapter One

Questions of Violence: Emma Goldman and the Social Imaginary

> "As an anarchist, I am against violence."
> ~Emma Goldman, *Living My Life*
>
> " If you are men, then you will rise in your might, Hercules, and destroy the hideous monster that seeks to destroy you. To arms we call you, to arms."
> ~August Spies, "Revenge! Workingmen to Arms!"

In late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century America, violence as a cultural phenomenon directed at one's countrymen existed in many forms such as lynching, mafia violence, and domestic violence. However, the phenomenon of anarchist violence received the most attention in the press. Anarchists were "irretrievably associated with bomb-throwing and violence" and in the public mind (Goodway 1). In comparing the number of murders that occurred through lynching and those that occurred through anarchist acts over a given year, 1895 for example, we find lynching outnumbers anarchist attacks by 163 to one.[1] To read the newspaper during this same year, however, one would assume the opposite.

This chapter questions why Emma Goldman and the anarchist movement, a relatively small political movement, attracted so much attention in the press. The lynching of African Americans, another phenomenon of violence, serves as a provocative contrast to the violence associated with Goldman, and the violence Goldman claimed was committed by the U.S. government.[2] Drawing attention to these three forms of violence shelves both the immediate

[1] Lynching: 164 (Wells, *Southern Horrors* 206); Anarchist violence: 1.

assumption that violence is solely a destructive force and the romanticization of violence as liberation. The point is to recognize the difference between the two: the reasons behind violent acts. How the public understands these reasons and whether there is public sympathy for the victims and/or the person accused of the crime often determined both whether the press covered the story and how the act was interpreted in the social imaginary. In this way, this chapter situates the violence associated with Goldman's anarchism historically and, more significantly for the purposes of this dissertation, draws a distinction between sensationalized violence in the press and Goldman's position on violence, without removing the significance of the combination. Finally, this distinction offers a clear view into the heart of Goldman's aesthetic anarchism.

Even though Goldman criticized the political system, dismissed authority in all its forms, fought for miners' and factory workers' rights, advocated free speech, free love, motherhood by choice, and access to birth control, the media often portrayed Goldman as a one-dimensional radical: a bomb-throwing anarchist. She writes:

> Such blood-curdling and incoherent stories have been circulated about me, it is no wonder that the average human being has palpitation of the heart at the very mention of the name Emma Goldman. It is too bad that we no longer live in the times when witches were burned at the stake or tortured to drive the evil spirit out of them. For, indeed, Emma Goldman is a witch! True, she does not eat little children, but she does many worse things. She manufactures bombs and gambles in crowned heads. B-r-r-r! ("What I believe" 48)

[2] Goldman argued that "every institution today rests on violence; our very atmosphere is saturated with it" (*Red Emma Speaks* 45). She defined anarchism as a "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" ("Anarchism" 50). Anarchists were reputedly, and sometimes actually, violent and the public often equated anarchism with violence. Therefore, Goldman's assertion that the "government rests on violence" is not without its irony. But anarchists who advocated violence asserted that it was temporary; it was a means to an end. It, unlike all forms of government, they insisted, could not be *sustained* by violence. Goldman believed that once the present systems—religion, property and the state—had been dismantled, anarchism would flourish. Its future success was based on the belief that humans, in Emerson's words, would make their "sense of the good and fair," central to a new social community (Goldman, "Anarchism" 56). Early in her career, she saw revolutionary violence as a means to an end, but later renounced that idea. In her essay, "What I believe" Goldman wrote, "What I believe is a process rather than a finality. Finalities are for the gods and governments, not for the human intellect" (*Red Emma Speaks* 35). See chapter two of this dissertation for a more detailed discussion of prisons as violence.

Her sense of humor allows her to take the public's fear in stride, but that fear eventually affected her ability to remain in the U.S., and when she lived in Europe, it affected her ability to make a living by lecturing and writing. The aura of violence surrounding Goldman was fed by sensationalized press reports connecting her to every act of violence committed by self-declared anarchists, by her own lectures—given primarily in her youth—advocating violent revolution, and by her refusal to publicly encourage or discourage propaganda by the deed, which, as mentioned previously, promotes physical violence against powerful and oppressive individuals. Reporters and public officials declared her a dangerous woman.

Through out her thirty-plus years residing in the U.S., her name, photograph, and sketches of her were emblazoned on the front pages of newspapers. But these news articles often contained inaccuracies. Although Goldman did not commit any of the violent acts attributed to her, a fact that even her friend Theodore Dreiser misunderstood,[3] and she later renounced propaganda by the deed, the public often assumed her guilt with delight and horror simultaneously. She fascinated them. Analyzing these news articles also reveals something about the reporters caught up in public fervor. And yet, to dismiss these images and sensationalized articles is to misunderstand Goldman's place in the social imaginary, the changes in her own stance on propaganda by the deed and violent revolution, and her use of this media attention to fuel her cause. She responded to the accusations against her not primarily by refuting them, but by recognizing the role of the political system in producing a person such as Leon Czolgosz, who killed President McKinley because he thought the political system left him no other choice.

[3] She did threaten to kill a specific person but under an unlikely condition—if she were in Spain at the particular moment she was speaking. In response to a question about killing a person in the Spanish Embassy in NY, she responded, "No, I do not think any one of the Spanish representatives in America is important enough to be killed, but if I were in Spain now, I should kill Canovas del Castillo" (*Living My Life* 189). Italian anarchist Michele Angiolilo did assassinate Castillo a short time later, but he had no connection to Goldman and had not heard or been inspired by her threat.

The point here is to analyze, not to dismiss, the sensationalized accounts, but to recognize them as created by the press, and to recognize that the constructed public persona often contrasted sharply with Goldman's actual practice of aesthetic anarchism. The press occasionally conducted interviews, which allowed her to speak for herself. Although interviewers were rarely anarchist sympathizers, they often admired Goldman's courage. The establishment couldn't simply dismiss her as a violent misanthrope because people paid to hear her speak and her lectures were well attended. Many in her audience were curious, sought an escape from the drudgery of their lives, and hoped for change. As a personal and public figure, Goldman embodies many of the contradictions that give anarchism its texture.

The Social Imaginary: The Sensational Overrules the Factual

Goldman became interwoven in the fabric of the social imaginary as early as the 1890s when her name, her anarchist views, and images of her began appearing in newspapers. The "social imaginary," a term coined by Cornelius Castoriadis in the 1960s, captures the idea that not merely individuals but societies harbor imaginations.[4] In response to Marx's assertion that we are determined by our material conditions, Castoriadis asserted that we are determined by the ideas around us.[5] This concept fosters a complex understanding of the narrative surrounding Goldman, encompassing how that narrative is interpreted though popular culture and changing gender roles. Further, the social imaginary helps us understand the profound effect Goldman had both in regard to the ideas she espoused and the press's presentation of her ideas.[6] According to

[4] The "social imaginary" is a complex philosophical term that I am using loosely to mean the public imagination.

[5] The social imaginary has some similarities to the national imaginary. For an interesting look at British women modernists in the national imaginary, see Jane Garrity's *Step-daughters of England : British Women Modernists and the National Imaginary*. New York : Manchester University Press, 2003.

[6] It is also an appropriate term as it incorporates what the anarchists call an "imaginative spirit."(Antliff 147)

Castoriadis, societies have ideas of themselves; these self-conceptions shape and define possibilities and actions. Aesthetic spheres such as literature, art, and popular culture define and shape political judgments. Castoriadis writes that "institutions, and . . . the whole of social life, cannot be understood as a system that is purely functional, an integrated series of arrangements geared to satisfying the needs of society" (135). Similar to the way that semiotics comes before the symbolic, the social imaginary comes before "the series of arrangements" that defines a society. This imaginary opens possibilities, generates original ideas that can, but do not necessarily, lead to new arrangements that satisfy the needs of society. The whole of social life must also be understood in terms of what the society imagines and how it reacts to ideas/concepts it has yet to imagine. As a complex, contradictory feminine figure—a gendered and ungendering figure—Goldman challenged but also employed the public's assumptions about gender and its meanings. She caught the imagination of a society.

Reports of her earliest political involvements emphasized violence and lawlessness and set the terms for how she would be perceived for most of her life. The two most significant violent acts for which the press accused Goldman of being ultimately responsible occurred in 1892, with the attempted assassination of Henry Clay Frick, and in 1901with the assassination of President McKinley. In a third example, the press accused Goldman of masterminding multiple acts of violence that occurred during March, 1908.

When Andrew Carnegie placed Henry Clay Frick as the chairman of the Carnegie Steel Company, Frick made it his mission to break the union, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers (AA). Shortly after negotiation for a new contract disintegrated, Frick locked the workers out and called in the Pinkertons who, according to Goldman, killed eleven steel workers

("The Psychology of Physical Violence" 93).[7] Frick eventually broke the union (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 523). In retaliation for the deaths of the steel workers, twenty-two year old Alexander Berkman attempted to assassinate Frick. Berkman assumed he would be killed in the process. Berkman hoped to stir the workers into revolution, but they were offended by his act. They wanted the eight-hour day and higher wages; they wanted to advance within the capitalist system, not change it. Thus, Berkman failed on all accounts. He served fourteen years in prison (of a twenty-two year sentence) and the exploitation of the steel workers continued.[8]

On July 28, 1892, *The New York World* printed a sketch of a dour-looking Goldman and accused her of masterminding Berkman's assassination attempt. But the article did not provide support for these accusations. Goldman's involvement, which she describes in her autobiography *Living My Life,* amounts to her plan to prostitute herself in order to earn some money to buy Berkman, her lover, a gun. She dressed the part but lost her nerve; a potential customer saw her nervousness, gave her money and told her to go home (*Living My Life* 93). She bought the gun and gave it to Berkman; however, she knew few details about the plan and certainly did not mastermind it.[9]

The New York World also quoted anarchist leader Johann Most who declared that Berkman's act was detrimental to the Cause. Two days later *Der Anarchist,* published Goldman's response, "Eingesandt" (Submitted). In this letter Goldman did not respond to the accusations against her; instead she defended Berkman's act. "Aufruf! Genossen und Freunde!" (Attention! Comrades and Friends!), a second letter also published in *Der Anarchist* was

[7] Historians in the PBS documentary "Emma Goldman: An Exceedingly Dangerous Woman" (2003) claim seven strikers and three Pinkertons were killed.

[8] A small plaque in the Frick Collection museum (Manhattan) commemorates the attempt on Henry Clay Frick's life, but it does not name Berkman as the assailant.

[9] It should be noted that she was desperate to know his plans and to be involved in this propaganda by the deed, but Berkman refused to tell her anything.

Goldman's appeal for money to help pay the costs of Berkman's defense (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 116-121; 123; 456; 457). In these examples, Goldman generates public attention not only through the accusations against her but in her insistence on defending Berkman. For Goldman, Berkman's attempt to assassinate Frick was acceptable violence because it was in retribution for all the workers the Pinkertons killed and, more significantly, it was an act that might incite the workers to take over the factory. She was twenty-three.

Goldman's continual search for the best way to lay the groundwork for anarchism led her to reexamine her ideas frequently. Thus, although she supported Berkman's actions wholeheartedly when he was on trial and then in prison, she became increasingly critical of propaganda by the deed. She realized that such violence "often implied a burning-out of the activist's own human sensitivity, as shown when no precautions were taken to protect innocent potential victims nearby" (Porter 216). Goldman writes, "If I ever believed in taking a human life, no matter how dangerous that life and how evil, I was entirely cured from it after Sasha's act" (Falk, *The Emma Goldman Papers,* Letter to Tom Bell, July 1st, 1937).[10] Berkman's act did not inspire the workers, but the negative press brought anarchism and Goldman into the public spotlight.

That spotlight grew more intense when Leon Czolgosz shot and killed President McKinley; anarchists, labor unionists, socialists, and the general public were horrified. Even before McKinley died from his wounds, headlines were ablaze with Goldman's guilt: "Czolgosz, The Anarchist Who Attempted to Kill the Chief Executive, Confesses to Police that Murderous Assault Is Result of Conspiracy, Emma Goldman Arrested in Chicago, Being the Only Accomplice" (Sept. 11, 1901). Although Czolgosz claimed to be an anarchist, he was unable to explain what that meant, and he did not "confess" to any such conspiracy. She had met him twice

[10] Hereafter cited by recipient and date only.

but knew nothing about his plot. The first time she met him was during the intermission of one of her lectures. He asked her for reading recommendations, which she gave him. The second time, he called on her at her friend's house, but she was busy and asked her comrades to welcome him. Within the week several anarchists published warnings about him in *Free Society;* they thought he was a spy because he asked so many questions about violence in political action (*Living My Life* 289). Three months later he assassinated the president.

The *Chicago Tribune* headline read, "Emma Goldman, High Priestess of Anarchy, Whose Speeches Inspired Czolgosz to His Crime" (Sept. 8, 1901). This headline sneers at Goldman through its religious and cult-like connotations: dubbing Goldman a "priestess of anarchy" contradicts the antiauthoritarian, antireligious elements of anarchism. Other reporters picked up the phrase.[11] Goldman used the attention of the press to defend not the assassination but the troubled man Czolgosz. In her autobiography she writes that she saw Czolgosz as one of the "supersensitive beings unable to bear up under too great social stress"; he was driven to violent expression because he could not "supinely witness the misery and suffering of [his] fellows" (*Living My Life* 312). Goldman used the attention to present the nuances of her anarchist philosophy. That is, she blamed the authoritarian systems for distorting his thinking. But most of the public heard only her defense of an assassin.

Neither shooting was thought to have furthered the goals of the anarchist movement, but the assassination of McKinley was particularly unpopular. These acts created bad public relations, which was particularly problematic when anarchists were soliciting funds. After Czolgosz assassinated President McKinley, press coverage of anarchists' activities took a more

[11] For example, even seven years later, when the *Chicago Daily Journal* interviewed Goldman, the headline read, "Emma Goldman, High Priestess of Anarchy, Sneers Over Crime" (March 3, 1908).

deeply negative turn and laws such as the Immigration Act of 1903 were passed to silence critics of the government and deport foreign-born anarchists.

A third example of accusations against Goldman included multiple events. On April 5th, 1908, a sketch of Goldman appeared next to the headline "The Trail of Blood Over March: The Red Month of the Anarchists" in the *Chicago Tribune*. The article did not provide evidence to connect her to any of the incidents of violence. Instead, it consists solely of quotations from Goldman denying any knowledge of the activities or the people involved in these incidents. She knew nothing of Selig Silverstein, a man who died when a bomb he was carrying exploded, but the newspaper reported that the police found correspondence from Goldman in Silverstein's apartment. The "correspondence" turned out to be a few mimeographed fund-raising letters and a membership card (signed by Alexander Berkman) from the Anarchist Federation (Falk, *Making Speech Free* fn4 297). The article quotes Goldman: "As soon as there is a riot, a bomb explosion, an assassination, or an uprising, the police immediately try to attach the affair to me" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 298). In this case at least, her assessment is accurate. The accusations of her masterminding these plots suggest to the press that she possessed clear organizing skills and influenced others. By describing her in this way, the press made her more powerful. Certainly, she did influence people. The tone of the article makes it sound as if she coerced people (or charmed them), which suggests again that reporters didn't understand the anti-authoritarian nature of her anarchism. Because of this and other stories, her name became associated with a variety of spectacles, controversies, and violence.[12] The articles ignored the nuances of her stance on violence and overshadowed her aesthetic anarchism.

[12] Smaller presses across the U.S. including the *Buffalo Times*, *Capital Times* (Madison, WI) and the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* covered her activities as well. One of the more sensational headlines appeared in the *Denver Post:* "Lynchings Needed in San Diego to Make Public Sane" on June 28th, 1912 (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 462). This headline was in response to Goldman and her manager and lover Ben Reitman arriving in San Diego in the midst of

After Goldman was deported in 1918, U.S. press coverage of Goldman's activities decreased. When she reemerged in the press after the Russian Revolution, coverage was more factual. *The New York World*, for example, ran a ten part series on Goldman's views on the Russian Revolution. The first one, printed on March 22, 1922 declared, "Emma Goldman Quits Russia Breaking Two Years' Silence to Reveal Bolshevik Failure." This article and many others quoted Goldman extensively and often without negative comment. Because many in the U.S. hoped the Russian Revolution would fail, it is not surprising that newspapers printed Goldman's criticism. Eventually, the U.S. press gave Goldman some credit for sticking to her ideals and paying the costs. In a letter to Cassius Cook, Goldman quoted the *Times*: "Whatever may be said against Berkman and Goldman, no one can charge them with cowardice. They have always stood their ground and they have bravely paid the price" (Sept. 29,1935). But even as late at 1935, this positive comment was the exception to the rule.

The sensationalized accounts of Goldman's activities and associations with violence and her actual involvement and position on violence in political action occasionally overlap, but drawing out the differences fosters a more concrete and historically accurate image of Goldman, the woman. However, the combination is just as significant historically because it indicates public sentiment—fear and fascination.

Goldman's Position on Violence during The Russian Revolution

During the Russian Revolution, Goldman developed a nuanced theory of the place of violence in political action. Her correspondence offers evidence of fundamental changes in her

a Free Speech struggle between the Wooblies and a conservative government. A Woobly had been killed and many beaten and tarred by vigilantes. The police turned their backs. Shortly after their arrival, Reitman was kidnapped, beaten, tarred, and tattooed. The article implies that lynching Goldman and Reitman would restore order.

thinking, which were brought about by her experience in Russia. Originally Goldman thought that once the revolution was over and the State dismantled, the masses would naturally form an anarchist society. She writes, "With many anarchists, I foolishly believed that the principle thing is to get people to rise against the oppressive institutions and that everything else will take care of itself" (Letter to Havelock Ellis, Nov. 8th, 1925). When the Russian political system was dismantled, anarchism did not flourish as Goldman had hoped it would. She realized later that the masses had "to learn how to construct, to rebuild, to do independent work for themselves and the community without feeling the master's whip" (Letter to Alexander Berkman, Dec. 17th, 1927). If not, then they would simply allow one form of government to replace another as was the case in Russia. Based on this experience, Goldman redefines her concept of revolution, rejecting ideas such as "the ends justifies the means." In a letter to Henry Alsberg, she writes, "The horrors of the soviet regime have forced me to revalue my values about active resistance" (March 24, 1931). She formerly viewed revolution "as a violent eruption destroying everything of what had been built up over centuries of painful and painstaking effort" (Drinnon, *Nowhere at Home* 89). She had a romantic idea of revolutionary violence before she saw it in action in Russia. She was willing to accept the transition period of violence and destruction as the State was dismantled, but when that simply produced another form of government instead of an anarchism, Goldman lost faith in the masses. In a letter to Berkman, Goldman writes, "The entire old school, Kropotkin, Bakunin, and the rest, had a childish faith in what Peter calls 'the creative spirit of the people.' I'll be damned if I can see it . . . . I honestly believe it is necessary to stress the fact that the masses while creating the wealth of the world under duress, have not yet learned to create it voluntarily for their own needs and that of their fellows. And unless they learn it, every revolution will and must fail" (Dec 17th, 1927).

Although this and other letters indicate a growing sense of disillusionment and despair, and although her ideas about how anarchism might unfold change and she loses faith in the people she originally had the most confidence in, Goldman's commitment to anarchism and fundamental human goodness did not waiver. She tells Havelock Ellis that "no other theory has the inherent quality to establish individual freedom and social harmony" (Nov. 8,1925). By 1931, her despair is obvious: "the mass is really hopeless as far as real progress and freedom are concerned" (Drinnon, *Nowhere at Home* 49).

For Goldman, revolution was as natural as a storm building, which "explains the extraordinary lack of violence during the actual overthrow of the old regime" (Letter to Cassius Cook, Sept. 29,1935). The violence and coercions, Goldman asserts, came with the advent of the Bolshevik state. The Revolution was "the result of a century of evolving social ideas in which the workers and peasants learned they had a right to the means of production. In the revolution, the peasantry and the workers . . . took the land and the factories. That was the ACTUAL REVOLUTION and not the seal put to it by Lenin. With every fiber I was then and am now for such a revolution" (Letter to Cassius Cook, Sept. 29,1935). The revolution started from the "ground" with workers taking over the means of production. According to Goldman, there was no organizing structure to the revolution, and the workers' takeover did not involve violence as a primary factor. Violence, it seems, happened when the new authoritarian system of government formed. When Goldman asserts that the masses of workers and laborers did not carry out the violence, she shows her faith in the goodness of the worker. At the same time, those workers and laborers failed because they did not organize and defend themselves.

Despite her comments about the failure of the Russian Revolution, when the Spanish anarchists began revolting, Goldman's hoped to witness the building of a living, breathing,

organized anarchism. She embraced the revolution wholeheartedly, developed creative fundraisers and sought support from Bernard Shaw and other writers. But few in England cared and the English newspapers ignored her activities. She tried unsuccessfully to return to the U.S. where she had been most successful at raising funds, but she was only granted a three-month visa and her lecture topics were restricted.

Interviews and Comments on Goldman's Attire

In the U.S. images of Goldman that appeared in newspapers and reporters' comments on her physical appearance contributed to her construction in the social imaginary.[13] Her conventional attire, neat physical appearance, and general pleasant manners frequently surprised interviewers and caused them to comment. In an interview about her drama lectures, for example, a male reporter from the *San Francisco Bulletin* judged her clothes without describing them: "Her costume answered the requirements of decency and warmth, but scorned any weak impulse toward adornment" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 398). Since she is not announcing her femininity, sexuality, or frivolity through her attire, she meets with the approval of the reporter and public alike. She visibly and consistently performed her gender "properly."

Goldman adhered to the societal dress code with its emphasis on small waists and wide shoulders. In late 1897, in an unusually positive tone, reporter Miriam Michelson from the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* found Goldman "neatly clad in a percale shirt waist and skirt, with white collar and cuffs" (Falk, *Made in America* 289). Goldman often wore white blouses with high-buttoned collars or pleated, puffy-sleeved blouses with silk scarves tied in a bow at her neck. Her long dresses and skirts fit tightly across her stomach, flared over her hips and dipped down to her

[13] For images of Goldman, see her autobiography *Living My Life*, "Anarchy Archives: An Online Research Center on the History and Theory of Anarchism," or Google image.

ankles. By the 1920s, she applauded the Flapper style because it was innovative and allowed free movement, but perhaps because she was in her fifties, she preferred her neat, conventional attire.[14] In short, she did not emphasize her sexuality through her attire even when it was fashionable to do so. This conventionality contrasted sharply with her lectures on free love, marriage and birth control.

Michelson, the same female reporter who described Goldman's clothes also called her a "bold, little thinker." The word "bold" is immediately tempered with the diminutive "little" as if to call her a bold thinker would be insulting to her femininity. Then Michelson asserted that Goldman "is in every sense a womanly looking woman, with masculine mind and courage" (Falk, *Made in America* 290-92). This tension between her feminine appearance and her "masculine mind" surfaced frequently in interviews and caused public fascination with Goldman and curiosity about anarchism.

In a popular culture context, when images of Goldman in her practical attire appeared with stories of free love and anarchism, they recall a serial-queen melodrama popular in the early '20s.[15] Modernist scholar Ben Singer examines the serial-queen persona "as a reflection of the excitement and anxieties surrounding major transformations in the cultural construction of womanhood around the turn of the century . . ." (222). In his analysis, Singer breaks the serial queen melodramas into two categories: hero and victim.[16] As a larger than life character

[14] In 1929 after he was offended by Goldman's observation that Spanish women's role had been simply to produce a brood of children, Max Nettlau implied that Goldman preferred the Flapper or the Movie girl as the proper image for women (Drinnon, *Nowhere at Home* 145). She could not believe an anarchist still held the most antiquated ideas about women.

[15] For one of the earliest detailed descriptions of Goldman, see the *New York World*, July 28, 1892, reprinted in Falk's *Made for America,* p. 111. Here is a sample sentence from the article: "A neck that once was rounded was still well poised, but as she turned her head the tendons bulged out into scrawniness, and blotches here and there added to the sharp disappointment one met with after leaving the upper part of the face."

depicted in newspapers, Goldman fits into both but complicates these categories because she takes on the masculine role of villain as well. She is a victim of the censors of print media as well as censors of free speech, a hero to the laborers, and a villain to the U.S. government and its supporters. Depending on the interpretation of the audience, she moved between these categories. Because she could not be easily categorized, she redefined what it meant to be a woman in the social imaginary. She paved the way for modern women to make themselves subjects by first becoming objects, what Liz Conor calls spectacles, of the public eye. In her book *The Spectacular Modern Woman*, Conor describes and categorizes images of women in the 1920s: "The conditions of modernity constituted certain usually typed subject positions—Business Girl, Flapper, Screen-Struck Girl, Beauty Contestant, and others—which I call types of the 'modern appearing woman.'" These subject positions were marked by a dramatic historical shift: women were invited to articulate themselves as modern subjects by constituting themselves as spectacles" (Conor xv). Political agitators like the suffragettes[17] fit into this "modern appearing woman" category; they are among the "others" not specifically listed here. But before the suffragettes became spectacles, and without an invitation, Goldman made herself a modern subject. She articulated herself as a political agitator, gave well-attended lectures, responded to audience questions (as well as their heckling), and became a spectacle because she combined feminine and masculine qualities.

Conor asserts that to constitute oneself as object was also to constitute one's self as subject (254). As a publicly visible woman Goldman created a spectacle. The news reporters—

[16] In his book *Melodrama and Modernity*, Singer writes, "If modernity represents an epoch marked by the 'madly thoughtless shattering and dismantling of all foundations,' an epoch in which all traditional belief systems 'melt into air,' then certainly one of the most prominent examples of modern ideological vaporization involved the destabilization of traditional ideologies of gender" (221).

[17] See Lisa Tickner's *The Spectacle of Women: Imagery of the Suffrage Campaign 1907-1914*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

male and female—often commented on her dress and demeanor, reflecting less concern with fashion and more with examining her femininity. In addition, unlike many of the women in Conor's subject positions, Goldman became defined by her political speeches and the spectacles she created. For example, the public frequently responded to the possibility of the spectacle of her arrest. When headlines warned of her intention to speak and the elected officials' or the police's disapproval, an adventure starved-public attended her lectures in the hopes of witnessing an altercation between Goldman and the police. In 1909, for example, the tension between Goldman and Saint Louis politicians attracted crowds. When she returned the following year, people again flocked to her lectures. However, because of the crowds she drew, after 1911 Saint Louis politicians forbade newspapers to cover her activities so extensively for fear that the public's interest in the spectacle she created might generate interest in anarchism. As she often did with controversy, Goldman used the spectacle to her advantage. At the same time she derided the public for their need of a spectacle. Goldman asserted that President Roosevelt, "knows that the majority cares little for ideas or integrity. What it craves is display. It matters not whether that be . . . a dog show, a prize fight, the lynching of a 'nigger'. . ." ("Minorities verses Majorities" 74) . The majority, Goldman asserts here, crave a spectacle—often one that involves violence. They demand to be "entertained." For Goldman, that need for spectacle was due to their complacency and acceptance of the unjust state.

The Effects of Press Coverage

The effect of such press coverage varied. In 1909 one reporter admitted that he knew Goldman only from newspaper and police reports, so he understood her to be "an inflammatory agitator, a Red radical and a menace to society in general" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 396). He

didn't know basic facts of her life or much about her philosophy of anarchism. Few understood her position on the place of violence in political action. But the main effect was that despite her lectures, her responses to the press, and her essays, reporters, acquaintances, and friends didn't know much about Goldman or the basic facts of her life, particularly in regard to her position on the place of violence in political action. One might expect that friends and even acquaintances would have a concrete view of the Goldman that they themselves saw, wrote to, and received letters from, but even a few devoted friends accepted the sensationalized public image of Goldman. They accepted and incorporated the popular idea of Goldman as it presented itself though the social imaginary rather than trust their own experience of her.

One such devoted friend was Theodore Dreiser. For many years he publicly and privately announced his appreciation of Goldman, and they corresponded sporadically from 1913 through 1937.[18] It is not until 1926, nearly ten years after she had been deported from the U.S., however, when she has been humbled by the failed Russian Revolution and many of her friends have become her bitter enemies, that she fully understands his devotion. In September of 1926, Dreiser writes the following letter: "The Bigness of your heart and your spirit is in this letter you have written me. It is what I have known from the first and admired and have bowed to. I am glad that I was able—at last—to make you understand my true and deep appreciation of the dignity and purity and force of your spirit. You are—and still remain—a great force" (Sept. 29th, 1926).[19] The expanse of Goldman's spirit that Dreiser describes refers specifically to a letter she had written him shortly after having had dinner with him and his wife. Dreiser is moved by her

[18] Goldman and Dreiser's relationship has gained little scholarly attention despite their correspondence and Dreiser's admiration for Goldman.

[19] Unless otherwise indicated, all Goldman letters can be found in Candace Falk's *The Emma Goldman Papers: A Microfilm Edition*, 69 reels (Chadwyck-Healey Inc., 1991).

loneliness and her refusal to judge others who have abandoned her. In a letter dated the same day as Dreiser's, Goldman writes:

> As you said yourself I had many people around me who while I was in America showed considerable interest in my work and friendship for me. But the Russian debacle and the war have shifted all values, most of all the values of integrity and fearlessness. The very people who posed as my friends are now among my bitterest enemies. That is their right. I certainly never asked for anything that could not be given voluntarily and gladly. But what makes my loneliness more poignant for now I have only very few whom I would call my friends, who really care whether I am dead or alive. I confess I did not think you were among the few . . . . Imagine my joy to find you so eager and so intensely interested in my struggle and the things I want to do. (Sept. 29th, 1926)

Dreiser supported the Russian Revolution so when Goldman wrote strong criticism of it and didn't hear from him, she thought she had lost his friendship as she had many from others who felt she had betrayed them and the Cause.[20] She has found a literary figure, a writer, who admires her and is interested in helping her with her work. Her affection for him is apparent in the simple sentence that ends the paragraph: "Thank you old man" (Sept. 29, 1926).

In 1929 the "old man" was working on a chapter about Goldman in his book, *Gallery of Women.* He writes her letters to check his facts about her life—many of which were inaccurate. In fact, Dreiser even had basic facts wrong. He thought Goldman killed Henry Clay Frick. He had gotten much of his information from newspaper reports and absorbed it directly from the social imaginary. This error demonstrates the power of the social imaginary to trump actual knowledge of the person. Further, and not surprisingly, it makes Goldman larger and more powerful than the actual woman.

[20] See *Dreiser's Russian Diary* exited by Thomas Riggio and James L.W. West, U of Penn, 1996.

Goldman slipped into the social imaginary not only through the newspaper accounts of her activities and personal interpretation of anarchist theory but also through references to her by people in authority. For example, Justice Brewer, a member of the United States Supreme Court, made the following speech:

> Many of the vast multitudes pouring into this country are racially cold-blooded and selfish. Not a few come tainted with anarchy and are willing to destroy all social order in the hope of personal gain out of the wreck. . . . Colored people are firm believers in the social order. You will find no . . . Emma Goldman . . . among them. . . . Stranger things have happened than that these people [African Americans] crushed and wronged for generations should become at last strong defenders of the nation and the community at whose hands have hitherto received mainly injustice. (Terrell 211)

The comparison was intended to praise Mary Church Terrell, author of *A Colored Woman in a White World* and first president of the National Association of Colored Women (1896). Brewer asserts that Terrell, whose ancestors were slaves and denied participation in the political system, managed to work within it in an effort to gain human rights, while Goldman and other anarchists were ungrateful foreigners who hoped to personally gain from its destruction. What Brewer thinks the anarchists might personally gain is unclear. However, his comments suggest that he interpreted anarchism as chaos and mob rule.[21] Of course, Brewer doesn't mention the fact that innocent African Americans were still being lynched by mobs of born-and-bread Americans. Brewer's comments—laden with irony and even absurdity now—and his understanding of anarchists were absorbed by the public and the sense of them incorporated into the social imaginary.

The violence attributed to Goldman contrasts sharply with another phenomenon of violence: lynching which occurred more frequently, produced more dire consequences for its

[21]For a detailed analysis of the parallels between anarchy and lynching mobs, see Chris Vials' "The Despotism of the Popular: Anarchy and Leon Czolgosz at the Turn of the Century" in *Americana: The Journal of American Popular Culture (1900-present)*, 3.2 (Fall 2004).

victims, and received little press coverage. Lynching, despite the number of people killed and the often brutal way in which they were killed, didn't seem to have so large or detailed a narrative in the social imaginary as Emma Goldman.[22] Anarchist violence claimed a handful of victims while people lynched over the same time period rank in the thousands.

Revolutionary Violence, Lynching, and Ida B. Wells (Barnett)

Despite their claims to the contrary, anarchists were naturally and wildly romantic; they had complete faith that once liberated, humans would desire to be and do good and they would govern themselves. As a strong, sexual, intelligent, and passionate woman fighting injustice, it is difficult not to romanticize Goldman and anarchist activities. Situating Goldman next to Ida B Wells (Barnett) further illuminates Goldman's place in the social imaginary and suggests what it was that Goldman tapped in the public mind that Wells could not. Further, it returns to the question of the role of violence in political action.

Goldman, like so many activists and writers of her time, never thoughtfully analyzed the atrocities African Americans endured, choosing instead to mention their plight in passing and occasionally use it as an example of a problem within capitalist society. The point here is not to examine why she did not fully address this issue but to recognize the lynching of African Americans as an underlying current of violence in the U.S. and examine how it relates to accusations of violence surrounding Goldman. The reasons for, or arguments behind, committing violence are key to gaining this understanding.

Reasons varied, of course, but in general anarchists who perform propaganda by the deed target individuals in position of power. On the other hand, lynch mobs attacked those without the

[22] The Tuskegee Institute sets the number of people lynched at 4,730 over the years 1882-1951 and 3,437 of whom were African American.

political power to defend themselves or even demand a trial. Lynching, unlike any other phenomenon of violence, was public, involved numerous perpetrators and crowds of silent witnesses. Although activists protested, it was an accepted means to control others in the community. Lynching was committed in fear to produce fear. In both propaganda by the deed and lynching, violence is used as a motivation for change.

In a 1909 article "The End of the Odyssey," Goldman confesses that in all her travels, she never visited the South because of the violence associated with it. She writes, "Somehow the very thought of it conjured up horrible pictures—pictures of little victims in the cotton fields, of bodies dangling from the trees, bodies mutilated to cinders and ashes" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 418-19). At this point in time, Goldman has been to every state in the North and most countries in Europe but has not ventured to the place, at least in her mind, whose violence affects children directly. But in the same article she decides that the North is probably no better than the South when it comes to humane treatment; she recalls the sweatshops of the East with their countless victims, the race feuds in New York City, and the disastrous events in Springfield, IL. All three are examples of inhumane treatment, but it is the Springfield "events" that parallel many of the same "events" in the South.

Three African American men were lynched during three days of rioting in Springfield in 1906. Ida B. Wells explains that "not any one of them had any connection whatever with the original cause of the outbreak. One of them was an old citizen of Springfield who had been married to a white woman for twenty years and had reared a family of children by her. When the mob could do nothing else, they went to his home and dragged him out, and hanged him in his own yard" (*Crusade for Justice* 299). That old citizen, Goldman scholar Candace Falk notes, was William Donnegan, "a long time Springfield resident, known to have been Abraham Lincoln's

friend and cobbler" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 419n4). Through this reference to Springfield, Goldman reminds her readers that the North also has a history of lynching.

The lynch mob is the extreme case of what Goldman calls the crude masses. In "Minorities verses Majorities," first printed in 1909, Goldman aligns herself with Ralph Waldo Emerson: "I . . . believe with Emerson that 'the masses are crude, lame, pernicious in their demands and influence, and need not be flattered, but to be schooled. I wish not to concede anything to them, but to drill, divide, and break them up, and draw individuals out of them. Masses! The calamity are the masses. I do not want any mass at all, but honest men only, lovely sweet accomplished women only'" (78). Could these masses that lynch humans be seen as rebelling against authority—the authority of law and the church? Would they think they are taking matters upon themselves and becoming judge and the jury? Goldman would be horrified at such a comparison because it misses her point: the masses that lynch people are acting as a group not as individuals. While anarchists seek to dismantle the entire system of laws, lynch mobs dismiss the laws regarding due process. They make themselves the exception to the rule and do not expect others to arbitrarily dismiss laws as they have. The reason for their violence is fear rather than liberation. Were they individuals who were not stifled by the State, then they, Goldman suggests, would not have felt the need to lynch anyone.

Goldman represents contemporary attitudes regarding race and discrimination. Drinnon asserts that Goldman, like many in her historical moment, had "a blindspot when it came to the importance of race" (*Rebel in Paradise* xi). Falk tempers that assertion, calling Goldman "inattentive" to issues of race (*Love* 56). While Goldman scholars may disagree on the degree to which Goldman overlooked racial issues, they agree that she never seriously considered the social, political, and financial difficulties African Americans faced as different from those of the

average Caucasian American. This lack of consideration made it easier for her to view lynching from a distance.

Goldman, unlike many of her contemporaries, publicly recognizes lynching as a form of unjustified violence accepted by the majority in the United States. If we imagine that people participating in lynching think they are helping their community by ridding it of "criminals," then in their minds this violence becomes libratory. Yet if this were the only reason, one would think they would lynch more white people. Further, one might also think that these generally law abiding citizens would allow the justice system to work. But there is something obviously much more sinister happening. As previously discussed, individual acts of violence, such as Berkman's attempt to kill Frick aimed to incite the masses to revolution for the purpose of preparing the ground for anarchism to grow. That revolution was, they thought, libratory.

Reasons for Violence

The 1886 Haymarket bombing, subsequent deaths of police officers, and trial of anarchist leaders affected activists and workers alike. Many people including Goldman, Day, and Shaw sympathized with the condemned anarchists. Ida B. Wells drew on this public sympathy in her comparison between the Haymarket anarchists' trail and the lynching of African Americans. Although she was not an anarchist or anarchist sympathizer, she saw the abuse anarchists faced as resembling what African Americans faced, except that for African Americans oppression happened every day.

As an activist educating the public about lynching, Wells' work fills in the spaces that Goldman's work left open and is therefore worthy of study. Wells collected and analyzed data from newspapers; she categorized violence, both in terms of what the victim was accused of and

the violence done to him/her; she wrote pamphlets and a few books; and she published accounts of lynching in her weekly paper *Free Speech*.[23] In "The Lynch Law," Wells compared the Chicago Haymarket anarchists to anonymous victims lynched in the South: "The Chicago anarchists were hanged, not because they threw the bomb, but because they incited to that act the unknown man who did throw it. Pity that the same law cannot be carried into force in Georgia!" (8).[24] There are three incidents of violence in this short passage: first, the Haymarket bomb and the resulting gun fire from police that together with the bomb killed eight police officers (most from "friendly fire") and at least four civilians;[25] second, the State violence that tried eight and hung four anarchists (who most critics agree, were innocent); finally, the lynching of African Americans. Wells draws parallels between the last two—innocent people are killed and the State sanctions it through the judicial system in the first case and through simply allowing the violence in the second case. When the violence is turned toward the State or the police as in the Haymarket example, the repercussions are profound. Wells appeals to the moral element.

In this passage, Wells humorously implied that if the same law that convicted the Chicago anarchists were applied in Georgia, individuals watching a lynching would be hung. Wells based her little joke on the fact that many African Americans were lynched and no one was held accountable for their deaths. In 1886, the year of the Haymarket bombing, the official number of African Americans lynched was 136 (Wells, *Southern Horrors* 206). The number of people killed due to suspected anarchist violence: eight, including several police officers who

[23] In an effort to be taken seriously, Wells collected only those lynching stories that were published in the newspapers, not those that were witnessed and overlooked by the press.

[24] Goldman, Day and Shaw were all influenced by the Haymarket affair, but Goldman the most dramatically; it redirected life, influenced her thinking and inspired her to join the anarchists.

[25] For a list of police officers' names, see Henry David's *The History of the Haymarket Affair*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1958, p. 234 fn 20.

died in friendly fire. The number of articles in the press about the Haymarket event suggests the opposite was true.[26]

In one lynching case a few years later, "a mob seized a well-known colored preacher, Elijah Strickland, and, after savage torture, slowly strangled him to death" (Wells, "Lynching Laws in Georgia").[27] Strickland was accused of paying Samuel Wilkes (alias Hose) to murder a white man. Both men were lynched without even the pretense of a trial. Through her joke, Wells implies that in a case like this, the men who witnessed the murders of Strickland and Wilkes would be hung. She also implies that this form of violence has been accepted in that no one was held accountable; no one person stepped forward to give reasons or take responsibility for his/her actions. There was only the "acceptable" din of accusations and public anger at the possibility of an African American claiming his rights. Anarchists threatened people in authority who had the political power to protect themselves by, one might argue, encouraging others to view anarchists as thoughtless murderers. In contrast, victims of lynching had less to do with the victim's actions than with control of the community through fear.

Although Goldman herself didn't publish accounts of lynching atrocities in her *Mother Earth* journal, when Goldman was in prison in 1917 Martha Gruening published a harrowing account of the East Saint Louis race riots. In what proved to be the last issue, Gruening included the following witness testimony: "I saw a crowd of white women grab a colored woman's baby

---

[26] Wells asserts that no one "in this section of the country believes the old thread bare lie that Negro men rape white women. If Southern white men are not careful, they will over-reach themselves and public sentiment will have a reaction; a conclusion will then be reached which will be very damaging to the moral reputation of their women" (52). The intersection of sexuality, violence, and race in this passage drew the ire of several prominent politicians. Wells implies that mobs lynch black men because white women desire black men. This desire threatens white men. In order that neither white women or black men consider the other, white men employ violence and thereby instill fear to keep everyone in his or her place. They respond to their own fear (of losing control of their women and/or servants) by cultivating a climate of fear. The same could be said about the Chicago politicians and police of 1886. This argument is much more complicated than I have indicated here. For a recent analysis of the connection between lynching, sex and race, see Evelyn Hammonds' "Toward a Genealogy of Black Female Sexuality: The Problem of Silence." *Feminist Theory and the Body: A Reader*. Edinburgh, Scotland: University Press, 1999: 249-260.

[27] The exact year of this lynching is unclear, but Wells' pamphlet was originally written in 1889.

and fling it into a blazing house . . . . Down by the Free Bridge, I saw them behead a man with a butcher's knife" (Glassgold 403). Because of Gruening's report, this issue of *Mother Earth* was confiscated and deemed unmailable by the U.S. Postal censors (Glassgold 400). But others including Wells responded to the riots. Wells traveled from Chicago to report on the situation and hold officials in charge responsible for investigating the deaths (*Crusade for Justice* 383-97). Destruction, fear, and horror were the results as well as the methods. Incarcerated, Goldman could do nothing.

At the International Anarchist Congress at Amsterdam in 1907, Goldman gave a speech called "The Situation in America," in which she said, "Sad and deplorable in the extreme is the position of the American negro. Rivers of blood have been shed to free the black man from slavery; yet, after almost half a century of so-called freedom, the negro question is more acute than ever" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 325). Goldman recognizes both the history of violence suffered by black men and women and the fact that abuses continue. To assert the abuse was "more acute" suggests that she understood the difficulties African Americans faced more than the average citizen.[28] In her speech she also makes the following comparison: "The persecution, suffering and injustice to which this much-hated race is being constantly subjected can be compared only to the brutal treatment of the Jews in Russia. Hardly a day passes without a negro being lynched in some part of the country" (325). This is one of Goldman's few references to the violence perpetuated against Jews. She does not further develop this comparison or discuss the discrimination she and her family faced in anti-Semitic Russia nor the details of the Russian

[28]Because of friends like Lillian Wald, founding member of the NAACP (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 545) and James Ferdinand Martin, member of the NAACP, author of *The Curse of Racial Prejudice* (New York, 1906), Goldman had some insight into the plight of African Americans (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 535).

pogroms surrounding her during her childhood—particularly during the1880s.[29] In her autobiography, however, she summarized witnesses' testimonies of the pogroms that occurred during the Russian Revolution—while she was in the country. Her accounts are narratives, not factual reporting of the number of deaths, and yet strikingly devoid of recognition of what this kind of hatred might have meant to her family and her sense of self. Neither an analysis of the phenomenon of violence nor specific examples are provided here.

Finally, in her speech to the International Congress, Goldman adds this insight about lynching: "Nor are these terrible atrocities perpetuated in the South only . . . the North is guilty as well. Nowhere in the country does the negro enjoy equal opportunity with the white man—socially, politically or economically . . . the negro is as much a slave now as in ante-bellum days, and even more ostracized socially and exploited economically" (325). To suggest African Americans were "ostracized socially" is to suggest that as slaves and property they were more accepted (as profits could be made), than as human beings. Goldman reiterates insightful claims she made in other articles, again recognizing not only the responsibility of the North, but also the impossible situation of African Americans—the constant, unrelenting threats and violence they face while she faced only threats. In short, Goldman spoke little of her Jewish heritage and accepted lynching and pogroms as a horrific part of capitalism in the U.S. and political unrest in Russia.

Perhaps Goldman paid little attention to racial and cultural violence because it is only one of the symptoms of problematic social and political systems. The law and/or the government did not protect Jews in Russia or African Americans in the South; the suggestion is that in the absence of both of those groups, everyone else would fare better. I oversimplify here, but Anti-

[29]The violence may have been a contributing factor to what Reizbaum calls her "disassociation from Judaism" (Reizbaum 457).

Semitism, racism, fear and jealousy were reasons behind the violence. It is the reasons behind or argument for violence that makes a difference (if indeed a difference can be made) in our understanding of the act itself. For example, the attempted murder of Henry Clay Frick by Goldman's lover Alexander Berkman and the murder of Elijah Strickland by a white mob the intentions are the same—murder. Furthermore, both murders are meant to have meaning beyond the act itself; that is, they are meant to instruct through hope and fear respectively. But Berkman intended to spur the steel workers into revolution by his act. Goldman accepts this violence as libratory and therefore acceptable. Berkman took responsibility for his actions and was incarcerated by the State. No one in the anonymous mob that lynched Strickland ever took responsibility or gave reasons for their actions, so we look to Wells and historians for an answer. The point is not to legitimate violence for specific reasons, but to recognize how it functioned as a "legitimate" practice in lynching and illegitimate practice in the theory of anarchism. Only "illegitimate" forms of violence gained press coverage.

Whereas the actual lynching of individual African Americans perpetuated by mobs received little public outcry, the threat of violence that Goldman posed gained much media and government attention. One of the important differences was that the victims of lynching were often poor and middle class African Americans whereas anarchism's victims were those with the most authority, money, and power. Goldman's connections to violence were more about the threat she posed than about actual violence. She threatened authorities because individuals might respond to her "call" to revolt against people in power.

Conclusion

Other factors that can be attributed to Goldman's place in the social imaginary include her literary and political lectures, the media accounts of her activities, her willingness not only to publicly address controversial topics like free love, but also practice her anarchism, the public's inability to categorize her, in part, because of the tension between her feminine attire and "masculine mind" and her conventional manners and unconventional politics.

Goldman provided a new image of woman. She dressed like any other woman, but like few other women she publicly spoke of revolution and sexuality. The public had not quite imagined that possibility before. The activities of female revolutionaries before her rarely received as much press coverage. She was more sexually and politically radical than the New Woman and as such she added a new way of performing womanhood to the social imaginary. Further, she connected femininity and violence in the social imaginary by being female and advocating anarchism.

The violence associated with Goldman and anarchism not only threatened the U.S. government and people in positions of authority but repelled many common folk. It also contradicts another fundamental anarchist belief: liberty will allow human kindness and cooperation to prevail—an ironically "spiritual" if not religious sentiment. The media portrayed Goldman and anarchism as violent and overlooked anarchists' underlying faith in humanity. This is because anarchist violence occurred whereas demonstration of "human goodness" within voluntary cooperation had yet to be seen. Despite the interviews in which Goldman came across as serious, logical, and not particularly threatening, the focus on violence in the press and the repetition of accusations of violence by public officials, as well as Goldman's own romanticization of violence (which vanished after the Russian Revolution), overshadow every other aspect of anarchism and Goldman herself.

Chapter Two

"My Beautiful Ideal": Art, Aesthetics, and Sexuality

> "I want freedom, the right to self-expression,
> everybody's right to beautiful radiant things."
> ~Emma Goldman, *Living My Life*

Although anarchist theory centers on liberty and although the anarchist movement included notable women such as Voltairine de Cleyre and Frederica Montseny, anarchist leaders Peter Kropotkin and Johann Most still adhered to traditional gender ideals, particularly in regard to sexuality. It is not surprising then, that in 1890 during an anarchist dance to raise money for striking cloakmakers, a young man insisted that Emma Goldman stop dancing with such abandon. He said her recklessness would hurt the Cause. An argument ensued with some people in the crowd, including Alexander Berkman, insisting the young man was right. In reflecting on this moment many years later Goldman writes, "I did not believe that a Cause which stood for a beautiful ideal, for anarchism, for release and freedom from conventions and prejudice, should demand the denial of life and joy" (*Living My Life* 56). Goldman thought transformation occurred through aesthetic sensibility, not science or theory. She continues, "I insisted that the Cause could not expect me to be a nun and that the movement should not be turned into a cloister. . ." (*Living My Life* 56). In fact, Goldman spent the rest of her life practicing a sexual philosophy quite different from nuns in cloisters: she unabashedly had sex with men she loved.

For Goldman, anarchism would secure everyone's right to the "full enjoyment of the necessities of life, according to individual desires, tastes, and inclinations" ("Anarchism" 62). Her aesthetic sensibility centered on those "individual desires, tastes, and inclinations" and was

inseparable from her anarchism. Since she thought that "radical art was potentially even more subversive than outright political agitation" (Wexler xvi), her emphasis on aesthetic sensibilities should come as no surprise. She encouraged the individual to express tastes, desires, and inclinations through art, literature, dance and other forms of creative self expression, all of which she saw as transformative. Everyone, she frequently asserted, had a "right to beautiful radiant things" like flowers, music, and the theatre (*Living My Life* 56, 32). Activists in and outside the anarchist movement resisted her construction of an anarchism that emphasized aesthetics and sexuality but Goldman persisted.

Literature in Anarchist Philosophy

As Goldman's construction of anarchism is built on and within literary references, these references invite analysis. Therefore, I examine two essays: first, her pointedly political and fundamental essay, "Anarchism: What Does It Stand for?" and second, her drama lecture "Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara.*" In contextualizing passages from literary figures in her political essay and the politics in her analysis of drama, a complex picture of Goldman's anarchism emerges. For Goldman, art, particularly the written word, is one of the critical forms through which human societies reproduce, revise, or revolutionize themselves. Art, in the most general sense, was both a place without boundaries where anarchism could grow and also a medium to convey an anarchist message. Through her use of literature and drama to convey her anarchist message, Goldman effectively altered the relation of the aesthetic to the political.

In publishing essays, drawings, poetry, and prose by her contemporaries, she popularized writers like Shaw and "helped create an audience for the rebel writers and artists of her day . . . she also played a role in introducing literary people to radical ideas" (Drinnon 164). At the

beginning of her career, she lectured in Yiddish and German to a very specific demographic: a working class, foreign-born audience. But over time she broadened her focus to include American-born workers and "literary people," particularly the educated middle class.

Margaret Anderson was one such literary person of the middle class influenced by Goldman's anarchism. Anderson's magazine, *The Little Review* "was politically engaged in its explicit and enthusiastic embrace of feminist and anarchist principles" (Golding 68). The magazine was a "venue that foregrounded the anarchist Emma Goldman" (Bochner 51). In her *The Little Review*, Anderson published several Goldman letters and essays—which later caused her to lose subscribers and patrons—alongside poetry and prose by writers such as T. S. Eliot, Sherwood Anderson, Ezra Pound, and Gertrude Stein.[1]

Another literary figure, Alelaide Schulkind, wife of novelist Waldo Frank, credited Goldman with introducing her to Strindberg, Shaw, and Ibsen. She fondly remembered how she "used to travel across town to hear her lecture on Sunday nights on literature, birth control and women" (Drinnon vii). Novelist Henry Miller wrote that meeting Goldman was "the most important encounter of my life. She opened up the whole world of European culture for me and gave a new impetus to my life, as well as direction" (Drinnon 164). John Diggins, one of Eugene O'Neill's biographers, suggests that Goldman inspired O'Neill to create anarchist Olga Tarnoff, the protagonist in his *The Personal Equation* (66).[2] O'Neill fashioned his character Rosa Parrit in *The Iceman Cometh* after Goldman. Goldman made personal connections to other literary figures such as Upton Sinclair,[3] Theodore Dreiser, and Bernard Shaw. She first met Ernest

[1] In the very first issue of the magazine, Anderson published a Goldman letter and several others including a few from prison, in the following years.

[2] Like several of Goldman's lovers, Olga's lover denounced social democracy but also wanted her to marry him. Like Goldman, Olga throws aside the "bourgeois convention" of marriage (Diggins 66).

[3] He was a guest lecturer at the Ferrer Center, an anarchist or modern school founded by Goldman and other anarchists.

Hemingway at a party given by Ford Maddox Ford in Paris in August of 1924 (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 90). In short, literary figures influenced Goldman and were influenced by her, in part, because of her insistence on the place of aesthetics in politics and art in revolution.

Goldman's appreciation of and confidence in literature as an engine of change is evident as early as 1898. She journeyed down to a Welsh coalmine where she summarized Bernard Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. The miners were affected by her genuine enthusiasm (Drinnon 155). Since her audience responded positively to her lectures, it is surprising that her mentor Johann Most and fellow anarchists disapproved of her methods. They argued that a revolution must happen spontaneously and immediately and that literature was indirect and therefore not a useful vehicle to convey their anarchist message. Further, they complained that it was bourgeois; the laborers should spend their time organizing, not reading or visiting the theatre. But Goldman insisted. Instead of repeating anarchist theory that argues that the State is flawed, she quoted diverse canonical writers, primarily men from United States, Europe, and Russia such as William Morris, Walt Whitman, Bernard Shaw, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, Theodore Dostoyevsky, and Friedrich Nietzsche.[4] By tying her ideas to those of lesser-known literary writers like Shaw (around the turn of the century in the U.S.), she brought them notoriety. By grounding her ideas in those of famous literary writers like Emerson and Thoreau, Goldman achieved a sense of familiarity and credibility. Instead of introducing liberty as an anarchist concept, she emphasized liberty as the foundation on which America was built. In

[4] A portrait of Whitman hung next to portraits of Tolstoy, Ibsen, William Morris and Kropotkin in the Ferrer Center, a center founded by anarchists, which provided alternative education for the working classes, both children and adults. A few artists, writers, and activists who lectured or taught there include Upton Sinclair, Jack London, Robert Henri, George Bellows, and Margaret Sanger. Man Ray attended classes. Goldman as well as many of the men and women associated with the publication of *Mother Earth* were also involved in "centers of intellectual and creative ferment" such as the Ferrer Center, the Provincetown Players, Alfred Stieglitz's "291" gallery, Mabel Dodge's weekly evening salons (Glassgold, *Anarchy* 151). For more on the Ferrer School, see Leonard D. Abbott, "Ferrer School in New York," *Everyman* 10 (December 1914): 8.

doing so she blurred the lines between anarchism as a "foreign" idea brought in by Eastern European immigrants and American individualism. Contrary to popular opinion that assumed "foreigners" were bringing anarchist ideas into the United States, Goldman asserted that these ideas were already embedded in American ideals: anarchism was quintessentially American.

While Goldman agreed the need for revolution was immediate, she disagreed with anarchists about the place of art in the movement. She, along with socialists (with anarchist leanings) like William Morris, contended that the revolution, and the political in general, did not demand the neglect of all else including the literary or artistic. In fact, in the novel *News from Nowhere*, Morris used the literary to covey a political position. Critics called Morris's novel a utopian fantasy and "a political act" (Holzman 589).[5] Goldman appreciated the work of experimental writers and artists whether or not their work suggested a new world order, but she was most appreciative of those like Morris who imaged a new social order that eliminated the need for the founding principles of the old, corrupt State. For Goldman, art and literature offered a way of imagining it into being. It provided a new form with which to convey an anarchist agenda and thus an aesthetic anarchism.

The literary references that punctuate most of Goldman's lectures vary greatly, but her chosen writers and texts have at least one commonality: they address topics Goldman deems socially significant. Within the realm of literature then, it would be reasonable to conclude that Goldman chooses content over form. And yet this conclusion oversimplifies Goldman's complex relationship with aesthetics, drama, and literature.

Although the works she referred to in her lectures did not break conventions of form or style, she supported experimental writers. She pointed to anarchist roots in traditional literature while sat

[5] Goldman published portions of Morris's work in *Mother Earth*. See for example, "Our Social Lunacy" 7.2 April 1912, p. 59.

the same time insisting that experimental art in all its forms was a place where self-expression could blossom. As a result of references to traditional and more well-know literature, she attracted the attention of the American-born middle class who had previously dismissed anarchism as a movement for immigrants and the disgruntled working class.

Within her pointedly political essay, "Anarchism: What It Really Stands for," Goldman defined anarchism and quoted *as many* literary writers as anarchists. She appreciated writers' literary techniques as well as their "beautiful ideals." In this and other essays, she referred to writers who either critiqued fundamental presuppositions of the social and political systems or who looked to the individual for what Emerson calls the "active soul" and Thoreau calls "conscience." Goldman built on the criticism in these authors' works and then encouraged direct action that she hoped would dismantle social and political systems.

In "Anarchism: What It Really Stands for," Goldman addresses two main critiques of anarchism: its impracticality and its embedded violence. Goldman dispels these myths by defining anarchism and referring to passages from philosophers, literary figures, and dramatists. More to my purpose, she defined anarchism, not as a governing system but as a philosophy of living that included aesthetic appreciation of humanity, which for Goldman, was often expressed sexually.

In the first literary reference Goldman quotes from Emerson's speech, "The American Scholar" given at Harvard in 1837. She writes, "'The one thing of value in the world,' says Emerson, 'is the active soul; this every man contains within him. The active soul sees absolute truth and utters truth and creates'" ("Anarchism" 52).[6] In the paragraph in which this passage

[6] The actual passage is taken from the section called "Influences of the Mind of the Past." It reads: "The one thing in the world, of value, is the active soul. This every man is entitled to; this every man contains within him, although, in almost all men, obstructed, and as yet unborn. The soul active sees absolute truth; and utters truth, or creates" (Emerson).

originally appears, Emerson asserts that an active soul has the potential for genius and that potential is not limited to the few; it exists within every human. However, he adds, in most it is not yet born. For Emerson and Goldman, it is the responsibility of the individual to make his/her soul active and yet both writers also assert that "authorities," such as the State, inhibit artistic expression and the emergence of a world filled with active souls and geniuses.

Goldman builds her argument by summarizing Emerson's assertion: "In other words, the individual instinct is the thing of value in the world. It is the true soul that sees and creates the truth alive, out of which is to come a still greater truth, the reborn social soul" ("Anarchism" 52). For Goldman, the individual instinct or the instinct to become an individual leads to rebirth, not simply of an individual but of society. A society filled with people who allow their "individual instinct" to guide them or who have "active souls" is one where anarchism and self-expression reign.

The State prevents its citizens from achieving this individuality, genius, or active soul, Goldman asserts, because it "enslaves the spirit, dictating every phase of conduct" ("Anarchism" 56). The State, along with organized religion and social pressures including those related to gender expectations, is an enemy of free expression. Although Goldman does not cite the rest of Emerson's paragraph, I include the last two lines here to clarify what Emerson means by individual expression, to emphasize the anarchist thread, and to show how Goldman uses Emerson's ideas—or beautiful ideals—to define anarchism.

Emerson writes, "There are creative manners, there are creative actions, and creative words; manners, actions, words, that is, indicative of *no custom or authority*, but springing spontaneous from the mind's own sense of good and fair" (emphasis mine). Emerson points to something that is unrelated to the pressures of customs or other forms of authority—basic human

goodness. These manners, actions, and words appear in everyday communication and, it may be argued, are part of a human aesthetic. Goldman's assertion that poetry, literature, and drama are fertile grounds for anarchism begins to make more sense when she clarifies that the "very essence of individuality is expression" ("Syndicalism: Its Theory and Practice" 88). According to her and Emerson, this instinct to become an individual is expressed in as many ways as there are ways to express oneself. In this passage Goldman refers to a complex concept: individuality that is the basis of anarchism. For both Emerson and Goldman, it is also the basis of humanity.

Goldman soon reiterates her claim that government is based on violence when she quotes Emerson a second time: "All government in essence . . . is tyranny" ("Anarchism" 56). Not only does the State rest on violence, but also its oppressive power deters "active souls." Goldman's explication of this quote reiterates the claim: "It matters not whether it is government by divine right or majority rule. In every instance its aim is the absolute subordination of the individual" ("Anarchism" 56). She equates monarchies, democracies and all other forms of government because they depend on the subordination of the creative "individual instinct" and limit aesthetic and sexual expression.

Goldman builds on these assertions by further criticizing governments through the words of Henry David Thoreau, whom she calls "the greatest American anarchist" ("Anarchism" 56). Here, Goldman is quoting Thoreau: "Government, what is it but a tradition, though a recent one, endeavoring to transmit itself unimpaired to posterity, but each instance losing its integrity; it has not the vitality and force of a single living man. Law never made a man a whit more just; and by means of their respect for it, even the well disposed are daily made agents of injustice" ("Anarchism" 57). In short, the government creates laws that force individuals to be part of a

system of laws and rules rather than trust their own judgment.[7] Whereas Goldman employs Emerson to point to the human potential for genius, she employs Thoreau to point to what prevents further human development.

Goldman quotes Thoreau a second time in order to criticize citizens' belief that they have power through voting: "'All voting,' says Thoreau, 'is a sort of gaming, like checkers, or backgammon, a playing with right and wrong; its obligation never exceeds that of expediency. Even voting for the right thing is doing nothing for it. A wise man will not leave the right to the mercy of chance, nor wish it to prevail through the power of the majority'" ("Anarchism" 63-64). A wise person will, instead, Goldman implies, follow his/her own "active soul."[8] Goldman relies on the popularity and respectability of Emerson and Thoreau's works to build her definition of anarchism and show how anarchist tenets such as individualism were already present in American literature. Anarchists claimed that through these references Goldman was catering to the American-born audience and in this sense excluding immigrants who were the majority of the anarchist ranks.[9]

Toward the end of her anarchism essay, Goldman reiterates her claims as well as those of Emerson and Thoreau. She writes that anarchism stands for liberation "of the human mind from the dominion of religion; the liberation of the human body from the dominion of property; liberation from the shackles and restraint of government" (62). The first form of liberation is

[7] These two lines were originally published in Thoreau's *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience* (1849, original title: *Resistance to Civil Government*). Goldman has not quoted exactly here. The original line reads: "This American government--what is it but a tradition, though a recent one, endeavoring to transmit itself unimpaired to posterity, but each instant losing some of its integrity? It has not the vitality and force of a single living man; for a single man can bend it to his will. It is a sort of wooden gun to the people themselves" (1). Goldman has changed the punctuation: the first semicolon should be a question mark and a comma after "and." More importantly, there should be an ellipsis between her two sentences as there is an entire paragraph between these sentences.

[8] See Goldman's essay "The Tragedy of Women's Emancipation" in *Anarchism* for a critique of the suffrage campaign.

[9] While there may be some merit in this criticism, Goldman also continued to give lectures in German, Yiddish, and Russian, which suggests she appealed to immigrants as well.

based on the Marxist idea that religion prevented people from thinking critically.[10] The second form refers to the human body as property or a commodity in, for example, prostitution,[11] marriage, slavery, and labor in factories.[12] Finally, the third phrase refers to governing bodies that create laws and regulations; these laws hinder individuals' ability to think for themselves. In the overcoming of these three forms of domination Goldman sees the possibility of Emerson's geniuses emerging. And to the extent that she is able to establish that claim in the minds of her readers, she will have taken anarchism, a reputably violent doctrine, and located it firmly in line with the established traditions of American individualism.

This effort to dispel myths around and find a home for anarchism in the American vernacular is consistent with Goldman's growing opposition to propaganda by the deed. She writes that anarchism "stands for the spirit of revolt, in whatever form, against everything that hinders human growth" ("Anarchism" 63). But she does not explain what that might mean before describing—in generalities—what happens after the system is dismantled. She outlines the basic elements for this new social order: it would be "based on the free association of individuals for the purpose of producing real social wealth" ("Anarchism" 62). It is not simply insistence on individual freedom but confidence in the wealth that all free individuals *together* create. That is, if only a few individuals have this freedom, then society is still underdeveloped. It is hard not to appreciate the utopian, optimistic and impractical elements here in Goldman's argument. She anticipates criticism of this sort and defends her philosophy by summarizing a point about practicality made by Oscar Wilde:

---

[10] The tension between religion and anarchism will be addressed more fully in chapter four of this dissertation.

[11] *Mrs. Warren's Profession* by Bernard Shaw is a play that addresses this idea and one that Goldman referred to in her political and drama essays; it will be analyzed in chapter three of this dissertation.

[12] Goldman more fully develops these examples in other essays such as "The Traffic in Women" found in *Anarchism and Other Essays.*

> A practical scheme . . . is either one already in existence, or a scheme that could be carried out under the existing conditions; but it is exactly the existing conditions that one objects to, and any scheme that could accept these conditions is wrong and foolish. The true criterion of the practical, therefore, is not whether the latter can keep intact the wrong or foolish; rather is it whether the scheme has vitality enough to leave the stagnant waters of the old, and build, as well as sustain, new life. In light of this conception, Anarchism is indeed practical. ("Anarchism" 49)

Wilde asserts that inequality and injustice cannot be addressed within the present system. The capitalist system is founded on competition and what Goldman calls the violence of ignorance ("Anarchism" 49-50). Goldman's assumption is that if everyone thought critically instead of allowing the government to think for them, then a new egalitarian social order would emerge. Here the resonance with Thoreau is clear. Because Goldman constructs her anarchism with passages from writers such as Wilde and because she makes it a philosophy of life rather than a political theory, it is not at all surprising that she would have found an immediate kinship with the American transcendentalist tradition, with its emphasis on self-reliance and in a phrase that is now, ironically, often associated with political conservatives, a limited role for government. The suggestion here is that along with Emerson and Thoreau, Goldman understands anarchism less as a collective political movement than as a call to individual growth and self-realization through political engagement, but even more through moral resistance.

In the final paragraph of this essay Goldman writes, "Anarchism therefore stands for direct action, the open defiance of, and resistance to, all laws and restrictions, economic, social, and moral" ("Anarchism" 65). Since anarchism stands for direct action, then, as Goldman writes in her later essay "Psychology of Political Violence," the anarchist her/himself is someone "perceptible by the spirit of revolt . . . and possessed [with] a keen desire to know. These traits are supplemented by an ardent love of others, a highly developed moral sensitiveness, a profound sentiment of justice, and imbued with missionary zeal" (82). The word "revolt," a synonym for

"direct action" in her earlier definition of anarchism, suggests violence and yet is tempered with the phrase "spirit of" that appears before it. Other words such as "love of others," "moral," and "missionary" have religious connotations and seem like a surprising choice from one who has a reputation for her anti-religious stance.[13] But her word choice in this passage and stance on religion are not incongruous.[14] Because organized religion attempts to dictate the way people live, Goldman rejects it. She asserts that people are basically good and must view themselves as authorities on their own goodness and truth.

Goldman defines an anarchist as someone with a personal philosophy rather than a political theory. She points out that although John Brown, a prominent African American and abolitionist, never claimed to be an anarchist, he resisted unjust laws. Had he simply obeyed then "America would still trade in the flesh of the black man" (Goldman, "Anarchism" 66). Brown trusted his own sense of justice rather than simply obeying the law, which meant he had an "active soul" and therefore was part of her beautiful ideal.

The "spirit of revolt," not simply revolt or resistance, was an integral part of the revolutionary process. Goldman focused on the "spirit" she found in the narratives of writers such as Feodor Dostoyevsky and in modern drama. In her essay "Prisons," Goldman reprints Dostoyevsky's "The Priest and the Devil," which he wrote in 1849 on the wall of his prison

[13] Religious language is not unusual for Goldman, but further analysis and examples are beyond the scope of this chapter.

[14] On the other hand, a 1907 federal warrant for the arrest of Goldman described her as "an Anarchist, or one who believes in or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all government, or of all or of all forms of law, or one who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 254). This description is noticeably devoid of positive words and images.

cell.[15] In this passage the narrator, the devil, is laughing at the priest for his ignorance and lack of moral resistance:

> Since the priest never recognized that both he and the authorities of the state work for the devil, he is dragged off to hell on earth: an iron foundry, a farm where the overseer beats anyone who falls to the ground, and finally a prison. The devil explains how and in what way the priest works for him. He tells the priest that these people are living in hell and . . . [asks] "Did you not know that these men and women whom you are frightening with the picture of hell hereafter . . .that they are in hell right here, before they die?" (111)

Dostoyevsky's narrative criticizes both the state for resting on violence and the church for ignoring the violence. The reader may find herself siding with the devil because he, the supernatural element in this story, is both evil because he tortures the priest, and he is also good because he recognizes the workers' difficulties. When Goldman employed Dostoyevsky's narrative, she repeatedly asserted that the U.S. government was sustained by the violence of incarceration, a statement that could only be heard indirectly through aesthetic expression.

As the conveyer of the ideas of Emerson, Thoreau, Wilde, Dostoyevsky, and other writers who criticized and/or rejected traditional social constraints and political systems, Goldman becomes the anti-traditionalist who accomplishes much, ironically, by referring to traditional literature. Although these writers have different styles, those styles are, for the most part, conventional. Looking at anarchism through the lens of modern drama, however, allows us to see Goldman's anarchism with a greater aesthetic emphasis. It also allows us to continue to question Goldman's theories about systemic violence and underlying human goodness.

Anarchist Elements of Modern Drama

[15] The original publication of Goldman's essay appeared in *Mother Earth* and includes a note that Dostoyevsky wrote: "This story came into my mind while listening to the sermon of the prison chaplain, and I wrote it down on the wall today. December 13, 1849. A Prisoner."

Goldman often asserted that modern drama was "a disseminator of advanced thought" because it presented radical ideas through a recognizable narrative that mirrored the present social and political condition (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 433). Further, as Goldman asserted in an interview with Charles Willis Thompson of *The New York Times Sunday Magazine,* "Drama, more than any other vehicle of human expression, sows the seeds of radicalism" (433). Through her lectures and essays on the works of dramatists such as Eugene O'Neil, Henrik Ibsen, and Bernard Shaw, Goldman critiqued the social and political systems. As she found elements of anarchist thought in them, they became as important as anarchist theory itself. In modern drama Goldman found a way to talk to the masses about their condition.

When interviewer Thompson asked how drama rather than any other art form or political propaganda might radicalize her audience, Goldman explained that "persons who had never been interested in radicalism, who believed, as unfortunately most persons do in this country, that such ideas are entertained only by the discontented and the hungry, receive their first hints of the real importance of social studies from . . . such plays as 'Ghosts' and 'A Doll House'" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 433). Most of the middle class were not interested in radicalism, but drama had the ability to radicalize them by presenting injustice which they could understand intellectually first and next understand emotionally. That is, as drama is a representation, not an actual moment of injustice, it becomes less threatening than witnessing a real act of injustice and thereby encourages thoughtful consideration. Goldman thought that if everyone understood the injustice of present systems and were moved (because of their innate goodness), they would revolt, demand change or, at the very least, refuse to participate.

Goldman "saw in the theater the potential . . . to dramatize the larger context behind each individual's seemingly insignificant decisions and actions—and to address the social prejudices

that she believed crippled the spirit of openness to change" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* n1 xxiii). Goldman may have reasoned that if the content middle class could be brought to see that their actions—however insignificant they might seem—were part of a system of injustice, then they would be more open to change. By the end of the interview, Goldman convinced Thompson that drama was an integral part of anarchism. Thompson was so impressed that he wrote, "Goldman is not a woman. She is a force" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 433). By pointing to the anarchist spirit of revolt in drama, Goldman made anarchism less threatening. In Thompson's view, she not only moved beyond expectations of women, she moved beyond gender. Further in employing drama rather than anarchist theory, Goldman emphasizes the synthesis of aesthetics and politics.

In "Priestess of Anarchy becomes Dramatic Seer" published in *The San Francisco Bulletin* (January 1909), another interviewer asked why she is as friendly and respectful to socialist dramatists as she is toward those who preach anarchism (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 402). Goldman's answer is key here: "I look on all art as the mirror of human life, so I cannot confine myself in that regard to the principles of any party" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 402).

In her book *The Social Significance of Modern Drama*, originally a series of lectures she gave throughout the U.S., Canada, and Europe, Goldman builds on what she previously stated in interviews and lectures and articulates her confidence in the political power of drama. In this small book, she addresses nineteen writers—from Strindberg and Hauptmann to Gorky and Yeats—and thirty-two plays.[16] The purpose of the book was not to carefully analyze the plays and suggest how they make meaning as a literary critic might but rather to emphasize the social

[16] In 1987 *The Social Significance of Modern Drama* was reprinted by Applause, Theatre Book Publishers. The drama publishing company rather than the anarchists appreciated her work which, it must be noted, is primarily summary of the plays. Goldman writes the book as a way of drawing attention to the plays as if they speak for themselves. She recognizes them as good works but does not describe what makes them good—other than their subject and style. Her personal correspondence often has more thoughtful analysis of literature as well as politics. Many of the chapters in this book have been reprinted on several web sites and act as a sort of summary or synopsis for these plays. For example, see http://www.theatredatabase.com/

critiques presented by modern drama. Goldman's chapter on Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara* (originally a lecture) highlights the play's humorous questions about morality and violence, particularly the commoditization of war, both of which are central to my larger inquiry.

Set beside her politically persuasive lecture, "Anarchism: What It Really Stands for," which as we have seen is rich in literary references, Goldman's chapter "Major Barbara" is more aesthetically focused as it is primarily comprised of dialogue from the play. *Major Barbara* is a decidedly conventional work in terms of plot but not content, which is one reason Goldman may have chosen to include it in her book. The play mocks people who consider themselves authorities on morality and thereby exposes the audience to the hypocrisy of their own religious and moral beliefs. Exposing the hidden and hiding the exposed are both a part of the aesthetic component of this play and indeed much of Shaw's drama.

Goldman asserts that in this play Shaw "has pulled off the mask of purity and Christian kindness that we may see their hidden viciousness at work" ("Major Barbara" 96). Barbara, the protagonist, is a major in the Salvation Army and the image of Christian kindness. She believes she is saving souls, but Goldman writes, "It becomes necessary for those who want to be saved . . . to invent sins—the blacker the better" ("Major Barbara"102). Ironically, Barbara's kind Christian intentions toward Rummy and Price (and other disenfranchised characters) encouraged them to lie.

Although Goldman doesn't refer to the following passage from Shaw, I include it because it clarifies Barbara's position on salvation, which sets up the main tension in the play. Barbara tells her father: "Ive had scores of them through my hands: scoundrels, criminals, infidels, philanthropists, missionaries, country councilors, all sorts. Theyre all just the same sort of sinner; and theres the same salvation ready for them all" (Shaw, *Major Barbara* 362-3).

Barbara thinks she has the ability to save everyone from the most respected to the least, but she has failed to understand how she rewards lying and how her work is supported by the very enemies she seeks to destroy—the corporations that sell alcohol to the people whose souls she is trying to save. Her father tries to educate her the same way the devil in Dostoyevsky's story educates the priest.

Barbara resists the argument of Mrs. Baines, the Army Commissioner. Baines tries to convince Barbara that accepting money from the whiskey maker, Lord Saxmundham, is not hypocritical because he, "has a soul to be saved like any of us. If heaven has found the way to make a good use of his money, are we to set ourselves up against the answer to our prayers?" (Shaw, *Major Barbara* 399). Barbara resists this logic, but her father taunts her. He suggests that he might allow her to save his soul, but first she must visit his munitions factory. His factory produces and sells weapons of war: the famous Undershaft guns, cannons, torpedoes, submarines and aerial battleships. And her father will sell to *anyone* with the money to buy these weapons. He is a successful capitalist who has cashed in on men's desire for war. He has given his workers their own clean, safe town, respectable church, and groomed landscape. All of this, however, is based on the death and destruction of countless towns and peoples. In this way capitalism is criticized in Shaw's presentation of a "successful" capitalist. Although Shaw's play is a dramatic work and not a political treatise, these contextualizing "lessons" would have been both recognizable and troubling to the play's audience. Goldman includes portions of this scene and then concludes that the "best modern method of accumulating a large fortune consists in organizing industries in such a manner as to make the workers content with their slavery" (Goldman, "Major Barbara*"* 104).

In this Goldman chapter, Undershaft, the representative devilish character of the story, speaks the most lines. In "Modern Drama," an earlier essay, which later grew into her book *The Social Significance of Modern Drama*, Goldman, presents Undershaft's argument. Poverty is the worst of crimes, Undershaft (through Goldman) asserts. He says to his daughter: "Poverty and slavery have stood up for centuries to your sermons . . . they will not stand up to my machine guns . . . .When you shoot, you pull down governments, inaugurate new epochs, abolish old orders, and set up new" (Goldman, "Major Barbara" 106). Since Goldman believed that all forms of government rested on poverty and slavery, shooting them meant the government would fall and a new order might evolve. Goldman comments: "No wonder people cared little to read Mr. Shaw's Socialist tracts. In no other way but in the drama could he deliver such forcible, historic truths. And therefore it is only through the drama that Mr. Shaw is a revolutionary factor in the dissemination of radical ideas" (261). The slight on Shaw—no one reads his political theory because it is not a medium through which truths can be understood—is symptomatic of Goldman's relationship to him. But more significantly, if they were stated scientifically or theoretically, few would be moved by these truths. Through the aesthetics of drama, Goldman might transform her audience/readers with these "truths." Shaw's drama conveys radical and, to Goldman's mind, anarchist ideas that might otherwise be indigestible. Here art is the medium through which ideas are conveyed and without which public interest in anarchism—particularly among the middle class—wanes.

By the end of the play, Barbara, along with her fiancée Cusins, agrees to run her father's munitions factory. Cusins, Goldman asserts, presents the "most revolutionary sentiment in the whole play" ("Major Barbara" 106). Cusins explains his philosophy:

> As a teacher of Greek I gave the intellectual man weapons against the common man. I now want to give the common man weapons against the intellectual man. I

> love the common people. I want to arm them against the lawyer, the doctor, the priest, the literary man, the professor, the artist, and the politician, who once in authority, are the most dangerous, disastrous, and tyrannical of all the fools, rascals, and impostors. (Goldman, "Major Barbara" 106)

Lawyers and artists alike may be dangerous because of the authority they wield, authority that, Goldman asserts, individuals already have within themselves—the Emersonian genius or Thoreau's insistence on following one's conscience. Goldman interprets this passage: individuals often defer to the lawyer, professor, or politician, and it is they "who poison the people with 'the germ of briefs and politics.' Thereby unfitting them [sic] for the only effective course in the great social struggle—action, resultant from the realization that poverty and inequality never have been, never can be, preached or voted out of existence" ("Major Barbara" 106). By providing their services, the educated, professional classes prevent the working classes from doing what comes naturally to them—revolt against poverty. Shaw makes this point clear through humor, and for Goldman, aesthetics are political. [17]

Nothing in *Major Barbara* speaks directly to anarchism and yet something in the presentation of the content—what I am calling the aesthetics—speaks to Goldman's audience. As one of Shaw's discussion plays, it warrants a place in Goldman's lectures. Goldman responds to language of the play by repeating lines and the content by summarizing important points.[18] She doesn't mention anarchism in this chapter; instead, she repeats the characters'

---

[17] Although Goldman doesn't refer to it, Shaw's preface to the play offers a direct claim that echoes ideas from Emerson, Thoreau, Wilde, and Dostoyevsky previously discussed. In a section called "Christianity and Anarchism," Shaw writes that "neither the Salvation Army nor the Church of England nor any other religious organization whatever can . . . merely endure the State passively, washing their hands of its sins. The State is constantly forcing the consciences of men by violence and cruelty . . . it forces us to take an active personal part in its proceedings on pain of becoming ourselves the victims of violence" ("Preface to Major Barbara" 329). Shaw was not an anarchist, but this passage clearly resonates with Goldman's accusations of government violence and the way in which the state forces everyone to follow its laws rather than her/his own conscience.

[18] Because Goldman admires Shaw's social critiques, humor, and aesthetics, in chapter three of this dissertation, I analyze Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession* and Goldman's interpretation of it. I also examine their rather disastrous first meeting at Frank Harris's house and the two impatient letters she wrote to him. In short, chapter three also

discussion of morality and their struggle to define it for themselves. In this way, aesthetics and the political message become intertwined.

Sexuality and Maternity

The aesthetic/political thread is complicated by Goldman's sexuality. Her relationship with maternity was colored by sentimentality and the ever-changing forces of the early-twentieth century, including but not limited to gender expectations. One might also argue that Goldman's transference of maternal love for her would-be children became sexualized maternal love for her romantic interests. As her rejection of her own maternity marks the birth of her commitment to anarchism, it is an appropriate place to begin the complex unraveling of the meaning and practice of sexual freedom in her anarchism.

Goldman's overworked mother, Taube, had little time for the young Emma. As Emma grew so did her ambivalence toward her mother. Goldman rarely wrote about her relationship with her mother, but in her autobiography she offers one story that took place when the family lived in Kovno, Lithuania. Taube was upset that the Nihilists planned to kill the Tsar: "Too good gracious Tsar—Mother had said—the first to give more freedom to the Jews; he had stopped the pogroms and he was planning to set the peasants free. And him the Nihilists mean to kill! 'Cold-blooded murderers,' Mother cried, 'they ought to be exterminated, every one of them!'"(*Living My Life* 28).[19] The young Emma didn't understand the context of her mother's comment, but she understood the tone and the suggestion that death should be met with more death. She also did

---

further examines the tension in grounding an anarchist revolution in literature whereas chapter four examines the tension in grounding anarchism in religion.

[19] Tsar Alexander II survived several assassination attempts but was killed by a bomb in1881. See Edvard Radzinski's *Alexander II: The Last Great Tzar*. New York: Free Press, 2005.

not recognize the violence directed at her because of her linage.[20] Goldman writes, "Mother's violence terrorized me. Her suggestion of extermination froze my blood. I felt that the Nihilists must be beasts, but I could not bear such cruelty in my mother" (25). Goldman's rejection of her mother whom she viewed as cold and distant and her fascination with the Nihilists began here. However, clearly Taube's comment is one of self-preservation and compassion for the peasants. That young Emma would respond to the tone without understanding the context speaks to Emma's innocence as well as her and her mother's already strained personal relationship.

Goldman's rejection of her own maternity, on the other hand, was a political and physical decision. When she was in her late teens, pain in her spine and legs caused her to consult a physician. She was informed that she would never have children and never "be free from the pain or experience sexual release" unless she submitted to an operation (*Living My Life* 58). Goldman writes that her heart was torn because she had always loved children but felt that many were unwanted, including her. She claimed she did not want her children to experience the same neglect she had, so she did not have the operation. Her logic is problematic here, but she wants to make it clear that she has the capacity to love and raise a child but made a choice not to.[21] She sets up a tension between her maternal instincts and her career goals. The Cause had to come first, and children would distract her from her goals (*Living My Life* 58-60). In short, she refuses "to bear children" (*Living My Life* 61). Although she does not mention it here, this decision freed her from the worries of pregnancy, which made it easier for her to love whomever and whenever she pleased. She lectured and published essays and articles on reproductive rights and birth control, which she was arrested for despite (or because of) the fact she did not need it herself.

---

[20]Goldman dismissed her Judaism as she dismiss all forms of authority and many traditions. At the same time, she gave lectures in Yiddish.

[21] In *The Iceman Cometh*, Eugene O'Neill fashioned his character Rosa Parrit after Goldman and then gave her a son. The son betrays his mother because she was dedicated to the cause and had no time for him. For the story, see Driggins p. 234-245.

Goldman's rejection of her literal motherhood was compensated for by a symbolic maternity, one that focused on motherly love for the common folk as well as by surrogate motherhood—a mother to her lovers such as Almeda Sperry,[22] Leon Malmed, and Ben Reitman.[23] Publicly, she treated her audiences as unruly children and named her publication *Mother Earth*, after an earth goddess. Kate Richards O'Hare, a well known socialist leader who had spent time in prison with Goldman, referred to Goldman as her "loyal comrade and cosmic mother" (Falk, *Love* 175). According to O'Hare, it was not Goldman's anarchism but her "passionate maternal spirit" that appealed to inmates (Falk, *Love* 175). Before their relationship became sexual, Almeda Sperry, a former prostitute and perhaps the only female lover Goldman had, wrote, "I wish I had a mother like you . . . .You are my mother" (Falk, *Love* 108). Goldman's love, whether maternal or sexual or both, was wide-ranging and intense.

Even Goldman's orgasms became her children. Leon Malmed, with whom Goldman had a passionate and illicit affair, helped her "experience her genitals as a separate being" (Falk, *Love* 219); in her letters to Leon, which she wrote nearly every day from November 1926 through February 1928, she called sex her "child" (Falk, *Love* 219).[24]

She also transferred her maternal love for her would-be children to a sexualized maternal love for Ben Reitman. She called him "my precious boy" and signed her letters "Momie" (Falk, *The American Years* 334). He referred to her as "little blue-eyed Mommy" (Falk, *The American*

[22]Although Sperry's letters to Goldman were rather explicit, Falk questions Sperry's trustworthiness and suggests Sperry may have invented their love affair (Falk, *Love* 108).

[23] Goldman met Frank Heiner, a thirty-six year old graduate student at University of Chicago, on her U.S. lecture tour. She allowed him to visit her in Toronto and become her lover a year later (Drinnon, *Nowhere at Home* 111). She was sixty-five.

[24] For more of these letters, see *The Goldman Papers*; reels 16 and 17. These reels contain approximately 900 letters, perhaps one-third of which are first drafts.

Years 206).[25] The sentimentality of a woman acting as a mother to her lovers situates her within and also against traditional roles of women.

But Goldman's complex relationship with maternity, femininity, and sexuality is not so swiftly packaged or compartmentalized as I have implied here. Her lectures on free love and birth control encouraged women to explore their sexuality and whether or when they wanted to be mothers. Through these lectures she promoted the "separation of sexuality and reproduction through accessible birth control" (Haaland 184). Goldman experienced that separation early on, and it freed her. She also discouraged women from fighting for the right to vote because it meant participating in the faulty political system that suppressed individual freedom. Her own choice to reject motherhood in favor of a political career was considered masculine and yet reporters frequently commented on her feminine qualities. Situated within and growing out of her historical moment, Goldman responded to the changing times and changing gender expectations with hope for revolution.

Sexual Freedom

Of all her revolutionary ideas and beliefs, free love was one of the more controversial. She was a woman espousing and practicing these beliefs, and encouraging other women to embrace their sexual desire as an integral part of their self-expression and radical self-creation. For Goldman, anarchism meant embodying her beliefs.

Much like her embrace of literature in the face of criticism from her fellow anarchists, Goldman's refusal to compromise her feminist and sexual freedom theories and practice distinguishes her from other anarchist theory and "altered a tradition of andocentric theory-

[25] Part of this dynamic can be attributed to their age difference. When they first became lovers, Goldman was 38 and Ben Reitman 28. She claimed that he sexually satisfied her in a way that no other lover had.

construction among anarchists—an exclusionary tradition which neglected issues related to women and sexuality on the grounds that they were 'private,' and therefore outside the scope of 'public' theory" (Haaland 21, 182). This inclusion meant that Goldman's anarchism, unlike that of her mentor Johann Most or friend Peter Kropotkin, was not a theory bifurcated between public and private, but one that bridged the gap between the two. She practices anarchism as a personal philosophy primarily and a political theory secondarily.

Advocates of free love directly challenged the public's understanding of women's sexuality. Religious moralists including the Federal Council of Churches of Christ viewed sexuality as dangerous and morality was defined by sexual morality (Haaland 74, 76). For religious institutions of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, "fuller expression of sexuality was seen as regression to egotism—as destructive and anti-social phenomenon" (Haaland 76). Goldman was a particularly visual practitioner and advocate because she was often in the newspaper.

Rather than compartmentalize her life as women of her age and status were expected to do, Goldman let them blend together so her political allies were her lovers and her lovers her financial backers and managers and mentors. She fell in love with men who appealed to her aesthetically, not simply through physical appearance, although that was a consideration, but who held beautiful ideals, similar or at least not in opposition to her own.

Goldman adhered to conventional feminine dress and manners, but her lectures on free love broke all rules of womanly decorum. Goldman was not unique in her feminist views or her views on sexual freedom. In the late 1870s, notable adherents to free love practice included

Victoria Woodhull (who was the first woman to run for president) (Blatt 71-73), Edna St. Vincent Millay, Bertrand Russell, and Dorothy Day (although she later renounced it).[26]

From the free-love movement to elaborate biological theories about women's bodies to straightforward formalized rules about women's attire, discourses about femininity and the place of the New Woman abound around the turn of the century and well into the 1920s. Turn-of-the-century medical professionals' conservative values, rooted in the double standard of sexual conduct for men and women (Haaland 75), served to amplify the already resounding notion that women's sexual desire (if its existence was admitted at all) was to be suppressed and that women who "succumbed" to their desires were at fault for their inevitable demise. The free-love movement responded to the sexual double standard and placed itself in opposition to strict Victorian rules of conduct and marriage customs. Free lovers rejected marriage as a form of social bondage and demanded freedom from state regulation and church interference. They challenged obscenity laws as well as those concerning adultery, divorce, birth control, homosexuality, abortion, and prostitution.[27] Free lovers also advocated free speech, particularly in relation to prostitution and sexuality.

Goldman's construction of free-love theory was not fundamentally different from that of other free love advocates, but because she blurred lines between sexuality, aesthetics, and politics, she expanded the definition of each. Through her reading of Freud and Havelock Ellis and her own experience with sex expression "as vital a force in human life as food and air" (*Living My Life* 225), she was determined to "discuss sex as frankly as [she] did other topics and to live [her] life without fear of the opinions of others" (*Living My Life* 225).

---

[26] Earlier adherents include Mary Wollstonecraft, William Godwin, Percy Bysshe Shelly, and Richard Wagner.

[27] For more on this topic, see *Free Love in America: A Documentary History* by Taylor Stoehr. New York: AMS Press, 1979. For direct references to both Shaw and Goldman, see *The Sex Radicals: Free Love in High Victorian America* by Hal D. Sears. Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1977.

Rather than accepting the general consensus about women's sexuality—that they do not or should not have any—Goldman asserted that not only do women have sexual desire, they should feel free to act on it when they are in love. She "idealized free love, believing that love given in complete freedom created the strongest bonds" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 5). Further, she asserted that sexual freedom was imperative to women's freedom: "Until woman has learned to defy them all, to stand firmly on her own ground and to insist upon her own unrestricted freedom, to listen to the voice of her nature, whether it call for life's greatest treasure, love for a man, or her most glorious privilege, the right to give birth to a child, she cannot call herself emancipated" (*Red Emma Speaks* 140). Neither winning the right to vote nor electing women to political office will free women; listening to her instinct will free her. The language and imagery used here connects women to nature and moves in the direction of essentialism.

In advocating free love and later birth control, Goldman challenged Victorian Puritanism and traditional ideas about appropriate behavior for women. She radically asserted that chastity was not a virtue and that it actually negatively affected women because it confined them (Clark 45).

In one of her most radical and explicit lectures, "Sex: The Great Element for Creative Work," Goldman asserted that "the creative spirit is not an antidote to the sex instinct, but a part of its forceful expression" (Falk, *Love* 99).[28] As sex is an expression of the creative spirit, social mores confining sexual desire to the boundaries of marriage are yet another form of authority that needed to be dismantled in order for a new society filled with self-expression to emerge. Free love, then, is not only an element in practicing anarchism, but it is also an aesthetic force.

Goldman makes her assertion even more dramatic when she adds, "Sex is the source of life . . . .Where sex is missing everything is missing" (Falk, *Love* 99). As sex is a fundamental

[28] This lecture can be found in manuscript folder XXIX–A, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam.

element of human existence, sexual liberation or liberation of the body, is as important to anarchism as liberation of the mind from the state or religion. Not all anarchists held to this belief; in fact, Goldman's focus on this topic embarrassed fellow anarchist Peter Kropotkin (*Living My Life* 253). Kropotkin told her not to lecture on sexuality and refused to include sexual freedom on the agenda for the anarchist meeting in Paris, 1900. He asserted that marriage, sexuality and reproduction were peripheral to the Cause, and Goldman should refrain from lecturing on these topics (Goldman, *My Disillusionment with Russia* 253). Some anarchists like Goldman's mentor Johann Most admitted that he wanted a traditional marriage (*Living My Life* 73). He was not the exception to the rule. In a letter to Berkman and several places in her autobiography, Goldman complained that most German anarchists were really antediluvian in regards to women (Drinnon, *Nowhere at Home* 145; Goldman, *Living My Life* 54).[29] But even Berkman, lover and lifetime intellectual companion, admonished her for her insistence on open sexual expression (*Living My Life* 56; 75). These friends and comrades were unable to fully understand the importance of sexual expression to Goldman. At the same time these men, with the exception of Kropotkin, were once her lovers. Finally, Goldman reinforced her basic assertion: since "love is an art, sex love is also an art" (Falk, *Love* 99). While this art of "sex love" was not a new idea, Goldman made it new and more provocative by focusing on women's sexual desire.

In an interview with a reporter from the *Chicago Inter Ocean,* Goldman outlined her belief: "We believe in free love. Such relations as that of husband and wife should only be constituted when a man and a woman love each other" (Falk*, Making Speech Free*, 285). In other words, sexual relationships (in or outside of marriage) should be saved for those in love and

[29] Ezra Heywood (1829-1893) both anarchist and free-love advocate is one notable exception. See *Free Love and Anarchism: The Biography of Ezra Heywood*. University of Illinois Press, 1989.

should end when a couple falls out of love. So a marriage commitment becomes problematic as it assumes the couple will be in love all of their lives. Love, Goldman implies here, is not usually that consistent.[30]

Goldman's lectures on free love emphasized women's emancipation from the respectable asexuality they had been assigned.[31] "Women anarchists all over the country practice [free love] now," Goldman claimed (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 285). When she emphasized women anarchists, not women and men anarchists, practice free love, she implied that men's sexual forays outside—before, during, or in no relation to—marriage were more acceptable although not accepted. While men were not encouraged to announce their sexual conquests, they encountered less friction than women for practicing free love. Even the most liberated among the male anarchists might agree with the theory of sexual freedom, but often were embarrassed by open discussion of sexual freedom—particularly in regard to women's sexuality. Goldman celebrated both male and female sexual desire, but even she had her limits. In her anarchist theory and practice, while women's sexual expression is recognized, it is not discussed openly or in depth.

Perhaps her most radical public statement about women's sexuality is: "sexual sensibility [is] greater and more enduring in woman than in man" (Falk, *Love* 99) . If woman's "sexual sensibility" were greater than man's, then it would follow that her need for sexual freedom is

[30] Halfway across the country and a few months after the interview with the *Chicago Inter Ocean*, another reporter quoted Goldman making a similar but more direct point about sex without love. Printed in the *Spokesman-Review* (Seattle) the heading, "Goldman Traces Anarchy to 1776" seems innocuous, but the subheading is decidedly negative: "Woman Terrorist Denies Her Followers Are Bombthrowers and Advocates of Free Love" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 323). The article does not explain how or in what way Goldman is a terrorist—it merely repeats what other newspapers have written. And while it describes Goldman's insistence that her followers are not bomb-throwers, it does not explain how or when Goldman denied she and her followers were advocates of free love. On the contrary, it quotes Goldman who offers a clear assertion: "It is degrading for man and woman to live together after they no longer love—it is immoral" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 325).

[31] The emphasis here is on how women were to view their own sexuality. Women were encouraged by the social morés of the time to be desirable/marriageable to others but not have specific sexual desires of their own.

greater as well.[32] Although Goldman doesn't fully develop this argument in this lecture, in a letter to her friend and known philanderer Frank Harris, she explains further:

> I do not consider the mere physical fact [of sexual intercourse] sufficient to convey the tremendous effect it has upon human emotions and sensations. Perhaps it is because to woman, sex has a far greater effect on sexual relations. It's psychological and cannot be described in mere physical terms . . . . For me, at any rate, it will be utterly impossible to describe the physical side, which is, after all, very limited, while the psychological is rich and varied. (August 7, 1925)

She cannot fully address what she means because "complete honesty about female sexuality would cause" a worse scandal than Harris's book which described his sexual exploits (August 7, 1925). One might reasonably assert, then, that sex (with love) is the foundation of Goldman's passion for her anarchist cause and as such it is inseparable from her politics and her aesthetics. Contrary to critics who disparagingly said that women join political groups in order to find lovers/husbands and then leave the ranks, Goldman asserted that sexual relations were among the social relations that defined political association; lovers with shared ideology energized the anarchist movement. In the painful process of revising the past in order to write her autobiography, Goldman tells Berkman, "I do mean to cut out only casual love affairs, although nearly all my experiences were so wrapped up with my work that it is difficult to separate them. I do not think there have been a half-dozen cases where the men were not either anarchists active in the movement or sympathetic to our ideas" (Feb. 20, 1929).

Goldman takes her assertions one step further in a 1909 debate with Edward Adams Cantrell, national lecturer for the Socialist Party. The title of the debate itself raised questions: "Free Love without Collective Regulation Is the Only Guarantee of a Healthy Race" (Falk,

[32] Ten years after Goldman's lectures on free love several fictional texts that broached the topic of women's sexuality such as D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* were published, but not without arguments from the censors.

Making Speech Free 500).[33] Collective regulation refers to the sanctioning of marriage through religion, the licensing of the couple/marriage through the state, and the social and familial pressures to marry which result, in part, from the first two. The social pressures to conform to codes of conduct are another form of authority Goldman wishes to dismantle. The codes overrule individuals' authority over their bodies and thereby distort their expression of self. For Goldman, not only is male and female sexual expression important for individuals, it is a major component in creating a healthy race; a healthy race is one that respects sexual desire.

In her essay, "Victims of Morality," Goldman describes the destructive effects of these codes of conduct but emphasizes women's changing values. She asserts that women are beginning to understand how they (and others) have made themselves sexual commodities in courting and in marriage and how they can be freed from this capitalist exchange:

> Woman is awakening, she is throwing off the nightmare of Morality; she will no longer be bound. In her love for the man she is not concerned in the contents of his pocketbook, but in the wealth of his nature, which alone is the fountain of life and of joy. Her love is sanction enough for her. Thus she can abandon herself to the man of her choice, as the flowers abandon themselves to dew and light, in freedom, beauty, and ecstasy. ("Victims of Morality" 32)

For a woman to have sex with or "abandon" herself to a man (or woman for that matter), and to pursue her own sexual desires, meant to live freely, anarchisticly, and outside the social codes of conduct and expectations of women. It meant to become a sexual subject. The language in this passage is strikingly conventional; "abandon herself" recalls images the fallen woman. Goldman embraces this image rather than creating a new one in which woman's sexuality is not a "giving up" or a "giving in" but something that would suggest a stronger agency: she decided to have him. In the context of the sexual image here, she encourages a "giving up," which sounds

[33] For Goldman's position on eugenics see Haaland, pp. 76-82.

like a defeat. In short, the "flowers" let go and grow because the "dew and light" takes care of them.

As her language and imagery suggest, Goldman is still caught in the ideals of women's passivity—quite a contradiction for one so clearly an agent. Her relationship with Ben Reitman is one such example. Her commitment to loving freely was tested several times but never so dramatically as by the sexual proclivities of Reitman. She met him in Chicago in March 1908 but by August was tormented by his infidelity. She struggled with the practical problems of putting the theory of free love into practice.

Diggins offers a succinct summary of the tension between being an anarchist and practicing free love:

> But to be free and to be in loving had always been a quandary to the anarchist, as Emma Goldman honestly observed in her writings. The urge to be free and liberated easily gives way to the urge to possess and dominate. The hope of the anarchist was to see humanity acting rather than allowing itself to be acted upon, asserting the self rather than submitting. But the presence of desire contradicts conscience as the will lusts after objects alien to the self. (234)

For Goldman, this tension is only one of the many that make up her loving, maternal, passionate, sexually satisfying, profoundly disappointing, and infuriating relationship with Reitman. Goldman hints at these tensions in her autobiography, but the complexity of their relationship becomes more apparent in their correspondence.

In a letter dated 4 a.m. August 31st, 1908, Goldman wrote to Reitman: "I am struggling, struggling the bitterest struggle of my life and if I succeed, I fear that I shall never be able to see you again. Yet, if I fail, I shall stand condemned before the bar of my own reason" (Falk, *Making Speech Free* 353-54). If jealousy, ego, and her own definition of free love prevail, she will not see him again. If she succumbs to her physical desire and her love for him, she stands condemned by her own interpretation of free love because Reitman did not adhere to it. Goldman

is caught between her reason and her emotions. Theoretically, she should not be bothered by his "loving freely"; in practice, she is jealous, committed to him, and angry with him and herself.

In the same 4 a.m. letter, her tone changes and she writes a strange and sentimental story of mother's love:

> A man had a cruel mistress, who would forever tease him, with her lack of faith in his love. He wanted her to believe in him so he said one day, "Is there anything I can do to prove my love?" "Yes, go and bring me your mothers [sic] heart." The man adored his mother, she had always been so kind and good to him. But his passion was great, so he killed his mother tore out her heart and rushed with it to his mistress. On the way he stumbled and fell. And his mothers heart said to him, "My precious child, have you hurt yourself?" It is that side of my nature, Ben dear, that stretches out to you, that would like to embrace you and soothe you. The mother calls to you, my boy, my precious boy!!!" (Falk, *The American Years* 353-54)

Goldman's self-sacrificing maternal feelings seem to overcome her and through this melodramatic, grisly story, she forgives his indiscretions and cruelty.[34] Her willingness to die metaphorically in order that her lover might be happy contrasts sharply with her dynamic, passionate persona and on the surface, her own construction of anarchism. Goldman's willingness to suffer humiliation in order that Reitman could practice his version of free love and her willingness to trot off to jail because of her beliefs are both strangely in line with her theory of anarchism.

In the course of the next year, Reitman frequently lied and stole money. These issues were problematic in themselves but they were not public knowledge and therefore not as embarrassing to Goldman as they might have been. However, Reitman also continued to have many casual sexual encounters. In a nine-page break-up letter to him, Goldman cites the main

[34] We should note too that Reitman lived with his mother when he was not riding the trains in his physician-hobo status or traveling with Goldman as her manager. At one point Reitman, his mother, Goldman, and two other women made a "household," but it didn't last long. See Goldman's chronology in Falk.

cause of her leaving him: his irresponsible and unscrupulous attitude towards women as well as his "lack of honesty with them," himself and herself:

> I have told you over and over again, if you really care for a woman, if you love her, no matter how it much that may grieve me, I should have strength enough to face it. Or if you were honest in your dealings with women, openly and plainly telling them, "I want you for a sex embrace and no more." That too I could stand. But your complete lack of justice and common humanity, of consideration for the rights of another is simply killing me. You deny leading on these women, but I know that not one of them, certainly not Grace or Lioness or Lilly or this latest fancy of yours, would consent to be used as a toy, not one of them. . . . Cann't you realize that Ben? (May 31st, 1909)

Goldman asserts that if Reitman and his partner simply want sex, then she cannot object. At the same time, she is appalled that he had treated her and other women as sex objects, but even angrier, she claims, with his dishonesty. These are women Goldman knows in the anarchist movement, and although she asserts that sexual relations make a political organization an entity, this is an example of sexual relations disrupting her anarchist group.

As this and many other letters indicate, Reitman's infidelity tormented Goldman. She struggled to practice free love without limits and without imposing her will upon him. In a remarkably raw passage in her autobiography, she recreates the emotional tension in those years, argues with herself, and questions her doctrine and his actions:

> "What right have I to condemn, I who claim to teach new values of life?" "But his obsessions? His going with every woman?" My heart cried out in protest. Women he does not love, does not even respect. Can you justify that, too? No, no! came from the depths of my woman's soul. "Yes," replied my brain, "if it is his nature, his dominant need, how can I object? I have propagated freedom in sex. I have had many men myself. But I loved them; I have never been able to go indiscriminately with men. I've paid dearly for the right to myself, for my social ideal, for everything I have achieved. Is my love for Ben so weak that I shall not be able to pay the price his freedom of action demands?" (*Living My Life* 440-41)

In this passage written years after their romantic relationship was over (they maintained a friendship), she struggles with reconciling her theory of free love to Reitman's actions.[35] His promiscuity and lies wounded her "womanly" heart and her ego. She realizes that she, who considers herself aware and informed, has been subject to a younger man's infidelity, like "any ordinary woman" (*Living My Life* 440). Her traditional feminine response is problematic for her because she considered herself beyond this kind of cultural gendering. Yet she allowed their tumultuous romantic relationship to last ten years. For many of those years Reitman was also her business manager and arranged many successful and well-attended lectures. Goldman refused to keep boundaries between business, pleasure, pain, and politics.

Her "woman's soul" is appalled at Reitman's persistent practice of indiscriminate sex as it makes her relationship with him simply one of many and destroys the originality of her gift of love. Her vulnerability makes her more pointedly human. In the end, her political ideal is also a personal struggle. The practice of free love theory enabled Goldman to wrangle her socially constructed femininity both within her personal relationships and in her public life.

She built her life around her commitment to radical social and political change. Through her refusal to conform, she created a new form and a new, albeit difficult, way to be a woman. Goldman was a passionate, intense, determined woman who allowed other women to imagine their whole selves—not the self that is determined by society.

Conclusion

In the end, the cultural, literary, and historical background noted throughout this chapter moves Goldman outside the one-dimensional political realm to which the media confined her. It

[35] Although she doesn't address it in her autobiography, she felt that Reitman also betrayed the anarchist movement through his return to his religion and his conventional marriage.

allows us to see her anarchism through the eyes of anarchists, literary figures, common folk, laborers, and the educated middle class and to suggest how political, social, and literary forces in the early-twentieth century defined Goldman.

In first analyzing Goldman's anarchism through literary references and drama lectures and then in situating it in a public context, we gain a clearer picture of the complexity of anarchism unencumbered by the public distrust of the movement itself. Goldman's lectures were more comprehensible and less threatening than other anarchists' because she employed literature and drama as a means of creating social change. She populated political essays with literary references that pointed to the Individualism in Emerson, anarchism in Thoreau, liberated "spirit" in Dostoyevsky, and the critique of political and social hypocrisy in Shaw. In using literature in anarchist lectures, she redefined both the literature referenced and anarchy itself. And by infusing literature in anarchism and anarchism in drama in her essays "Anarchism: What Does It Stand for?" and "Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara*," Goldman effectively altered the relation of the aesthetic to the political by blurring the line between the two.

But Goldman's appeals to literature were also incongruous to her detractors who held to a model of political action that opposed political and literary work. Goldman worked from a broader and more realistic conception of political work that avoided the standard opposition between theory and practice. She emphasized the need for art and sex in the anarchist movement. She emphasized aesthetics through espousing free love and trying to live it. Her lived life was the canvas on which questions of aesthetics, sexuality and politics arise.

Chapter Three
A Literary Anarchist and Her Political Dramatist

> "I want you to call on [Emma Goldman] and make everything as nice for her as possible. If you placed one of your numerous motor cars at her disposal you would be doing a good deed and kindly, and she would love it."
> ~Frank Harris, Letter to Bernard Shaw, Aug. 30th, 1924

The acquaintance between Emma Goldman and Bernard Shaw may be more important than heretofore acknowledged. In fact, there is evidence of a truncated dialogue that has tantalizing potential. They exchanged a few letters, met once at Frank Harris's apartment, and had a hand in editing Harris's unauthorized biography of Shaw. But Shaw, the prolific writer of drama and letters, never publicly mentioned meeting Goldman, the "notorious" anarchist. And, at a time when Shaw had become a virtual cottage industry, Goldman wrote but never sold her story about meeting Shaw. Furthermore, neither Shaw's nor Goldman's biographers have explored the relationship. While it would be an overstatement to say that Shaw dabbled in anarchism, he and Goldman shared some political values—about birth control and prostitution, for example. Their similar concerns as well as their affection for literature and Goldman's appreciation for Shaw's plays, would suggest that when they finally met, they might have enjoyed a lively conversation. However, this was not the case.

In all likelihood, Goldman's anarchist politics, her frankness, and the sensationalized news reports of her association with violent acts contributed to the tension between these writers. Her political message was more radical than Shaw's, her approach more direct, and her delivery

more aggressive. Shaw's plays inspired thoughtful reflection while Goldman's lectures inspired awe and righteous indignation. Whether addressing modern drama, free love, or birth control, Goldman's lectures attracted laborers, disgruntled socialists, budding anarchists, and curiosity seekers alike. If Shaw, the Nobel Laureate, was a force by virtue of his writing, Goldman impressed the public with her impassioned speeches, complete commitment to her cause and willingness to go to prison for her ideals.

In contrast, Shaw supported women's rights, not by risking his freedom, but through his letters to the editor, essays, and drama. He asserted that *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, for example, was a play for women because it portrayed prostitution as a systemic problem, rather than attributing it, as Victorian reformers did, to a lack of morals.[1] In general, he recognized that the nineteenth century political and social systems obstructed women's progress, and at the same time, he asserted that most women were quite capable of caring for themselves. Goldman clearly fits into the competent woman category. Aside from the odd absence of discussion about the two famous writers, their acquaintance itself is strange too, not so much because of Goldman's competence but in spite of it.

The Shaw/Goldman relationship, both what it was and equally important, what it was not, offers insight not only into the nature of Goldman's aesthetic anarchism; it also amplifies the biography of an important literary figure via his acquaintance with a radical and passionate woman, which was unlike any of the relationships he had with other strong-willed, independent women. Aside from adding one more element to the complexity of Shaw's character, this hitherto unexplored acquaintance offers a particular instance of Shaw privileging traditional aesthetics over politics and results in aesthetics limiting his politics; this privileging is not visible

[1] For an overview of the play and historical influences, see Leonard Conolly's introduction to *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, Orchard Park, New York: Broadview Editions, 2005.

when we only compare him to other modernist writers. Some of Shaw's critics such as Gilbert Chesterton and H.G. Wells (both of whom were his friendly agitators) asserted that his drama was simply an excuse for making political arguments. They would have him landing on the side of politics. My reading is a corrective one. Shaw was clearly not producing art for art's sake, nor was he producing political propaganda. While he blends art and politics, when he is analyzed through a feminist anarchist lens, he lands firmly on the side of art.

Shaw's Connection to Anarchism

Whereas Goldman recognizes Shaw's distance from anarchism, several writers accused him of having anarchist tendencies. If Shaw's biographies are any indication, the misinterpretation by Shaw's contemporaries had no lasting effects. Few of the collections of his life and work, such as A. M. Gibbs's, *A Bernard Shaw Chronology,* or Michael Holroyd's *Bernard Shaw: A Biography,* mention anarchism.[2] Further archival research, however, reveals a few reasons writers might be confused about his political beliefs in the mid 1880s and 1890s.[3]

What might have caused the public to think Shaw had anarchistic tendencies? Readers of his work who lived in England might have noticed that he published a resolution, wrote a petition, and attempted to gather signatures all in order to grant the Chicago anarchists reprieve. He also attended lectures given by William Morris and other socialists with anarchist leanings. Critics may have heard that he influenced Oscar Wilde's *The Soul Under Socialism*, which is said to have anarchist elements (Goodway 73). The confusion began when Shaw's article,

[2] *The Anarchist*, a newspaper, is listed in Gibb's index. Shaw's essay, "What's in a Name" was published here, among other places not included in Gibb's text. Laurence's *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography* is one of the few exceptions.

[3]Many of references to anarchism can be found in Laurence's *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography* and "Anarchism" in the Dan H. Laurence Collection, University of Guelph.

"What's in a Name? How an Anarchist Might Put It" was published in London and New York anarchist papers.

In March of 1885, Shaw allowed *The Anarchist* (London) edited by Henry Seymour to publish "What's in a Name? How an Anarchist Might Put It," but Shaw soon regretted his decision because many people took the article seriously.[4] The article, bearing Shaw's signature, was reprinted in an American anarchist paper, *Liberty,* edited by Benjamin Tucker. That printing was not authorized. As the first work of Shaw's to appear in the United States (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw A Bibliography* 14; Gibbs, *A Bernard Shaw Chronology* 57), many readers and writers thought Shaw was an anarchist. Ford Maddox Ford and other public figures point to the article as proof that Shaw was an anarchist in his youth (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters* 109). The confusion is not unfounded. If taken by itself, the article is anarchistic. Shaw writes,

> The sole valid protest against Czsardom, individual or collective is that of the Anarchist, who would call no man Master. Slavery is the complement to authority, and must disappear with it. If the slave indeed makes the master, then the workers are slaves by choice, and to emancipate them is tyranny. But if, as we believe, it is the master that makes the slave, we shall never get rid of slavery until we have got rid of authority. ("What's in a Name?" 7)

The confusion about Shaw's political ideology becomes apparent in this passage: Shaw calls for the elimination of authority, a clearly anarchist message. However, Shaw claimed the article was written and published as a lark. When Charlotte Wilson wrote an article "What is Socialism?" which Shaw thought was poorly written, he wrote "What's in a Name?" in response. In a letter to Seymour, the English anarchist publisher, Shaw claims the article was written "to shew Mrs. Wilson my idea of the line an anarchist paper should take in England" (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters* 109). If he were an anarchist, he asserts here, he would write a short article that

[4]In 1889, Seymour reprinted the article as "Anarchism verses State Socialism." This time the reprinting was unauthorized (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography* 14).

employs simple logic. The article outlines what angle Shaw thinks an anarchist paper *should* take, not his personal views on anarchism. It was not out of character for Shaw to write and encourage an anarchist journal to publish what appeared to be his anarchist article. For years after its publication, those unfamiliar with Shaw's political views or his affection for provoking his audience mistook him for an anarchist, but he continued to allow anarchist papers to publish his work. As late as the1980s, a critic misinterpreted Shaw's article because he focused on the article itself rather than the circumstances surrounding it.[5]

His political stance is obvious throughout most of his writing. "I am a Socialist," Shaw proclaimed in 1907, "because I have learnt . . . freedom with out [sic] law is impossible; and I have become a religious agitator because I have discovered that men without religion have no courage" (Laurence, *Shaw: An Exhibit* Forward). He is a Fabian who enjoys engaging in political discussions, in person or in print. At the same time, however, his connections to anarchists and anarchism are more involved than indicated in his biographies. First, Shaw wrote several signed and unsigned articles reporting on anarchist activities: "The Zurich Anarchist Conference" for *Freedom* in 1893 found in the *Dan Laurence Collection*, University of Guelph and many for *The Star*, all listed in the index of Laurence's *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography*. Moreover, several editors of anarchist journals published Shaw's work: William Banham of the publication *Alarm* (London), editors of *L'Humanité*, Helen and Olivia Rossetti (daughters of William, nieces of Dante Rossetti) of *The Torch.*[6] Second, and often overlooked by critics and Shavian fans alike,

[5] Stephen Gill claims that Shaw's "What's in a Name?" was evidence of Shaw's inclination toward anarchism. Gill also quickly asserts that Shaw was not an anarchist and points to Shaw's "The Impossibility of Anarchism" originally a paper read to the Fabian Society in 1891. See *Political Convictions of G.B. Shaw*, Vesta Publications Ltd, Cornwall, Ontario, Canada, 1980, p. 63.

[6] They also published a letter from Goldman on Sept. 18, 1895. In her autobiography, Goldman writes, "While in London, I spent much time with them, greatly enjoying their prodigious hospitality and the inspiring atmosphere of their circle" (165). Their semi-autobiographical novel *A Girl among the Anarchists* describes their work on *The Torch*. It also shows officials of all ranks, from police to politicians, harassing anarchists. The novel can be read

Shaw respected and corresponded with a handful of anarchists—even though he had no actual interest in anarchism as a political theory.

Benjamin Tucker was an anarchist who earned Shaw's respect (Szladits 33).[7] Aside from publishing Shaw's "What's in a Name?" in 1891 Tucker published—with permission—Shaw's book *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, which was also published simultaneously in England.[8] Two years later, Tucker published Shaw's long review of Max Nordau's *Entartung* (1893, English translation *Degeneration*)[9] in *Liberty,*[10] the text of which was then republished in book form with Shaw's appended preface and renamed *The Sanity of Art* (1908). Shaw and Tucker's relationship grew. They exchanged letters between 1896 and 1928 and debated politics in essays published in several newspapers and journals.[11] Further, Tucker published Charlotte Shaw's translation of *Maternité* by Eugéne Brieux "preceding the Shaws's joint enterprise, *Three Plays by Brieux* by four years" (Szladits 34).[12] Tucker wrote, "Since Anarchy cannot have Shaw for a champion, the next best thing for the cause is to have him as a conspicuous foe" (Edwards).

---

online or downloaded through Project Gutenberg. For an overview of the publication of the journal, see William Phillips' *Nightmares in Anarchy: Language and Cultural Change 1870-1914*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2003. For a novel highly critical of anarchists, read Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent,* first published in 1907.

[7] Other writers who admired Tucker include H. L. Mencken and Walt Whitman. Whitman once declared, "I love him; he is plucky to the bone" (Szladits 33).

[8] Tucker translated and published the works of Warren and Proudhon; the synthesis of which was the basis of his political beliefs (Szladits 33)

[9] The *Frankfurter Zeitung* printed Max Nordau's reply entitled "Wie Shaw den Nordau" or "How Shaw Demolished Nordau." See The Berg Collection in New York Public Library for originals.

[10] An excerpt from an Emma Goldman lecture and her essay "Between Ourselves" were published in *Liberty* (Oct. 1895 and May 1896, respectively).

[11] For a more about their relationship, see Shoshana Edwards' "The Worthy Adversaries: Benjamin R. Tucker and G. Bernard Shaw" in *Benjamin R. Tucker and the Champions of Liberty: A Centenary Anthology* edited by Michael E. Coughlin and Mark A. Sullivan. New York: Michael E. Coughlin, 1986. This article is also found online at http://www.uncletaz.com/liberty/shaw.html#anchor30439.

[12] Special thanks to Shavian Leonard Conolly who mailed me several documents from the Dan Laurence Collection at the University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Shaw's respect for Tucker is apparent here: "An examination of any number of this Journal [*Liberty*] will show that as a candid, clear-headed and courageous demonstration of Individualist Anarchism by purely intellectual methods, Mr. Tucker may safely be accepted as one of the most capable spokesmen of his party" (Edwards). They respected one another, but neither could convince the other to join his political party, so they remained friendly adversaries. Edwards contends that Tucker's *State Socialism and Anarchism* (1888) and Shaw's *The Impossibility of Anarchism* (1895)[13] grew out of their private letters and public debates. I would add that Shaw's lesser known work *Anarchism and the Social State*, which reverses Tucker's title and was published a year after Tucker's text, was also an outgrowth of their discussions. Finally, some of the American and British public might have viewed Shaw's friendship with Tucker as evidence of Shaw's anarchist leanings.

The publication of Shaw's works in anarchist journals, the article "What's in a Name?" itself, and Shaw's respect for Tucker and other anarchists confused readers. Gibbs also asserts that "What's in a Name?" lead "many to believe mistakenly that Shaw is an anarchist" (*Bernard Shaw, A Life* 57). However Goldman understood Shaw's political position; she never considered him an anarchist. At the same time, she wrote him in the hopes of finding he still had sympathy for those unjustly prosecuted and abused. In other words, while she did not succumb to the public confusion surrounding Shaw's political position, she was influenced by it. This influence can be seen in the last paragraph of her letter to him.

Shaw's Letter to Goldman

Although the Shaw-Goldman acquaintance is thus worth examining for what it can tell us about the differing conceptions of politics and gender in their relation to literature, their personal

[13] See *Fabian Tracts* no. 45, p. 419.

connection is slight, consisting of many indirect public and private references but a confirmed direct exchange of two letters and one meeting. [14] Shaw received two letters from Goldman; he wrote one to her, but it did not survive except by virtue of being embedded in Goldman's second letter.[15] Goldman's letters disclose a rather provocative and enduring tension, reaching back at least as far as their first meeting with their mutual friend Frank Harris, and referenced in the letters by means of a series of subtle and not so subtle insults. Furthermore, Goldman's second letter—a reply to the missing Shaw-Goldman letter—enables an indirect examination of Shaw's missing letter. The relationship that can be teased out of these letters and other archival fragments, including correspondence from Frank Harris and attorney Arthur Ross, might serve as an analogy of two different views of the tension between poetic and political activity. Neither Shaw nor Goldman were particularly fans of the other, but art, politics, curiosity, and a personal friendship with Harris brought them together briefly.

In her book on drama Goldman openly recognizes that Shaw finds anarchy more than distasteful: "Shaw the Fabian would be the first to repudiate such utterances as rank Anarchy, 'impractical, brain cracked and criminal'" (*The Social Significance* 107). But she admires the

[14] For example, several letters between Shaw and Frank Harris mention Emma Goldman. In one letter dated March 14th, 1918, Harris complains that he has written Shaw but has not received any letters from him lately except one that references the Bacchae of Euripides. Harris writes, "You would be put in prison for two years and fined ten thousand dollars for saying half as much here, if they did not give you twenty years. I am warned that it is not even well to mention Miss Goldman's name" (Weintraub 93). Harris refers to Shaw's letter dated January 4th, 1918: "In the autumn of 1915 I returned to the platform and delivered a harangue of such length that it nearly killed me, in the course of which I recalled the terrible scene in the Bacchae of Euripides, where the Bacchante who thinks she has torn a stag to pieces in the Dionysian frenzy finds that the dripping head she carries in triumph is that of her own son; and I said that many an English mother would wake from her patriotic delirium to the same horror" (Weintraub 76). In this passage Shaw criticizes the mothers who demand revenge and send their sons to war. Had Shaw been in the U.S. when he wrote this provocative story, Harris claims he would have gotten in trouble. Harris who is visiting the U.S. at this time, is afraid to mention Goldman's name. But for our purposes here, the more important point is the familiarity with which Harris mentions Goldman. He simply writes "Miss Goldman" and does not include her first name, which suggests that Shaw would have known to whom Harris was referring. Therefore, Harris and Shaw have probably discussed Goldman before.

[15] The original Shaw-Goldman letters can be found in the International Institute of Social History, Emma Goldman Archives, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

revolutionary spirit embodied in his plays: "But Shaw the dramatist is closer to life—closer to reality, closer to the historic truth that the people wrest only as much liberty as they have the intelligence to want and the courage to take" (*The Social Significance* 107). For Goldman, Shaw's personal politics and the politics embodied in his characters do not coincide; in his private life, he does not take as many liberties (or risk as much) as his characters do. Goldman considered Shaw "a puritan through and through, much as he might rave against puritanism" (Letter to Evelyn Scott, Nov. 21, 1927). She thought his works were thoughtful, original, and suggested anarchistic principles, but the playwright himself, an excellent writer, provocateur and even propagandist, misunderstood anarchy and the breadth and depth of the messages in his own work. She could not comprehend the disparity between Shaw's drama, his rudeness when they met, and as she saw it, his conservative politics. And yet in her letters to him, written twenty-three years after she published her book on modern drama, she tried to convince him to connect the revolutionary spirit in his plays to his own personal life.

On March 2nd 1937, Goldman wrote to Shaw, ostensibly to invite him to write briefly for a memorial celebration of an influential political event in both of their lives: the death of the Chicago Anarchists of 1887. But that invitation was only Goldman's lead in to her more pressing request: she wanted his endorsement of a fundraiser for the "innocent victims of fascism, especially the evacuated women and children from Madrid." If Goldman thought the memory of the Haymarket event would encourage Shaw to comply with her requests, she was mistaken. While the Haymarket affair disturbed Shaw at the time, it did not redirect his life as it had Goldman's. An old rumor that Shaw flirted with anarchism in his youth might have also encouraged Goldman in her requests, although at this point she probably knew he was an unwavering socialist.

At the time of the writing of the letter, Goldman and Shaw both lived in London, just a few miles from each other. Shaw enjoyed a wide reputation as a dramatist, social critic and promoter of women's rights. He had already reached celebrity status years before. A reporter for *The Sunday World* wrote, "Everybody in London knows Shaw. Fabian, Socialist, art and musical critic, vegetarian, ascetic, humourist, artist to the tips of his fingers, man of the people to the tips of his boots. The most original and inspiring of men—fiercely uncompromising, full of ideas, irrepressibly brilliant—an Irishman" (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters* 106-107). While Goldman was a known figure in England, few people supported her humanitarian aid fund for the women and children in war-torn Spain. She thought that if she gained the support of popular writers, the public was likely to follow. Therefore she wrote to Shaw, H. G. Wells, Theodore Dreiser, and others to ask them for their endorsements. While none of these writers were anarchists, Goldman expected to find a sympathetic audience because their published texts demonstrate a revolutionary spirit. In the end, Dreiser agreed wholeheartedly, but both Shaw and Wells rejected her request.

In her first letter to Shaw, Goldman refers to meeting Shaw at Frank and Nellie Harris's house in the south of France. The experience, Goldman writes, "was no doubt as unsatisfactory to you as it was to me" (March 2nd, 1937). Later she writes, "I am not sure if you want to see me . . ." which implies that Shaw did not have a pleasant experience when they met either (March 2nd, 1937). But neither Shaw nor Goldman ever publicly admits they met, nor do they discuss whatever made the meeting "unsatisfactory." Neither of their biographers offers much information. However, Harris describes the meeting in his book *Bernard Shaw: An Unauthorized Biography*. As the accuracy of the text is questionable—due to Harris's tendency to embellish descriptions of events—I first point to primary sources, which refute, confirm, or

leave open to question Harris's interpretations. Ultimately, Harris's story offers one observer's interpretation of the two figures and one possible explanation of the Shaw/Goldman meeting in 1928.

Apart from Harris's tendencies to embellish facts, the production of the Harris text produces another layer of controversy: While the book credits Harris as the only author, Shaw, Frank Scully, and Goldman all contributed. It is difficult to discern who wrote or edited what. It seems to have been a disjointed but collaborative effort. When Harris originally contacted Shaw about writing a biography, Shaw provided Harris with personal information that he knew Harris would use in a biography while at the same time Shaw discouraged Harris from writing the biography. Shaw was concerned that Harris's book might be an infringement of copyright; Shaw already had a contract with an American publisher for the authorized biography. In September of 1930, Shaw sent Harris and the American firm that advertised Harris's "authorized" biography letters threatening legal action (Weintraub 240).[16] Shaw writes to Harris, "no biography of me except Henderson's is authorized, and that yours is specially deprecated. And if you publish one word of mine, I will have the law on you" (Weintraub 240). However, a few months before Harris's death, Shaw changed his mind. He felt sympathy for Frank's wife Nellie, who had been loyal to her husband despite his philandering. In a generous effort to provide for Nellie, Shaw agreed not only to edit the book but also to write a postscript. By the time Shaw saw the manuscript, Frank Scully, Harris's friend and collaborator, had already been writing and revising the text. Goldman too had contributed.

[16] The story is more complicated than I indicate here but can be pieced together through Shaw's letters. See Weintraub's *The Playwright and the Pirate* and Laurence's *Collected Letters*.

While Shaw's nine-page postscript lent the text credibility and increased sales, his hand in editing and revising other parts of the text is more controversial. In a letter to Alfred Douglas years after the book was published, Shaw wrote:

> As the man [Harris] was dying, the book fell to pieces at the end; and at the beginning it was full of stupendous inventions, as he knew nothing about my early life. Consequently a good deal of it is autobiography on my part, with the advantage of making Harris say one or two things that I could not decently say myself. (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters* 24-25)

Those autobiographical parts Shaw refers to are factual, and the things he could not decently say about himself might have to do with praising himself and/or his work or saying negative things about his parents. However, since the original manuscript no longer exists, it is nearly impossible to discern which parts of the book Shaw wrote. There are, however, some revisions that are clearly Shaw's.

Shortly after Shaw finished writing and editing the manuscript, he made similar, if less dramatic, claims in a letter to Nellie: "I have had to fill in the prosaic facts in Frank's best style, and fit them to his comments as best I could; of all I have most scrupulously preserved all his sallies at my expense" (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters* 261-63). In addition, Shaw doctored parts of the text and eliminated five libels, which he suggests Scully added. Finally, the book includes letters that Shaw had written to Harris years before. Shaw changed a few of his words in those letters (Weintraub 253). The word changes such as "gallantries" for "copulations" and "mistress" for "whore" indicate that Shaw wanted to publish a more genteel representation of himself. He privileges mainstream aesthetics over direct self-presentation. This is not the same as Shaw privileging art over politics, but it suggests a tendency to favor a conservative version of himself. This conservative Shaw is the one Goldman eventually meets and she complains his art and his fame are more important to him than his politics.

Before Shaw stepped in to revise and edit the book and before he gave his permission for Harris to publish his letters, Harris wrote to the editor of the *London Times Literary Supplement* asking the public for postcards, letters, or other materials about or written by Shaw (Weintraub 244). At this time, Scully asked Goldman to contribute too. A story written by Goldman was originally included in the manuscript of Harris's biography on Shaw. The story may have been her own version of the meeting with Shaw, an unrelated story, or, to complicate matters further, her unpublished biography of Shaw. However, since this portion of her contribution is referred to as a "story," the unpublished biography seems unlikely.

By fall, shortly before Harris's Shaw book was published, Shaw removed Goldman's story. In a letter to Scully, Goldman claims she felt relieved: "I am . . . glad to know that Shaw has thrown out my story. I cannot for the life of me see why I should have been dragged into Shaw's book and I am greatly relieved that I am no longer gracing its pages" (Nov. 18th, 1931). And yet, she is still in the book in the story about her and Shaw's meeting. Since she claims Shaw eliminated her story, we can assert that Goldman did not write the version of her meeting with Shaw that appears in the published text. Shaw may have eliminated Goldman's story simply, as Goldman says, because it did not belong in his biography (which could mean that the story had little to do with Shaw), or because he did not wish to be associated with her or her anarchism, or because her story offended his aesthetic sensibilities. At this point, we can only be sure of three facts: first, that they did meet; second, the meeting was not a particularly pleasant experience for Goldman; and finally, the particular story Goldman wrote for the biography of Shaw is present only in its absence.

To further complicate matters both on the history of the writing of Harris's biography of Shaw and on the Shaw/Goldman acquaintance, on August 27th, 1930, just a month before Shaw

threatened to set the law on Harris if he claimed his biography was authorized, Shaw wrote the following to Harris: "NOUS PARTONS LUNDI PROCHAIN JE SERAI LIBRE SAMEDI POUR VOUS VISITER POUVEZ VOUS ARRANGER AVEC GOLDMAN" ("We leave next Monday. I will be free Saturday for your visit. You can make arrangements with Goldman."—my translation). The message is a bit cryptic and stilted, and the use of *vous* (the formal second person plural and singular of "you") does not clarify much. The first time *vous* appears in the sentence it could mean the formal, plural "you" if Shaw refers to a visit from Harris, Goldman, and perhaps Nellie, Harris's wife. (It would be formal because Shaw does not know Goldman well.) But the second *vous* may refer only to Harris as he is the one making the arrangement with Goldman. It could also have been meant as a slight: the use of formal when informal was more appropriate for the Shaw/Harris friendship. This message was sent two years *after* Goldman complained to her attorney about Shaw's treatment of her when they met at the Harrises'. It also suggests a second meeting that, if it did occur, would have been on Saturday, September 13th, 1930. The Harrises were staying in Nice, the Shaws in Antibes (20 miles from Nice), and Goldman in Saint Tropez where she had been writing her autobiography (with the help of her typist Emily Coleman[17]). So a second meeting would have been logistically possible.[18] However, little evidence exists to confirm a second meeting.

Finally published on November 27th, 1931, Harris's biography sold well, much to the relief of Nellie Harris. But Goldman was disappointed. In a December letter to Alexander Berkman, she complained about Scully. The letter suggests that she had a hand in writing the

[17] Coleman later becomes involved in the Catholic Worker and corresponds with Dorothy Day. Their letters are housed in University of Delaware Special Collections: The Emily Coleman Papers.

[18] If there were a second meeting in 1930, the first line of the March Goldman-to-Shaw letter would be referring to that meeting, not the one she describes to her attorney in 1928. As little evidence exists regarding this second meeting, I simply note the possibility here.

Shaw book and was not earning a percentage of the sales: Scully "knew what he was doing when he offered me a percentage on the Taylor book, but NONE on the Shaw book" (Dec. 12th, 1931).[19] Goldman's complaint suggests that she contributed to the text and that had she negotiated aggressively with Scully, she would have received a percentage of the sales. It also implies that she had been given a one-time payment for her work. While she may have simply contributed the story that was expunged by Shaw, if that were the case it seems unlikely that she would later complain she was not receiving a percentage of the sales. In short, it is unlikely she would complain about not earning money on a story that was not published in Harris's biography.

Most likely, Goldman's manuscript, "George Bernard Shaw: A Biographical Sketch," is her contribution to Harris's biography on Shaw. The work originally included at least ninety-six typed pages but only fourteen survive and the last page ends mid sentence. It is not clear if she, like so many other people, was intending to write about Shaw's life in order to capitalize on his celebrity or if, less ironically, after years of analyzing his work, she simply decided to write about him. Harris's biography of Shaw contains echoes of Goldman's manuscript. For example, Goldman writes: "At the same time, Bernard Shaw eagerly haunted public meetings of all kinds. By a strange chance, he wandered that night into the Memorial Hall in Farringdon Street. The speaker of the evening was Henry George; his speech wrought a miracle in Shaw's whole life. It 'kindled the fire' in his soul" ("George Bernard Shaw: A Biographical Sketch"). Harris's book reads: Shaw's "haunting of public meetings for practice led him one evening into Farringdon Hall, where an American speaker was spell-binding a crowded audience. The spellbinder was Henry George, whose *Progress and Poverty* was just then a best seller. This was Shaw's first

[19] The Taylor book may refer to G. R. Stirling Taylor who published *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Study in Economics and Romance*, John Lane, 1911. See also reprinted edition (New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1969), p.193.

real turning point" (92). If Goldman sent her research on Shaw to Scully or Harris, and if they revised and built on it, then that would explain why Goldman complained about not receiving a percentage of the sales of Harris's book.[20]

This rather complex history of creating and editing the book by four writers—Shaw, Harris, Scully and Goldman—forces critics to read the published text as more than Harris's interpretation of events and certainly less than a historically accurate text. If Shaw or Goldman found something particularly offensive or wildly inaccurate in Harris's portrayal of their meeting, one might assume they would have removed, rewritten, or at the very least protested its inclusion.

After having outlined the important background questions that surround the authorship and accuracy of Harris's text, I can now turn to the text itself, specifically the story of the Shaw/Goldman meeting. The story begins by noting that neither Harris nor Shaw felt comfortable at the beginning of Shaw's visit because Charlotte, Shaw's wife, had burned Harris's book, *My Life and Loves.* She did not want the servants to read it because it contained photographs of naked women and described Harris's sexual conquests. The story implies that Shaw neither verbally objected nor did he rescue Harris's book from the flames. Shaw's letters bear out these claims. On July 31st, 1928, Shaw writes that Charlotte, in fact, burnt Harris's book and later admits that he only read the first volume of *My Life and Loves* because Frank "was much too disgusted with me for not leaving it on the drawing room table to send me the others " (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters* 105-06; 263). A fighter for free speech in public

[20] Shavian scholars note that there has always been some mystery as to who contributed to Harris's book and have been recently convinced by my argument that Goldman was involved. However, it is important to note that I have not found sentences that are exactly the same in Goldman's manuscript and Harris's biography of Shaw. Goldman frequently quotes Shaw and Harris/Scully summarizes some of those quotes. Full and careful consideration of this argument is inviting but beyond the scope of this chapter.

life, Shaw adheres to conventional standards, aesthetic as well as those of decorum, in his private life.

Similar to Shaw's decision to change a few words in the original letters published in Harris's biography as previously discussed, this event hints at Shaw's tendency to privilege conventional aesthetic standards in his personal life. When viewed through an feminist anarchist lens, Shaw's work lands solidly on the side of art. For Harris, art takes a back seat to a particular kind of lived, rather than simply espoused, politics and yet his entire life is centered around his art, namely his semi-autobiographical, mildly pornographic books.

Shaw and Harris's disagreement, defined by art, politics, and decorum, was short-lived; only moments pass before Harris and Shaw "got on together famously" (Harris, *Bernard Shaw* 33). Almost as an afterthought, Harris mentions Goldman was present. Then he writes, "Shaw and I talk a lot, but she has lived her convictions more than most of us and has been punished for them. Of course, I too have been in gaol—even as Shakespeare, Cervantes, Wilde, and nearly all the courageous writers (all seemingly but Shaw); but we went to gaol for our trumpery sins, and she for her deepest convictions" (Harris, *Bernard Shaw* 34).[21] Here, Harris sets the stage for his interpretation of the events. He places himself parallel to Shaw in "talking a lot" and in the same ring as venerated canonical writers, but Goldman, who is not a writer of plays or poetry, he elevates above everyone. In distinguishing between going to jail for "sins" and going to jail because of one's convictions, Harris differentiates between these canonical writers and Goldman, a political agitator who lives out her deepest convictions. Shaw is simply relegated to the parenthesis because he has not managed to be sent to jail for his convictions or his personal

[21] Harris's affection for Goldman is well documented. For example, in his *Contemporary Portraits*, Harris compares Goldman to George Eliot: "I have the advantage of having known and admired George Eliot; yet I am not sure that she . . . was far inferior to Emma Goldman in courage, and there is no page in George Eliot for that sublimity can compare with Emma Goldman's confession of how she lost her sympathy with Bolshevism and the Russian revolutionaries" (225).

debauchery. Either one would have gained Harris's respect—which says something about Harris's take on morality. Harris's admiration is already quite obvious; Goldman gains his respect because she practices her politics.[22] While Shaw's plays, like *Mrs. Warren's Profession,* are often political in that they criticize social and political systems, Shaw himself is not at risk of being thrown in jail for disseminating his art. His greatest danger is that his art will be and in fact is censored.[23] Goldman, on the other hand, is so committed to her beliefs—political, social and even poetic—that she risks and loses her freedom: she herself as the living drama is "censored." Because the risks Shaw takes to convey his politics do not endanger his freedom, Goldman views his politics as secondary and his art as primary.

Finally, Harris summarizes the vast political differences between Shaw and Goldman:

> Between Emma the Anarchist and Shaw the Fabian Marxist there could be no genuine *rapprochement*. In 1921, when Lenin was busy shooting Anarchists as Trotsky shooting White Tsarists, Shaw sent Lenin a book with a laudatory inscription which is now lithographed and circulated through Soviet Russia. Emma Goldman took to the revolution for the establishment of liberty. Shaw, who agrees with Mussolini that liberty is a putrescent corpse, looks to the revolution for the scientific organization of slavery, which he declares to be the sole business of governments and an inexorable law of nature. (34)

[22] Another example of Harris's affection for Goldman appears in Harris's letter to Shaw on August 30th, 1924. In the letter, Harris insists that Shaw welcome Goldman to London. Harris writes, "I want you to call on her and make everything as nice for her as possible. If you placed one of your numerous motor cars at her disposal you would be doing a good deed and kindly, and she would love it" (Weintraub 200). Harris provides her new address in London and asks Shaw to "influence the Labor Government to make it easy for her in every way. . . . Take my word for it she is worth all the assistance you can give her and all the comfort too. Whatever you do for her shall be reckoned unto you for righteousness" (Weintraub 201). Whether or not Shaw responded to Harris's requests is unclear. There are no existing letters between this one and a letter from Shaw to Harris in May of 1926 (Weintraub 201). In her autobiography Goldman complains of the coldness of the English people during this time and does not mention Shaw.

[23] For an analysis of censorship in Shaw, see Celia Marshik's "Bernard Shaw's Defensive Laughter" in *British Modernism and Censorship*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.

The last lines in this passage seem particularly sensational and as such throw into question Harris's interpretation of events. However, Shaw did, in fact, have a particular appreciation for Mussolini.[24] Shaw describes Mussolini's rise to power in the preface to *The Millionairess*:[25]

> With inspired precision he [Mussolini] denounced Liberty as a putrefying corpse. He declared that what people needed was not liberty but discipline, the sterner the better. He said that he would not tolerate Oppositions: he called for action and silence. The people, instead of being shocked like good Liberals, rose to him. He was able to organize a special constabulary who wore black shirts and applied the necessary coercion. ("Preface on Bosses" 254)

Harris's original statement about Shaw's political views now has some merit: the line "liberty as a putrefying corpse" clearly echoes Harris's phrase, "Liberty as a putrescent corpse." Further, Shaw's word choices like "inspired precision" make his summary appear sympathetic to Mussolini.[26] Shaw could be simply repeating Mussolini's ideas to shock his readers. A critical reader familiar with Shaw's writing style might look to the rest of the paragraph for the sentence that undoes previous controversial statements.[27] However, that statement never appears. In fact, a few paragraphs later Shaw, again, seems sympathetic: "Mussolini proved that parliaments have not the slightest notion of how the people are feeling, and that he, being a good psychologist and a man of the people himself to boot, was a true organ of democracy" ("Preface on Bosses" 255). Further, in the final one-sentence paragraph that leads from Mussolini to Hitler, Shaw writes, "I, being a bit of a psychologist myself, also understood the situation, and was immediately

---

[24] See letters published in *Mr. Shaw and Mussolini*, 1927 (London, Nation Limited). See also Shaw imitating Mussolini on Youtube http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=40VegR6uaTI.

[25] Thanks to Shavian Bernard Dukore for directing me to this passage.

[26] In *Shaw's Marxian Romance* (1973), Shavian scholar Paul A. Hummert reads "Preface on Bosses" as decidedly pro-Mussolini.

[27] For example, in his summary of Hitler's rise to power a few pages later Shaw writes the following offensive statement: "No doubt Jews are most obnoxious creatures" and the world would have been better without them. Within that same paragraph he also asserts that he is an authority on the subject and the world would be better without the English and the Irish too ("Preface on Bosses" 257).

denounced by the refugees and their champions as an antidemocrat, a hero worshipper of tyrants, and all the rest of it" ("Preface on Bosses" 255). Harris is not the only one who perceived sympathy in Shaw's description of Mussolini as Shaw himself indicates in this last passage.[28] Clearly, Harris's original radical statement about Shaw and Mussolini has some merit but not to the extent Harris implies. Shaw may have sympathized with Mussolini, but Shaw never asserted that freedom was dead or that the role of government and laws of nature was to produce slaves. Clearly, Harris interpreted Shaw's words to mean something Shaw did not intend.

Goldman and Shaw's differences and the possibility of a heated political debate excite Harris as he writes the passage about Goldman and her commitment to her cause and about Shaw and Mussolini, but when Shaw and Goldman are in the same room, they do not discuss political ideas or, it seems, even literature. Shaw, Harris explains, "thought discretion the better part of valour, and talked at great length" about how Mussolini's first talking picture should have been produced (Harris, *Bernard Shaw*, 34-35).[29] Much to Goldman's disappointment, Shaw's sense of gallantry or aesthetics causes him to steer the conversation to a topic that might annoy Goldman for any number of reasons, but which does not cause open confrontation. If this part of Harris's story is to be believed, the lack of engaging conversation might be one reason Goldman would later call the meeting unsatisfactory.

A more convincing reason appears in another description of the Shaw/Goldman meeting. Harris recounts this particular scenario during an interview with his own biographers Tobin and Gertz. Harris's story also gains credibility through a letter Goldman wrote to her attorney, Arthur Ross. The letter confirms that the meeting took place and describes her disappointment and

[28] Shavian scholar Richard Dietrich claims that Shaw wrote this passage with a twinkle in his eye.

[29] Goldman's text *My Disillusionment of Russia* describes her slow realization that the anarchist spirit was being quelled, not encouraged, in Russia. For Goldman, the revolution failed, but Shaw saw success. In fact, when he visited Russia in 1931, he was impressed with what he found.

annoyance with Shaw, although it does not offer details. Harris explains the situation to Tobin, clarifying what else was said that day:[30] "Miss Goldman, you know, never met Shaw and always expressed a desire to meet him. A few weeks ago, Shaw called on me when Miss Goldman happened to be staying with us. Of course, I introduced them." Goldman's letters support this much of Harris's story, but the rest, although plausible, has yet to be substantiated. Harris continues: "Shaw asked about Berkman and Miss Goldman told him he was living in a suburb of Paris. Emma then became reminiscent as the three of us talked, and told what appeared to me the greatest story I've heard in a long while"(Tobin11).[31] Goldman tells the story of her part in Alexander Berkman's attempt to kill Frick, which amounts to her plan to prostitute herself in order to earn some money to buy Berkman a gun. She dressed the part but lost her nerve; a potential customer saw her nervousness, gave her money and told her to go home (*Living My Life* 93). It is odd that Goldman would tell Shaw such an intimate story the first time they met, but she may have thought that since Shaw wrote *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, he would appreciate her story. The play, after all, is a social critique of a system that does not offer women a chance to earn a living wage through respectable employment. It centers on the connection between prostitution and economics as Goldman's life experience did.

At another point in her life, Goldman unknowingly rented a room in a brothel for a short time where she met prostitutes and mended their clothes (*Living My Life* 104-5). She also nursed Mrs. Spenser, a brothel owner and former prostitute (*Living My Life* 356). All three experiences

---

[30] For biographies on Frank Harris, see Samuel Roth's *The Private Life of Frank Harris.* NY: W. Faro, inc., 1931; Root, Edward Merrill. *Frank Harris.* New York: Odyssey Press, 1947. Bain, Linda Morgan. *Evergreen Adventurer: The Real Frank Harris.* London: Research Pub. Co., 1975; Pullar, Philippa. *Frank Harris: A Biography.* New York: Simon Schuster, 1976. For criticism and interpretation, see Robert Brainard Pearshall's *Frank Harris.* New York: Twayne Pub, 1970.

[31] In *Frank Harris,* Robert Brainard Pearsall claims that Harris's short story, "The Yellow Ticket" "is a complimentary look at Emma Goldman, who is Harris's model for [the main character] Rebecca" (108). The story involves prostitution.

with prostitutes and prostitution made Goldman uncomfortable, and when she understands that Mrs. Spenser (like Mrs. Warren) continued to make her living through the bodies of younger women in order to live in a manner to which she had become accustom, she stopped working for her. Goldman's relationship to prostitutes was not one of simple sympathy, but a complex connection between her political theory and the lives of humans who happened to be prostitutes.

Both Shaw's and Goldman's discomfort in relation to prostitutes makes it harder to accept Harris's account of Goldman confessing her story to a man whom she has never met. And yet, the emphasis of the story that appears in her autobiography (and one she repeats elsewhere) is that she *fails* to prostitute herself; she cannot make the ends justify the means. She happily admits that even she has her limits on what she can or will sacrifice for the Cause. If indeed Goldman told Shaw about her attempt at prostitution, then the manner in which she told it might be a key to understanding Shaw's reaction. As a young activist willing to sacrifice for her lover and "the greater good," it is unlikely that she would have been ashamed to use her sexuality. So we must assume it was told much the same way she told the story to others: with slight embarrassment but laughingly. She was proud of her attempt to prostitute herself and prouder still of her failure.

Harris delights in his memory of events. He continues: "It was a great scene to me: Emma trying to become a street-walker, mind you, for the man she loved, and at the crucial moment losing her nerve" (12). But then Tobin, Harris's interviewer, notes that Harris suddenly sneered and continued, "but when she finished her story, Shaw, without a word of comment, began talking to me about something else. I cut off his talk immediately, and turning to her I said: 'Miss Goldman, you've just told a great story, and I thank you for it!'" (13). Harris portrays himself valiantly attempting to compensate for Shaw's snub. If Harris' version of the

conversation is accurate, Shaw's snub suggests an emotional and personal reason why Goldman might call the meeting with Shaw unsatisfactory. Further, it suggests that the topic, like Harris's book about his sexual conquests, was too raw for the genteel Shaw.

Shaw, a feminist in his own right and a man who understood the economic issues that lay behind prostitution, did not respond with sympathy to Goldman's story. Perhaps he simply did not approve of Goldman's reasons for her attempt to prostitute herself. However, that explanation is also unsatisfactory because Shaw was interested in Berkman. Perhaps Goldman's willingness to discuss such sexual vulnerability disgusted Shaw or violated his sense of propriety. In her refusal to focus on polite conversation, Goldman violated both class and gender norms.

Goldman's letter to Arthur Ross, her attorney, supports Harris's story only in that Shaw offended her. Goldman does not provide Ross with details, promising to explain everything in full in her autobiography, which she never does. However, she gives Ross this bit of information: "I can only say that with all of the fame of GB Shaw, Frank has more humanity, more warm interest in the life and struggles of his fellows than Shaw" (Sept. 7th, 1928). If Shaw snubbed Goldman, her complaint that Shaw is not interested in other people's struggles logically follows. Goldman continues: "That merely illuminates my contention of years that Shaw's characters in all his works are mere puppets that have no independent being; they merely move and talk according to the turn of their creator – Bernard Shaw" (Sept. 7th, 1928).

Clearly, the conversation is a charged and uncomfortable one in which Goldman finds herself disappointed that the private man is not as interesting, liberated, or dedicated to the common person as his work suggests. When Goldman criticizes Shaw as not being particularly sympathetic to his fellow human beings, and says his characters do not have an "independent

being," she accuses Shaw of mimicking life without grasping it. A humanitarian artist cannot create independent beings without fully being involved in the world, she contends, and her own writing—letters, essays and autobiography—are inseparable from her compassion for others who struggle under the weight of oppressive authority. Shaw does not meet the standards she expects of all true humanitarians. Unlike her aesthetic anarchism, Shaw's aesthetics are still located in his drama, not on the terrain of a lived life.

Ten years later, Goldman's tone is quite different. In her original letter to Shaw, Goldman suggests that the meeting at the Harris's may not have been memorable to Shaw. She writes, "Perhaps it left no impression at all on you, you may therefore not remember it at all" (March 2nd, 1937). Her words are both humble and sardonic. She thought the meeting was important enough to write her attorney Ross and claim that she would include it in her autobiography. Her self-depreciation may be a result of his literary success and popularity. At this point, she must have recognized that while she and her causes are not popular in England, Shaw has won the Nobel Prize (1925) and become a household name in many countries.[32] The English public's fascination with Goldman was never as intense as the Americans', and by 1937 even the latter had waned. She establishes an uneven relationship: she remembers and values what she thinks he will not.

In next line of the letter she builds on the differing power relationship and compliments Shaw on the "generous part" he played in defending the Chicago Anarchists who were sentenced to death after the Haymarket bombing.[33] Goldman reminds him that he "had been the Initiator in collecting signatures of outstanding men and women for a protest against the judicial crime in Chicago" (March 2nd, 1937). Her underlying message: while we may not agree on many issues,

[32] Shaw won an Oscar for *Pygmalion* in 1938, the year after Goldman sent Shaw these letters.

[33] The bombing occurred in 1886 and the final sentence was announced in 1887.

we once agreed on this political and controversial issue, and we agree that injustice must be addressed.

Most of her information is accurate. In 1886 and 1887, Shaw did more and less than collect signatures. First, he did more in that he published the text of a resolution to protest the treatment of the Chicago anarchists (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography* 128).[34] Second, along with William Morris and anarchist Peter Kropotkin,[35] he sponsored a mass rally in London against the Haymarket death sentence.[36] And Shaw did less because he didn't actually collect many signatures. In his essay "My Memories of Oscar Wilde," first published in Harris's *Oscar Wilde: His Life and His Confessions,* Shaw complains that Wilde was the only literary figure in London whom he could convince to sign the petition for the reprieve of the Chicago anarchists, sentenced to death after a travesty of a trial. In a later letter to Harris, Shaw commented:

> I was in no way predisposed to like [Wilde] . . . . What first established a friendly feeling in me was, unexpectedly enough, the affair of the Chicago anarchists, whose Homer you constituted yourself by *The Bomb* [Harris's novel]. I tried to get some literary men in London, all heroic rebels and skeptics on paper, to sign a memorial asking for the reprieve of these unfortunate men. The only signature I got was Oscar's. It was a completely disinterested act on his part; and it secured my distinguished consideration for him for the rest of his life. (Weintraub 33-34)[37]

Shaw recognizes that the literary London men, despite their reputations as rebel heroes and skeptics, were not willing to sign an unpopular petition. Just as Shaw asked literary men for their

---

[34]At a meeting on October, 14th 1887, Shaw successfully proposed a resolution to protest "the outrageous sentence passed upon the Chicago Anarchists for free speech, though ostensibly for conspiracy." The resolution was published in *Commonweal* the next day (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography* 333).

[35] Shaw respected Peter Kropotkin. For example, on Dec. 1st, 1912 at the Pavilion Theatre, Whitechapel, Shaw gave a speech at a celebration of Kropotkin (Lawrence, *Bernard Shaw: a Bibliography* 128).

[36] In *The History of the Haymarket Affair: A Study in the American Social-Revolutionary and Labor Movements*, Henry David summarizes *Commonweal*, Oct 22, 1887: "London was the scene of an impressive mass-meeting on Oct 14, at which William Morris, Stepniak, the Russian revolutionary, George Standring, Peter Kropotkin, George Bernard Shaw and Annie Besant spoke in the defense of the eight men" (David 246).

[37] In 1908 Shaw writes to Frank Harris: "I have forgotten the details of the Chicago Business of 1886. At the time I was so much interested in it that I tried to get signatures to a petition for the reprieve of the men" (Weintraub14).

signatures on his petition asking for reprieve in 1886, Goldman, in 1937, asks Shaw for his support in commemorating the anniversary of the Haymarket event. Surprisingly, Shaw's response was similar to the one Shaw received from the literary men of London. Although he was once politically active and protested the treatment of the Haymarket anarchists, he is no longer committed and is unwilling to support the commemoration.

Goldman's letter continues, "Whatever objections I have entertained through all the years, to your interpretation of anarchism, I have never ceased to be grateful to you for the sympathy you had expressed during the Haymarket Tragedy" (March 2nd, 1937). Goldman offers her gratitude to Shaw's political act; at the same time, she reminds him that while he may not have agreed with her anarchist views, he did not think the innocent anarchists should be killed, and he was willing to assert it publicly, despite popular opinion.

In the fourth and longest paragraph of her letter to Shaw, Goldman makes her final and personal request for Shaw's public support. She explains that she wants to present to the British public the "antifascist struggle in Spain" but needs to raise funds. At this point she is not directly asking Shaw for money but rather for his sponsorship, which, she explains, does not entail any financial responsibility. She used to be able to rouse crowds, but she complains that she can no longer attract the public unless titled people, "those with money or men and women known in the creative world," support her (March 2nd, 1937). The larger English public has dismissed her.

If Shaw recognized the injustice in 1886 and perhaps even had anarchist leanings as many thought, Goldman might have reasoned, then Shaw would support the commemoration of the Haymarket martyrs and humanitarian efforts in Spain. But he does not. In fact when he writes to Goldman two days later, he asks her why she wants "to resurrect those poor Chicago

Anarchists" and does not mention the poor Spanish women and children. He clearly does not appreciate Goldman's approach to politics.

In the second, longer and more detailed, letter from Goldman to Shaw dated May 7th, 1937, Goldman quotes Shaw's missing letter seven times in an attempt to dismiss each assertion. Through these quotes, piecing together the content and tone of Shaw's letter is possible. The content shows a tension between art and politics.

While Shaw responded to Goldman's letter within a week, she does not respond to him for two months. When she does write, she begins politely and generously: "[Your letter] contains more than one surprise. But then your great function in life has been to give the world all sorts of surprises" (May 7th, 1937). She then tells him that she considers his work worthy of consideration: "It may interest you to know that I have years ago brought your works to the attention of the broad masses in the United States and other countries. I have actually talked to miners and longshoremen about G. Bernard Shaw, the man, his plays and many funny contradictions of his characters." In fact, she had been addressing audiences and "regularly featuring [Shaw] in her lectures" for nearly forty years in the US, Canada and England (Falk, *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History* 542). This passage implies that Shaw did not know Goldman popularized his work and that when he met her at the Harris's years before, they did not discuss literature. Again, that seems particularly odd in light of her engagement in his plays: she lectured on, wrote about and even advertised Shaw's work in her journal, *Mother Earth*.

Evidence of Goldman's admiration for and appreciation of Shaw's work abounds. She appreciated the political commentary in his art. Goldman lectured on anarchism and literature throughout the United States from early 1890 until 1919 when she was deported and then again for a three-month tour in 1934 when she was granted a temporary visa. Her lecture topics varied,

but she consistently returned to Shaw's work. The following partial list supports the claim that she popularized Shaw's work in the United States and provides evidence of her early interest in Shaw's dramas: in May 1904, she gave a lecture called, "The Unpleasant Side of George Bernard Shaw" at Etris Hall in NY (Falk, *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History* 473) which was a reference to the collection of plays he published called *Plays: Pleasant and Unpleasant* (1898). In September of 1908 she lectured on "The Revolutionary Spirit in the Modern Drama" as a part of her Yiddish Language Series (Falk, *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History* 495). Later the same year at Cullis Hall in London, Ontario, she gave a similar lecture with the same title but addressed a few different plays. Both lectures included a discussion of Bernard Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession* (Falk, *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History* 488). Goldman understood Shaw's art as revolutionary and therefore worthy of discussion and analysis. Her book *The Social Significance of Modern Drama*, published in 1914, grew out of her lectures on drama. The book includes two chapters on Shaw's plays and provides further evidence of Goldman's appreciation for Shaw's work and her conviction that his work supported her anarchist agenda. She responds to Shaw's social critiques and the political ideals framed in his art.

Finally, Goldman's papers include fragments of two manuscripts titled simply "The Life and Works of George Bernard Shaw" and "George Bernard Shaw: A Biographical Sketch."[38] The manuscripts, like her lectures, are full of quotations from Shaw and other reliable sources. But unlike her lectures, the manuscripts show few signs of propaganda in terms of sensational tone or pithy content. Instead, in the manuscripts Goldman reports facts about Shaw's childhood and his political development. At one point, she analyzes the complexity of Shaw's political

[38] These manuscripts can be found in *The Emma Goldman Papers: A Microfilm Edition,* (Chadwyck-Healey Inc., 1991) reel 54.

position in relation to anarchism. She writes, "While he laughs at the Individualism expressed in Herbert Spencer's The Coming Slavery at the Anarchy expressed in the word Liberty and in those 'silly words' of John Hay on the title-page of Benjamin Tucker's paper, Shaw is, nevertheless, both an individualist and an intellectual anarchist" (35). The pages following this assertion are missing, so we must imagine how Goldman supported her claims. She might have reasonably asserted that Shaw was an individualist because he promoted self-reliance and opposed forces that limit individual choices, such as the social and political forces that limit women's ability to earn a living wage. She might have also simply claimed that Shaw is an intellectual anarchist because he writes plays that critique the present social and political system.

Though Shaw was the sole force behind the Haymarket petition in 1887, he questions Goldman's desire to remember the martyrs publicly, and in a rebuttal to Shaw's dismissal of the Chicago anarchists, Goldman calls attention to Shaw's hypocrisy. She compares Shaw's resurrection of Joan of Arc in *Saint Joan* (1924) to her "resurrection" of the Chicago anarchists. She asks, incredulously, "Have you not rattled her long decayed bones and turned her into living form?"(May 7th, 1937). She reminds him that he is also remembering a martyr as the combined forces of church and state unjustly killed the young Joan; Goldman's Chicago anarchists' story is not as romantic but is as tragic. Goldman quotes Shaw:

> If my 'digging up who died and making foolish speeches are a waste of time and energy' what is one to say of you, having done the same with your heroine and the long and foolish speeches delivered over her, her time and her contemporaries. No doubt you consider your effort in 'digging up the dead' of greater value to the future than mine in digging up the Chicago Anarchists. In all due respect and appreciation of your great dramatic craftsmanship I must say that your waste of time and energy merely served to amuse your large audiences . . . .

Shaw objects to her commemorating the dead not, it seems, for the controversies surrounding their deaths, but the fact that, as he sees it, they are dead and their story has died with them.

More importantly, he also objects to how she will commemorate them—artlessly, in long boring speeches as a politician might. Landing on the side of art instead of politics here, Shaw objects to her choice of political cause and her lack of a creative approach. And Goldman, for her part, knows that Shaw writes his plays for reasons greater than simple audience amusement; to abuse him for his popularity amounts to an insult.

In the following paragraph she is again dismissive. In Shaw's letter, he must have mentioned the lack of signatures on the 1886 petition and lack of public interest in the fate of the Chicago Anarchists. But Goldman, who is not privy to the story behind the petition, does not believe him. She responds, "Since I wrote you I have learned from very dependable sources that scores of Englishmen have also been moved to appeal for the lives of the Chicago Anarchists, among them William Morris, [and] Walter Crane . . . to mention only a few." Goldman reminds Shaw of others who were involved as if he didn't know them. Shaw listened to Morris speak several times in the 1880s, they became friends, and shared the stage when they defended the Chicago anarchists.[39] As for Crane, Shaw's book *Last Lecture at the Craneries. Walter Crane as a "Lightning Sketcher"--The Exhibition Has Paid Its Way* (1888) provides evidence of their relationship. And, ironically enough, five days before Goldman writes her letter to Shaw, Shaw has published a pamphlet *May Day Demonstration, Sunday, 2nd May, 1937*, in which he writes "Bernard Shaw's Appreciation [of Walter Crane]" (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography* B265). In all likelihood, Goldman knew of Shaw's connection to Morris and Crane, and she provokes him one more time. She reminds him of his old days when commitment to politics came before propriety or popularity or perhaps even art. She also reminds him of his dead friends and suggests that he be loyal to their memory and their political commitment.

[39] For further evidence of the Shaw/Morris friendship, see Shaw's "Morris as I Knew Him," the preface to May Morris's *William Morris: Artist, Writer, Socialist*. London: Russel and Russel, 1966, 1936c.

This needling tone continues throughout the letter. At one point, the letter implies that Shaw has quoted the Bible. Goldman writes,

> While I am not versed in scripture as you are I do remember a passage where it says that the Lord will save a city if but one just man can be found in it. With you and Oscar Wilde to have demonstrated a sense of Justice England will surely be saved even if you two happen to be Irish. You are however mistaken in thinking that you and Oscar Wilde had been the only ones to protest.

Is this humor, irony, or sarcasm or a bit of each? On one hand, Goldman calls Shaw and Wilde ethical men and therefore able to save the city (or country) from god's wrath. On the other hand, the Irish comment is ironic, humorous, and insulting. Ironically and humorously, Goldman asserts that the only ethical men in England are two Irish men. And perhaps she meant to slight Shaw in the "*even if* you two happen to be Irish" which implies that he (and Wilde) are ethical despite the circumstance of being Irish. Although Goldman does not quote Shaw, the last two lines of this passage also indicate that in his letter to Goldman, Shaw must have written about attempting to collect signatures for the Chicago anarchists—that Wilde was the only man of letters willing to sign a petition against the injustice and to do so without fanfare. The story about Wilde was probably meant to remind Goldman that few were willing address the injustice at that time and also suggest that no one would care fifty years later either.

In her letter Goldman rebukes Shaw for his lack of compassion, his hypocrisy, and his nationality. She criticizes his unwillingness to address unpopular political beliefs but not his skill as a dramatist, his style of writing, or the themes of his work. His personal politics draws her ire. By the end of the letter, she seems to find satisfaction, not with Shaw, but with her own response to him.

Instead of looking directly to the common folk as she did in her early years as lecturer and writer, by 1937 Goldman felt compelled to write to literary figures like Shaw, who had

become respected by the common folk as well as the elite. And with Shaw's endorsements, the public would respond positively. That Goldman had to look to Shaw may finally explain the antagonism of the second letter. That she should have to appeal to Shaw as a public figure of sufficient reputation to provoke public support could only have been seen by Goldman as a recognition of the failure of any true substantial social revolutionary consciousness in the people. And, perhaps, Shaw too must have recognized that a committed political activist was addressing him as merely a public figure, a celebrity. More importantly, Shaw's aesthetic sensibilities may have prevented him from lending his name to a cause that he originally supported.

Perhaps Shaw might have refused to allow Goldman to use his name because he thought the money would not be sent to the Spanish women and children but to the active anarchists fighting against fascism. Shaw wrote only one letter in the 1930s that mentions the war and it is non-committal: "At present, The Spanish Government is only a Kerenskyan muddle fighting a solidly prejudiced rebellion with all the reactionists in Europe at its back; but after the Russian success against overwhelming odds anything may happen" (Laurence, *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters* 441-2). He observes here, without passion for one side or the other. Haunted by the article "What's in a Name?", Shaw may not have wanted to be associated with anarchism again—particularly Goldman's brand of anarchism as hers was more reactionary and less theoretical than Benjamin Tucker's.

Mrs. Warren's Profession

In contrast to Goldman's mild antagonism toward Shaw, she consistently makes laudatory remarks about his plays. As both Goldman and Shaw worked to make their audiences self conscious and, indirectly, self reliant, it is not surprising that Goldman lectured on Shaw's

play *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. In the play, art, politics, and notions of femininity intersect—both for Goldman and implicitly, for Shaw.

The play itself is not particularly anarchistic—Mrs. Warren is, after all, a capitalist—but Goldman used it to point in the direction of anarchism. It would be an overstatement to assert that *Mrs. Warren's Profession* suggests revolution. There are elements in the play, however, that allow an anarchistic interpretation. Were she a literary critic, Goldman might have focused on the gentleman artist, Praed. In the beginning of the play, he has a few inviting lines. Impressed by Vivie's unconventionality—her hardy handshake and direct answers—he feels comfortable showing his own. He declares, "I am an anarchist. I hate authority. It spoils the relations between parent and child: even between mother and daughter" (Shaw 89-90). But Goldman's goal, like Shaw's, is to make her audience uncomfortable and aware of themselves. Analyzing one half-hearted anarchist character who represents romance and art more than anarchy, and passivity rather than revolution, would not further her cause. In fact, Goldman does not mention Praed, the only character in the play who claims to be an anarchist, in her lectures or her book. She is a political, not a literary, reader and her readings are interpreted by a political audience. She employs art as a lens through which to critique politics and convey political ideals.

Praed is an anarchist artist who represents an emotional, sentimental element that Vivie lacks. He wants to take Vivie to see the beauty in Verona or Venice. He claims she "would be charmed with the gaiety, the vivacity, the happy air of Brussels" (Shaw 148). But she is repulsed. Overall, Praed is an unrealistic and ineffectual romantic who fails in his attempt to bring beauty and joy into Vivie's life. Shaw might have created the only anarchist character as an artist because he recognized the way anarchism emphasizes aesthetics. More likely, he presents this

anarchist artist in opposition to the reputedly and sometimes actually violent anarchists whose acts were sensationalized in the press.

The play directly criticizes capitalism through its portrayal of successful but morally corrupt characters like Mrs. Warren's seedy partner Crofts. His brothels earn thirty percent on the pound, which allows him to ignore the fact that he exploits women. While Mrs. Warren is not much more respectable, when she was young she had few employment choices and prostitution was the only one that paid a living wage. But when she refuses to leave the profession after she has achieved financial independence, she lands next to the seedy Crofts. For her daughter Vivie, continued involvement in the running of the brothels makes her mother socially, morally, and ethically unacceptable, so Vivie cuts financial and emotional ties.

Vivie does not want any part of her mother's exploitation of women, but as an actuary, she is involved in her own kind of legal but morally questionable economic gain that calculates how much money a life is worth. In fact, almost all of the characters except Praed and perhaps the cowardly Reverend, are successful capitalists. The audience sees how capitalist values distort or even destroy the characters' lives, whether or not the characters themselves recognize it. For example, Vivie is perfectly content to work, talk, smoke, and walk. She does not seem to want love, beauty or even a vacation. Thus, similar to the successful capitalist character Undershaft in Shaw's *Major Barbara* discussed in chapter two of this dissertation, capitalism is criticized in Shaw's presentation of "successful" capitalists. This move attracts Goldman; in her lectures, she emphasizes Shaw's characterization of the flaws in the capitalist system and reiterates the need for revolution and a new beginning. In this way she values both his art and his politics and, at the same time, furthers her own anarchist agenda.

Not only does *Mrs. Warren's Profession* expose the darker side of successful capitalists, it critiques commonly held social beliefs about women's dependent economic position, another element that is particularly important to Goldman and one that lends itself to anarchist interpretations. Goldman appreciates *Mrs. Warren's Profession* for its social critique, and more importantly, for the portrayal of the distorted relationship between the sexes. This distortion, namely prostitution, goes to the heart of Goldman's critique of capitalism; prostitution capitalizes on humans' natural sexual instinct and as such represents the distortion of our most basic selves, before any authority imposed morals. *Mrs. Warren's Profession* shows "how capitalism has corrupted the relations between the sexes," Margot Peters explains in the introduction of the facsimile (xxi). But for Goldman capitalism is an *expression* of all sorts of prostitution. More concretely, *Mrs. Warren's Profession* and anarchism share a similar approach to prostitution. Peter Glassgold writes, "Anarchism approached prostitution not as a moral question but as a social wrong rooted (as was conventional marriage) in economic exploitation and the lack of education for women, conditions aided and abetted by the hypocrisy of organized religion and the state" (113). *Mrs. Warren's Profession* depicts prostitution as a social problem with roots deep in capitalism. The play radically criticizes society when it implies that sex is women's only commodity. And everyone, according to Goldman, is to blame.

The play is not about expressing sexual desire or advocating free love because little is free here—and certainly not love. It is a social critique of prostitution, the sexual double standard, hypocrisy, and the complacent audience watching the play. If an audience recognized its own part in the hypocrisy and injustice played out on stage, its reaction may be action and, perhaps, Goldman hopes, revolution.

If Shaw is the gentleman scholar writing social critiques about prostitution—properly, without actually mentioning the word or the act—then Goldman is the commoner or vulgarian not only discussing sexual practices but spelling out the implications. The art of the play includes what is left unsaid but what everyone is meant to understand. But in her lectures, Goldman frequently interprets what was unsaid. For her, the value lies in the content of the story, not in her retelling of it. At the same time, the fictional narrative is the basis of her message, not an open critique of a specific politician, law or a theoretical analysis. She uses Shaw's art as a lens with which to view politics. But Goldman reads his art as his first priority and the politics as secondary.

Goldman's Interpretation of *Mrs. Warren's Profession*

Because most of Goldman's lectures were not recorded or transcribed, her exact analysis of *Mrs. Warren's Profession* is open for interpretation. But four sources provide some information. They include a reference to the play in her lecture called "The Traffic in Women," a summary of a Goldman lecture by Louis J. Domas, German interpreter and informant, an overall analysis of Goldman's drama lectures by Margaret Anderson, and finally, a chapter in Goldman's *The Social Significance of Modern Drama*. Her critiques in this book offer further evidence that lands Shaw on the side of art.

In "The Traffic in Women," also called "The White Slave Traffic," Goldman derides social reformers who have suddenly started to pay attention to prostitution as if it were a new social problem. Then she addresses the causes: "What really is the cause of the trade in women? Not merely white women, but yellow and black women as well. Exploitation, of course: the merciless Moloch of capitalism that fattens on underpaid labor, thus driving thousands of women

and girls into prostitution"(178). Here Goldman asserts that capitalists gain wealth through the exploitation of the poor; the low wages girls are paid cause them to go into prostitution. Readers may recognize this argument from Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession.* Goldman continues, "With Mrs. Warren these girls feel, 'Why waste your life working for a few shillings a week in a scullery, eighteen hours a day?'"(178). In her essay, Goldman does not name Shaw's play because she assumes the audience recognizes it. In short, she uses Shaw's social critique to fortify her own argument. His art reinforces her politics.

In comparison, a paragraph later Goldman mentions Reginald Wright Kauffman's *The House of Bondage,* a novel the author claims is based in fact,[40] as "the first earnest attempt to treat the social evil--not from a sentimental Philistine viewpoint. A journalist of wide experience, Mr. Kauffman proves that our industrial system leaves most women no alternative except prostitution. The women portrayed in *The House of Bondage* belong to the working class. Had the author portrayed the life of women in other spheres, he would have been confronted with the same state of affairs" (178-9). She states this claim more explicitly in her essay "White Slave Traffic": "Nowhere is woman treated according to the merit of her work, but rather as a sex. It is therefore almost inevitable that she should pay for her right to exist, to keep a position in whatever line, with sex favors. Thus it is merely a question of degree whether she sells herself to one man, in or out of marriage, or to many men. Whether our reformers admit it or not, the economic and social inferiority of woman is responsible for prostitution" (56). Here Goldman builds on Shaw's social critique with evidence from experience and observation. She isn't interested in writing style since she does not differentiate between Kauffman's melodrama and

[40] In April, 1912, the book was in its 16th printing. The forward reads: "This story is intended for three classes of readers, and no more. It is intended for those who have to bring up children, for those who have to bring up themselves, and for those who, in order that they may think of bettering the weaker, are, on their own part, strong enough to begin that task by bearing knowledge of the truth. I have written only what I have myself seen and myself heard."

Shaw's deliberately anti-melodramatic treatment of the same subject. Through these and other references, Goldman points to what is already in the social imagination as a way of showing the audience that they have already accepted the main principles she presents. They also show how Goldman employs Shaw's work to further her anarchist message.

Domas's report offers more than a single reference to Mrs. Warren in a lecture. It is only one document from a rather sizeable government file, which includes FBI reports, confiscated personal papers, and other written "observations" of Goldman.[41] Domas was assigned to attend Goldman's lecture "The Revolutionary Spirit of Modern Drama" and write a report for the Bureau of Immigration, which was looking for a way to revoke Goldman's citizenship. This was his third report filed on Goldman in 1907.

Domas provides a few basic facts: Goldman gave her lecture in German to a packed hall on Leverette Street in Boston. His five-page report includes two paragraphs on *Mrs. Warren's Profession* and one on each of six other plays. Goldman discussed plays by Gorky, Ibsen, Shaw and others—all within an hour or so. Her intention in her drama lectures is not to move from revolutionary to literary critic but instead to expose the audience to revolutionary ideas in modern drama. And in this way she hopes to show her audience what, on some level, they already know.

When Goldman discusses Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession* either she or Domas, the interpreter spy, or both do not have their facts straight. First, Domas quotes Goldman as saying, "Of American Drama, I will just mention *Mrs. Warren's Profession* by Bernard M. Shaw." *American* Drama? Bernard *M.* Shaw? Perhaps Domas was not paying attention. But the inexactness continues.

[41] The entire government file can be found in *The Emma Goldman Papers*; reels 56-67.

Domas includes what appears to be Goldman quoting the play, but she is not quoting the standard version. A "friend" is talking to Vivie. Domas writes: "Your mother's money is not any more tainted than all the money there is in the world. There is a mill owner employing 600 girls paying them $3 a week. Do you mean to say that these girls are able to live on this miserly salary? They are forced to prostitution" (5). Leaving Domas out of the equation for the moment, Goldman may be simply adapting the quotation as a director might, but more likely, she is adapting to suit her audience. While the inclusion of dollars instead of pounds can be attributed to Americanizing the play, the inclusion of the word prostitution makes the implicit explicit and is particularly out of sync with Shaw's writing style. In short, his play is not explicit enough for Goldman. At the same time, she does not employ narratives that are more didactic or written explicitly for anarchist purposes.[42]

A comparable quote in the original version occurs when, in defense of owning brothels, Crofts points to respectable men who also exploit women. In the facsimile of *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, Crofts, who contrary to the Goldman/Domas quote, is not Vivie's friend, says: "He [Crofts' brother] gets his 22 percent out of a factory with six hundred girls in it, and not one of them getting wages enough to live on. How do you suppose they manage? Ask your mother" (Shaw189). Both this and the previous passage from Goldman/Domas ask a similar rhetorical question about how poor women survive, but whereas Shaw leaves the obvious answer unsaid, Goldman bluntly states Shaw's implications. In this way she simplifies his message. More importantly, she uses an already political play about prostitution to point in the direction of anarchism.

Although it is clear that the following Goldman/Domas lines look like they were quoted from the play, they do not exist in Shaw's published text:

[42] See for example, Pietro Gori's *Primo Maggio*, 1895.

> The owner of the Department Stores is doing the same. Carnegie with all his libraries he gave to the people who have not the time to read the books in those libraries, produced more prostitution than your mother did. And finally, whose money was it that enriched your mother, and paid for your education? Your mothers [sic] numerous establishments were patronized by cannons of the Church, by Pillars of Society, by representatives of the Army and by representatives of every walk in life. (5)[43]

We assume Domas did not invent the lines about department stores or Carnegie, and that Goldman is not using an unknown director's adaptation, she herself is doing the adapting. The only lines that Shaw writes that have some of the same meaning occur here: "You wouldn't refuse the Duke of Belgravia because some of the rents he gets are earned in queer ways. You wouldn't cut the Archbishop of Canterbury, I suppose, because the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have a few publicans and sinners among their tenants" (139). Shaw's lines focus on the men who profit through renting to, we assume, prostitutes, although the word is not used. Goldman not only uses the word but also names the types of men who visit prostitutes—the common man as well as the most respected men in society, the church, or the army.

Shaw, the gentleman artist, critiques society for its acceptance of and responsibility for prostitution, but this critique is once removed. He only ventures to assert that wealthy, respectable men and the church officials receive rent from prostitutes; he says nothing about sex. Goldman, ever aware of her audience, spells out what Shaw only implies. And while even she shies away from more fully developing the literal participation of men, she does mention them, and she names their occupations. Here Goldman reminds her audience that the distortion of the relationships between the sexes is not one-sided. On the whole, both Goldman and Shaw recognize that the cause of prostitution is much greater than any immorality in the prostitute herself.

[43] Although neither Shaw nor Domas used apostrophes, it is unlikely that Domas was copying Shaw here as first, the passage is not from Shaw's play and second, Domas was listening to Goldman, not reading a text.

One might generously claim that Goldman Americanized Shaw's play (and even Shaw) by adding details familiar to laborers. More critically, one might claim she added details that more directly fit her agenda. For example, she named Carnegie as one of the producers of prostitutes. Berkman's attempted assassination of Frick, Carnegie's chairman, received considerable newspaper coverage and Goldman's audience would have recognized the reference. While not diverging from the play's main message, Goldman names Carnegie as a famous and respectable man who exploits people. In this way, she provides a human face and a direct connection to Shaw's political critique.

Although the Domas report is a summary of Goldman's lecture as heard through the ears of one assigned to attend, it is remarkably uncritical and seemingly unbiased. The fact that the Commissioner of Immigration sent an infiltrator to Goldman's lecture on drama speaks volumes about his expectation that she would make radical statements that might help him build a case against her and eventually lead to her deportation. However, the Domas report does not offer evidence of blasphemy, plans to overthrow the government, or any other treachery. It summarizes Goldman summarizing and embroidering on Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. While the Domas report does not suggest Goldman made direct connections between the play and anarchism, implications abound. Goldman may have reasoned that if the present system is as flawed as the play suggests, the system should be eliminated and a new social order in which each individual adheres to his/her own authority created. In short, Goldman uses *Mrs. Warren's Profession* as evidence of the need for a fundamental change—through anarchism.

Goldman's lectures on modern drama evolved and in 1914, seven years after the Domas report, Margaret Anderson sought out Goldman. Anderson attended a number of Goldman's lectures in Chicago and wrote a review, which was later published in *Mother Earth.* Further, in

the September 1916 edition of the *Little Review*, Anderson published blank pages—no poetry or prose because she claimed she hadn't received anything worthy of print. At the end of these blank pages, she published a page of cartoons depicting what she had been doing since she didn't have anything to edit. That page included a cartoon of Goldman at a podium. The cartoon reads, "Suffering for humanity at Emma Goldman's lectures." Anderson's attention legitimates and further develops Goldman's reputation as a lecturer on drama, specifically, drama which furthered her anarchist agenda.

Early in the year, Anderson and some of Goldman's organizers decided they wanted, in Anderson's words, "to enlighten a certain type of benighted human being—the type that will go to anything which happens to be featured in the Fine Arts Building but that shudders at the mere thought of Emma Goldman in the Labor hall" (320). So Goldman addressed the Chicago Press Club. That they who so often depicted her as a violent anarchist agreed to listen to her lecture suggests that they were less threatened than their sensational headlines and articles indicated. Her lecture, called "The Relationship of Anarchism to Literature," included references to literature, but instead of summarizing plays she directly addressed her audience. "You are mental prostitutes!" she hurled at them. "You sell yourselves and your work to your editors or your publishers . . . .You say what you are told to say—whether it's the truth or not; you must not have an opinion of your own; you dare not have any ideas; you'd die of indigestion if you had" (Anderson 321). The mental prostitute and Mrs. Warren are one and the same for Goldman; selling one's body or selling out amounts to the same thing. In the larger picture, Goldman objects to the way capitalism *relies* on a selling of the self. Prostitution of all kinds, she would assert, stems from the capitalist system, and anarchism with its demand for "a new social order

based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law," will set everyone free ("Anarchism: What It Really Stands for" 50).

After berating the reporters, explaining the philosophy of anarchism, and making connections to literature, Goldman ends by anticipating what the reporters are thinking: she is an optimist and a dreamer. She agrees with this assessment and then accuses them of forsaking their own dreams. They cannot afford to be optimists and still work for the mainstream press.

In her article, Anderson is both impressed with and critical of Goldman's passion. She writes that the drama lectures were not particularly interesting because Goldman covered too many plays and had only enough time to summarize and point out each play's social value. And at the same time, Anderson writes that Goldman "instead of being indiscriminate and uncritical . . . proved how creatively critical she is: she understands what the authors were trying to do and she does not distort and misinterpret in an effort to say something clever on her own account" (323). This passage could be understood as a compliment or an insult: Goldman is more interesting than other critics because she does not say something clever to draw attention to herself, or alternatively, she does not have anything insightful to say about the plays. At the end of her article, Anderson encourages Goldman to be more than simply a dramatist's mouthpiece. Anderson did not appreciate that Goldman never claims to be a literary critic. And yet, as a disseminator of art and interpreter of the implied, she fulfills some of the responsibilities of one.

In her book on modern drama published the same year as Anderson's review, Goldman's Shaw quotes are exact and appropriate. She summarizes the plot of *Mrs. Warren's Profession* and then asserts that Mrs. Warren and women like her make sensible choices in order to survive. She also asserts that most people dismiss prostitutes as simply immoral. To support her point, Goldman presents the scene when Mrs. Warren explains her choice to Vivie. Mrs. Warren asks,

"Do you think I did what I did because I liked it, or thought it right, or wouldn't rather have gone to college and been a lady if I'd had the chance?" (Shaw 121). According to Goldman, Mrs. Warren is a "superior sort of mother" because she has provided her daughter with what her own parents could not: choices. Vivie will not be forced to marry, work in a factory for non-living wage or prostitute herself in any other manner.

Mrs. Warren's Profession, Goldman writes, "infuriates because it goes to the bottom of our evils; because it places the accusing finger upon the sorest and most damnable spot in our social fabric—SEX as women's only commodity in the competitive market of life. 'An immoral and heretical play,' indeed, of very deep social significance" (*The Social Significance* 102). Goldman is quoting Shaw in the phrase "an immoral and heretical play" which is discussed, among other places, in the preface to *The Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet*[44] and "New Plays by Bernard Shaw" in *The New York Times*, March 5th, 1911. According to Shaw, Goldman, and other critics, the play receives criticism because it tells one of the great truths. When Goldman agrees that the play is "immoral and heretical," she recognizes that critics think the play *itself* is immoral rather than the actual social evil that the play merely reflects. The play radically criticizes society when it implies that sex is women's only commodity. In exposing sex as woman's primary commodity in the marketplace, *Mrs. Warren's Profession* also exposed "the sorest and most damnable spot in our social fabric . . ." (*The Social Significance* 186).

In the final analysis, Goldman's adaptation of *Mrs. Warren's Profession* is at once used to further her anarchistic agenda and relatively true to Shaw's intentions. The play exposes the hypocrisy of the present social and political system; for Goldman, a step in the direction of anarchism and revolution is acknowledging major faults within the system. The fault in the

[44] For a quick reference to Shaw's the phrase "immoral and heretical plays," in the preface of *The Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet*, see http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Shewing-up_of_Blanco_Posnet/Preface.

system that Shaw critiques and Goldman emphasizes leaves women (and, she would add, men) few alternatives to literal and figurative prostitution. Shaw's solution is social and political reform while Goldman's is revolution and the creation of a new social order.

Through Goldman's feminist anarchist view, Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession* takes on a political meaning, which she adapts and makes explicit to her audience. *Mrs. Warren's Profession* is "a realistic and explicitly didactic play" (Marshik 47); and Goldman takes that realism one step further by mixing fictional and historical events. It is an example of Goldman's insistence on blurring traditional categorical lines.

Conclusion

Through this biographical, archival, and social/historical analysis, feminist methodology, and feminist literary criticism, readers gain a more complete understanding of Goldman as both the passionate anarchist and the literary scholar. This multidimensional approach allows for an overlapping view of a few moments in which these well-known figures crossed paths, circumstances surrounding the crossings as well as the effects of such crossings.

More concretely, examining both the writers' acquaintance as well as Goldman's employment of Shaw's work for her own anarchistic purposes offers insight into both revolutionary and reformer. Shaw privileges propriety over politics and remains in the mainstream, critical but still accepted by and accepting of his general public. His emphasis lies in aesthetics of drama and this, as such, prevents him from living out his politics in his everyday actions. While he believes the present social and political system needs reform, his primary method of criticism is through his plays, not propaganda of the deed or violent revolution. Following his own politics to their fullest extent and perhaps risking his freedom and being

imprisoned for his beliefs was, understandably, not part of his agenda. Ironically, had Shaw made his plays any more political, they would be propaganda, and would lose their power as art. But Goldman interpreted Shaw's unwillingness to translate the criticism implicit in his plays into radical political action as a character flaw. She found his social critiques right on the mark—funny, poignant, and controversial—but her disappointment with the man himself haunted her: long after their uncomfortable meeting, she wrote him in an effort to move him beyond writing plays—out into the world of suffering people. She comes just short of accusing the man of prostituting his art through his lack of social commitment.

Goldman and Shaw's peculiar acquaintance highlights the tension between political and literary readings (as well as leanings), content and form, and art and propaganda. It exposes and contrasts the gentility of a man addressing prostitution though implication and the impropriety of a would-be prostitute smoking and marching off to jail. Both writers had a sharp wit and often biting sarcasm that they used on worthy opponents—which for a moment in time was each other. It is almost as if Goldman said to Shaw, "You are only an artist," and Shaw replied, "You are merely a politician."

Chapter Four

From Anarchism to Radical Catholicism: The Catholic Worker and Dorothy Day's Literary Love

> "The greatest challenge of the day is: how to bring about a revolution of the heart, a revolution which has to start with each one of us."
> ~ Dorothy Day, *The Long Loneliness*

Anarchists have traditionally been opposed to the authoritarian, hierarchal nature of organized religion, arguing that religious institutions are aligned with oppressive governmental power. It thus seems contradictory to assert that anarchism informed a god-centered movement like the Catholic Worker, and yet, as this chapter will show, it has. Furthermore, despite the fact that both Catholicism and anarchism made claims to racial equality, neither practiced it. When Dorothy Day combined these doctrines in the Catholic Worker movement, she not only embraced both the theory and the practice of racial equality but found it central to her work—without intending to make it so.

Although Catholics and anarchists disagree about the function of religion, they share a common emphasis on the dignity of the individual, "the concept of the common good, the rights of the laborers, the principle of subsidiary and the primacy of conscience" (Boehrer 98). Through her unique blending of Catholic doctrine and anarchist theory, Day built on these parallels, particularly the dignity of the individual and the primacy of conscience; she developed a philosophy upon which she and Peter Maurin founded the Catholic Worker Movement in1933. The movement centers on personalism, a philosophy which grew out of the works of Marx,

Hegel, and Kierkegaard and one which Maurin introduced to Day. Maurin and Day had a partnership where she worked and he theorized; she dedicated her life to the movement and Maurin, although equally committed, came to it late in life (Miller 17). Alexander Berrigan, one of Day's biographers, wrote: "It was she who grounded Peter's lightings, in long travail and patience, in planning and scrimping; she who instructed and guided the young, bore with the foolish and ne'er-do-wells; she who kept insisting there is no mercy without justice, kept insisting the most dreadful injustice of the modern world is the crime of war" (x). Day frequently gave Maurin more credit for his work than critics do.

In the early 1930s Maurin grew interested in the French Personalist movement founded by Emmanuel Mounier. He translated the French literary magazine, *Espirt* and brought it and Mounier's other work to the attention of Day shortly after they met in late 1932.[1] Together they incorporated Mounier's ideas into their philosophy. But when they put their philosophy into practice and espoused a new way of living, Day and Maurin relied most heavily on a literal interpretation of The New Testament and looked to the life of Saint Francis of Assisi for inspiration. In particular, they lived in voluntary poverty and performed works of mercy: they fed the hungry, visited the imprisoned, cared for the sick, and sheltered the homeless.[2] Practically, this meant they rented a house and invited interested people—homeless or not—to live with them. Day and Maurin "began with a simple program which called for round-table discussion, created houses of hospitality, and farming communities" (Day, "Houses of Hospitality" 57). They published a monthly paper, *The Catholic Worker,* which described their philosophy of

[1] Later and frequently referenced texts for personalism include Emmanuel Mounier's *Le Personnalisme* (1950, trans. 1952) and Jacques Martin's *The Person and The Common Good* (1947, trans. 1966).

[2] Day's complete list of the works of mercy is divided into two sections: the spiritual and the corporal. Spiritual: "to admonish the sinner, to instruct the ignorant, to counsel the doubtful, to comfort the sorrowful, to bear wrongs patiently to forgive all injuries, and to pray for the living and the dead. Corporal: to feed the hungry, to give drink to the thirsty, to clothe the naked, to ransom the captive, to harbor the harborless, to visit the sick and to bury the dead" (*House of Hospitality* x).

nonviolence, personalism, and voluntary poverty. Day, Maurin, and other volunteers celebrated small acts of kindness, wrote articles that exposed the exploitation of laborers, quoted scripture that advocated individual authority, and emphasized the primacy of conscience. Day frequently wrote appeals to readers requesting support in the form of money, clothes, food, and labor. The paper sold for a penny and its circulation steadily increased as the movement grew.[3] Over the next ten years, thirty Catholic Worker houses of hospitality and newspapers were founded in the U. S. and abroad.[4]

Through an examination of the internal conflicts that mark Day's place in the strange intersection of anarchism, Catholicism, and feminism, this chapter addresses the larger questions about the nature and practice of anarchism and the function of literature that are central to my inquiry. The Catholic Worker movement grew out of Day's internal conflicts beginning with her interpretation of Catholicism and her practice of aesthetic anarchism.

The founding of the movement and its representations in Day's autobiographies *From Union Square to Rome* and *The Long Loneliness* pose several problems: First, the movement was founded on two opposing ideas—god-centered Catholicism and anti-authoritarian anarchy. The combination of these theories produced a second problem, a related but strangely free-floating logical jump in the history and purpose of the Catholic Worker: although neither Catholics nor anarchists were particularly concerned with racial equality in the 1930s, when the Catholic Workers linked these theories, they focused on the plight of people of color. In order to contextualize these contradictions, I first briefly situate the Catholic Worker movement in

[3] In her autobiography, Day provides the numbers: they printed 2,500 copies for the first edition and within four months, the number increased to 25,000. By the end of the year, they increased production to 100,000 copies and then by 1936 to 150,000 (182).

[4] According to the Catholic Worker Movement website, today there are 185 Catholic Worker communities in the U.S. and abroad.

relation to other social and religious organizations. I then argue that through careful analysis of the tension between Day's religious self and her contradictory political identity as a reporter surrounded by the New York literati, we can see the way in which these identity categories overlap. Finally, I argue that Day's concept of a "harsh and dreadful love," adapted from Theodore Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*, resolves the tension between these contradictions.

Unlike other religious or semi-religious groups, the Catholic Worker movement did not compel anyone to pray or accept God as their savior. The Salvation Army, which had become more evangelical in the United States than in Great Britain, required those wanting food or other services to confess and be forgiven before they were given anything,[5] whereas the Workers served food first and then, if asked, talked about their God. Their refusal to become religious authorities endeared them to people already humbled by unemployment. For many of the Workers, the primacy of conscience or the freedom to follow one's conscience came before all else, including religion.

Mounier called the essence of a person "the living activity of self-creation, of communication and of attachment, that grasps and knows itself, in the act, as the *movement of becoming personal*. To this experience no one can be conditioned or compelled" (xviii). Simplified, personalism advocates following one's conscience and taking personal responsibility for one's choices and actions. It also challenges oppression in all its forms.[6] Jordan, editor of *Commonweal* for many years, summarizes, "The radical . . . Catholic Worker movement tapped

[5] For the history of The Salvation Army, see Lillian Taiz's *The Remaking of The Salvation Army in America, 1880-1930*, (UNC Press, 2001). Today, at the Pacific Garden Mission in Chicago which is run by the Salvation Army, anyone wanting a meal must attend a religious service before they are served a meal.

[6] The tenets of the movement were published in *The Catholic Worker* and periodically revised. For a recent example, see The Catholic Worker Library on the Web. <http://www.catholicworker.org/dorothyday/>.

into the core of the Christian gospel with a remarkable zest, applying the spirit of The New Testament to the social issues of the time, as well as to the quotidian concerns of family, work, prayer, and community" (xi). But the spirit of the Worker is more complicated. Unlike other movements, there is no central office or set rules; each new house regulates itself according to their collective interpretation of Day's, Maurin's, and Mounier's writings. Many Workers—then and now—personally interpreted Day and Maurin's vision, and many non-Catholics, including atheists such as Ammon Hennesy, an avowed anarchist, became central to the movement. The Catholic Worker attracted and allowed for a diverse crowd.

The Catholic Worker also differed from state or federally funded organizations that serviced the poor because Day's "purposes were different . . . her approach directed at people's attitudes, at their moral lives, at their overall ethical purpose as human beings" (Coles 96). Federally funded organizations, by contrast, addressed the immediate physical needs of the people only. In a *New York Times* article, Day clarifies the difference between the goals of the movement and those of a social worker: Catholic Workers "object to being called social workers because the work of a social worker is to help people to *adapt* themselves to their surroundings, whereas the work here is to *change* the surroundings" ("Wide Scope Noted" 33, my emphasis). Catholic Workers did not accept government money or grants from corporations to support their houses of hospitality, since to do so would mean adapting without changing policy or the oppressive practices of corporations. Popular drama of the time, particularly Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara*, offered a critique of social/religious organizations like the Salvation Army that adapted to rather than challenged the system of oppression.

Day "wanted to affect not just the overall problem [of poverty and oppression], but people's everyday lives—their manner of living with one another" (Coles 96). She asserted that

loving interaction occurred more frequently after people's basic needs were met. Her journey among literary writers and political activists as well as the insistent internal pull of religion eventually led her to believe that caring for people's physical bodies was only the beginning of caring for the dignity of humans. And the dignity of humans, particularly of the individual, was a tenet of both anarchism and Catholicism.

Day's Roots in the New York Political and Literary Scene

Day's relationship to literature is similar to Emma Goldman's, but Day comes of age in the middle of Greenwich Village, among bohemians, political activists, and writers who influence her personally and politically. She too is a writer—occasionally a poet, mainly a journalist—and her style is traditional. Her early writing offers a narrative of the New York literary scene. More importantly for our inquiry, it gives an account of events which intensified her internal conflicts pertaining to anarchism, Catholicism, and aesthetics. In particular, those between hard, concrete reporting of events, with its empirical quantifiable evidence and a sense that there was more to life. Finally intermixed within these conflicts are Day's questions about feminism and her relationships with New York writers. The resulting layers of contradiction and conflict lead us through a complex but ultimately productive narrative that outlines the forces behind Day and the Catholic Worker movement.

In the teens and early twenties, Day was a reporter for the *Call,* then the *Masses* and finally the *Liberator*. She wrote and published news articles and essays, delving into fiction only once. Her novel, *The Eleventh Virgin,* published in 1924 and categorized as fiction, was primarily autobiographical.[7] The novel, like several works in the 1920s, addressed taboo subjects such as the protagonist's alcohol abuse, abortion, and sexual/romantic relationships with writers.

[7] Forty years after the publication of her novel, Day confesses to her biographer, "It's all true" (Miller xiii).

Contemporary writers had already described "deviant" sexual experiences. James Joyce's character Molly Bloom had an adulterous affair in *Ulysses* (1922) and T.S. Eliot referred to joyless sex in his poem *The Waste Land* (1922).[8]

Day's novel was written in a sentimental style punctuated by dramatic flourishes. Thus, it reads like a confession. The proceeds from the novel never amounted to much.[9] Day was not one of the women who set out to contest or reformulate "dominant representations of gender and modernity" (Felski, *The Gender of Modernity* 21) in order to make sense of her own position. In fact, while controversial throughout, her novel ends with the protagonist's acceptance of women's traditional role.

Morton and Saltmarsh point out that the novel "is an intimate telling of her personal struggles confronting the cultural tensions surrounding vocation, gender, sexuality, spirituality, and politics in the Teens and Twenties" (234). In other words, many of Day's internal conflicts mirror those of her historical moment. Further, both Day and her protagonist, June, come of "age at a time of cultural fragmentation, experiencing the disconnection of modern labor, intellect from spirit, knowledge from morals, the individual from community" (Morton and Saltmarsh 235). The influence of this historical moment became even more apparent a decade or so later, when Day founded a movement that connected fragments of her life in the teens and twenties; that is, her movement combined intellect, spirituality, aesthetics, and physical labor. It emphasized the individual within a community, and in doing so dissolved a few tensions haunting her since her early adulthood.

---

[8]Victorians addressed controversial topics like prostitution and sexuality, but not in as much detail as the modern writers. While texts like James Joyce's *Ulysses* were censored for equally or even less sensational descriptions than Day's, her text managed to go unnoticed. Most likely the novel stayed under the radar because only a few hundred books were printed.

[9] However, she had enough financial success with the "moving-picture rights" of *The Eleventh Virgin* to buy a bungalow on Raritan Bay, Staten Island (Miller 55).

The narrative of Day's life in the New York literary scene illuminates her internal conflicts. In her early twenties when she was pulled toward religion and at the same time repelled by it, Day frequented Jimmy the Priest's, "a rundown saloon and rooming house on lower New York's Fulton Street" (Diggings 21) and The Hell Hole (The Golden Swan), a pub on the corner of Sixth Avenue and West Fourth Street in Greenwich Village and a hangout for literary types as well as the mob. She and her literary friends such as Hart Crane (*The Long Loneliness* 113), Mike Gold,[10] who edited *New Masses* (*The Long Loneliness* 137), and Eugene O'Neill, who roomed above Jimmy the Priest's (Diggins 21), frequently drank, sang, and discussed poetry, religion, Baudelaire and Strindberg long into the night.

In her description of The Hell Hole literary scene, Day recalls that O'Neill frequently recited Francis Thompson's *The Hound of Heaven* in its entirety: "he used to sit there, looking dour and black, his head sunk on his chest, sighing" the lines of the poem *(From Union Square* 88).[11] Day identifies with the poem's narrator who recognizes that he has been fleeing his God all his life:

> I fled Him, down the nights and down the days;
> I fled Him, down the arches of the years;
> I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways
> Of my own mind; and in the mist of tears
> I hid from Him, and under running laughter. (Thompson)

The poem then describes God's pursuit and the narrator's eventual return to his God. According to Day, the poem awakens the soul and "recalls to it the fact that God is its destiny" (*From Union Square* 88). Even though Day outwardly eschews religion during this time, she believes that her

[10] In *The Radical Periodicals in the US,* First series 1888-1960, Preface by Dorothy Day, NY, 1969, the editor claims that Gold and Day were engaged for one year.

[11] Diggins, one of O'Neill's biographers, suggests that the recitation would actually take place in O'Neill's room where just before he passed out, he would ask her if she were ready to lose her virginity. But Diggins does not cite the source of this rumor.

soul will ultimately return to God. She writes, "The idea of this pursuit fascinated me, the inevitableness of it, the recurrence of it, made me feel that inevitably I would have to pause in the mad rush of living to remember my first beginning and last end" (*From Union Square* 88). The moment she hears the poem is marked by something she understands as inevitable. She does not recognize any particular God or religion, but rather a sense of something divine that she is actively fleeing—and poetry is the medium in which her God pursues her. The poem also marks not her fascination with the divine because she has felt that long before she heard the poem, but a moment when she assumes she will one day confront her mortality. For Day, the poem and O'Neill's recitation combine her sense of the divine with an eerie, haunting love.

Day's attraction both to the poem and O'Neill in all his somber misery seems at odds with her vivacious personality. Day often joyfully sang "Frankie and Johnny" in the pub, and Agnes Boulton, fiction writer and O'Neill's second wife,[12] claimed the song was never sung so beautifully (Boulton 38). Day's "songs and her complete lack of fear about anybody or anything" endeared her to the literary crowd (Boulton 40). The gangsters appreciated her ability to hold her liquor as well as they could (Cowley x).[13] They all thought she "was odd, because she looked and dressed like a well-bred young college girl. But . . . she had a sort of desperate quality beneath her extremely cool manner" (Boulton 40). That desperate quality Boulton describes was what Day later described as a haunting—a haunting by God.

When she was, in fact, a college student (at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), a professor told her that religion tells people what they should do, "so they don't have to think for themselves" (Day, *From Union Square* 40). This idea recalls Goldman's interpretation of religion as an oppressive authority. "In my youthful arrogance," Day confesses,

[12] They were married in 1918 (Boulton x).

[13] Miller debates the truth of this statement in *Dorothy Day: A Biography*, pp. 103-106.

"in my feeling that I was one of the strong, I felt then for the first time that religion was something that I must ruthlessly cut out of my life" (*From Union Square* 40-41). Although drawn to religion, Day rejected it when she was in college and for a while after she arrived in New York; she thought her friends would view her as a weak, unthinking person if they knew she was attracted.

Her rejection of religion did not last long. After a night of drinking in The Hell Hole, Day frequently disappeared for an hour at dawn. It did not take her friends long to realize that she visited a neighborhood Catholic Church (Boulton 39). On one of these church visits, Day encountered two men sleeping on the steps, invited them to the pub, and bought them drinks (Boulton 39). Her literary friends thought her actions strange and interesting. They did not understand what drew her to a Church that seemed to require blind obedience when she was clearly a person who thought for herself. But they appreciated the contradiction.

The contrast between literary discussions in a loud, crowded pub, and quiet reflection in a spacious church seems stark, but ideas presented in each are not: namely, Thompson's *Hound of Heaven* repeats Catholic liturgy, and both resonate with Day. Thus, while Day is drawn to what her friends see as a contradiction between intellectual conversations in the pub and the communion with her God through Catholic mass, she finds that both appeal aesthetically and both offer her something similar: intellectual and spiritual comfort as well as confirmation that she is not alone.

A tragic event and Eugene O'Neill's response to it finally drove Day away from the literary scene. In her biography *Part of a Long Story: Eugene O'Neill as a Young Man in Love* (1958), Boulton described the sequence of events: Louis Holladay, a friend of O'Neill's, returned to New York after a year in California. He came to claim his girl's hand in marriage as they had

arranged if he succeeded in staying sober for a year. However, at Louis's homecoming party in Romany Marie, a restaurant near The Hell Hole, the girl told him that she changed her mind. A few hours later, the drunk Louis "suddenly seemed to be quite himself, as if he had solved some problem; he half smiled at Gene [O'Neill], and glancing at Dorothy [Day] as if sure she, too, would understand, he removed a small glass container from his pocket and quickly swallowed some sort of white powder" (Boulton 83). When Holladay began foaming at the mouth, O'Neill and everyone but Day left. Day held Holladay in her arms as he died. She hid his heroin bottle from the police who later ruled a heart attack was the cause of death (Boulton 80). After telling this part of the story, Boulton comments on the fact that Day jeopardized her own safety by hiding the heroin bottle; however, far more striking is that Day remained behind to comfort the dying man when everyone else left. That choice set her apart from her literary friends—literally and emotionally.

Shortly after the police arrived, Day left to search for O'Neill whom she found in Boulton's apartment. Day tried to convince him to come back to the restaurant and talk to police, but he insisted on returning to The Hell Hole. Boulton accompanied Day back to the restaurant. After the police filed their reports, the body was moved, and the two women left. Boulton reported noticing "a strange peace in [Day's] eyes" (83), as if something had become clear to her. That was in 1917.[14] Day never mentioned this event in any of her autobiographical work or in her novel *The Eleventh Virgin*. Her recognition of O'Neill's limitations mingled with her own waning affection for him and her guilt around Holladay's death all led her away from the literary scene—at least temporarily. More importantly, some aspect of the tension between drinking all night with the literary crowd and disappearing at dawn to attend Catholic mass was momentarily resolved by this incident. Day's conflicting attractions to the dangerous avant-garde literary

[14] Boulton and O'Neill were married in the winter of 1918 shortly after Louis Holladay's suicide (Boulton 84-88).

scene and the aesthetic pleasure of a Latin mass in a Catholic cathedral parallel tensions within literary circles where the literary avant-garde represents itself—always demanding something new, sensational, without form and building on, at the same time rejecting, canonical literature—and Catholicism represents tradition. T.S. Eliot, a literary avant-garde figure himself, offers this explanation of the tension within the creation of something new:

> No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. . . . I mean this as a principle of aesthetic, not merely historical criticism. The necessity that he shall conform, that he shall cohere, is not one-sided; what happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all the works of art which preceded it. ("Tradition and The Individual Talent" 4)

Eliot recognizes that a poem makes meaning in relation or in comparison to other poems. While Day is drawn to the literary avant-garde with its tension between the dead and the newly created, she is also drawn to the security of tradition in the form of the Latin mass. That tradition offers a long history of rituals completed in a sacred space: words spoken and repeated, voices raised and lowered in song, and gestures observed and obeyed. But it is also more than a place where she repeats a priest's gestures and words. And it is more than simply the new/old literature that draws her. In the end, her attraction to both is much more self-centered; the underlying forces that bring the opposing sides together are arrogance and a desire to be an exceptional woman.

A second and related internal conflict is dramatized in Day's novel *The Eleventh Virgin* and offers clarification of the first conflict. Perhaps born out of anti-feminine elements in modern literature, Day's protagonist June makes antifeminist pronouncements about women's dependence while at the same time acts independently herself. Through June, Day addresses the constrains facing her sex, particularly Victorian norms of femininity. And like many other turn-of-the-century novels with a female protagonist, June's rebellion fails. Throughout the novel, June fervently attempts to address violations of human rights and dignity by joining the

socialists, the IWWs, anarchists, birth controlists, and suffragists. At the end of her novel, June says, "I thought I was a free and emancipated young woman and I found out that I wasn't at all, really" (*The Eleventh Virgin* 312). June decides that her frustration lies not with the fight against oppression nor organizations pulling her in different directions but with herself. June is a socially and politically active career woman who decides that she is not what she thought she was. Most other independent and free women, she asserts, are not what they think they are either.

June's active involvement in these political and social movements suggests a type of optimism—problems can be fixed if we work at them—but the last sentence of Day's novel suggests a far darker view: "It looks to me that this freedom is just a modernity gown, a new trapping that we women affect to capture the man we want" (*The Eleventh Virgin* 312). June asserts that when women join political organizations, it is an act of coquetry: they join in order to meet and "capture" men, not because they are inspired by the principles of the organization. What women really want, June asserts here, is to stay at home and raise children. Unlike Goldman's assertion that sexual relations are among the social relations that defined political association, June/Day looks at the same sexual relations and calls them false and destructive.

June finds herself to be a false feminist and a failure in public life and then extends this self-realization to include all women. Women, June implies, are motivated by self-centered desires rather than the altruistic desires she attributes to men. Critics could not ask for a more essentialist argument that reduces women to their bodies and a desire to reproduce themselves.

While Day herself rarely asserted such directly antifeminist generalizations, and while a few years after she published the novel she wanted to destroy all copies (for many reasons), she was clearly conflicted about her own and women's place in the world. Day's later founding of the Catholic Worker Movement undermines her and her protagonist's generalization about what

women want. Eventually, Day embraced the tension—not the balance—between living a domestic and a public life. As a single mother she raised her daughter in a public home—the Catholic Worker House of Hospitality; she traveled frequently and spoke publicly and, at the same time, occasionally encouraged other women to forgo public life in order to stay home and raise children.

From Union Square to Rome, the earliest version of her autobiography, provides a more directly autobiographical example of Day's conflicting views of feminism. In the book, Day describes her sense of disconnection from the suffragette movement and the literary scene. She details the conflict between her feminist goals—namely gaining the right for women to vote—and her growing awareness of the struggles of poor women in prison. She identifies the suffrage/feminist movement as being unconcerned with the needs of poor women. During a rather traumatic few weeks she spent in prison with other suffragists, this conflict between the right to vote and the right to basic necessities became apparent to her. To the outside observer, her passionate commitment to the suffragist cause would seem apparent; she engaged in an act of civil disobedience and was subsequently arrested during a march on Washington.[15] But in reflecting upon the event years later, Day surprisingly states, "I had not much interest in the vote" (*From Union Square* 86). Day thought that the fact that women did not have the right to vote was a minor injustice, and in comparison to other more compelling injustices, voting rights seemed both uninteresting and unimportant. She writes, "it seemed to me our protest should have been not for ourselves, but for all those thousands of prisoners throughout the country, victims of a materialistic system. They were enduring punishment which would not cure them nor deter

[15] Day was sentenced to thirty days for marching on Washington in 1917. In Occoquan prison, she and others refused to eat because they were treated as common criminals instead of political prisoners. She was moved to solitary confinement and soon learned that the suffragist leaders were being force-fed. Finally, the suffragettes were moved and treated like political prisoners. Then President Wilson pardoned them (*From Union Square* 83-84).

them from future crimes, and they were being punished by men not much better than themselves, indeed, far worse in some cases" (*From Union Square* 86). Day sees a failure of the entire prison system: most of the prisoners never had sufficient food or safe housing when they were on the outside, and so they committed crimes to meet their basic needs. Further, she sees that when they are finally released from prison, they will be in the same position they were in when they were arrested. On the other hand, she and most women involved in the suffragist movement had food and shelter. Day's politics are evident: The materialistic system she mentions in this passage is capitalism, not just the prison system, and both are a failure.[16] Day's concern with human rights leads her to hierarchical assertions—basic human rights trump women's political rights. Day's criticism of prisons as well as her recognition of the injustice of the political/materialistic system recalls Dostoyevsky's and Goldman's assertions discussed in previous chapters. As in those instances, Day's criticism provides evidence of her emerging anarchist theory: "Day sought fundamental changes in the structure of society by minimizing the presence and power of the state" (O'Connor 79). Day argued that the prison system did not merely need revamping; it needed to be abolished in favor of a new solution to the problem of criminality. To her mind, that new solution began with meeting basic human needs.

One has only to look at Day's essays to discover more directly antifeminist and essentialist arguments. Day told women who wanted to be part of the Catholic Worker that they should stay home and care for their children,: "Women do love to be active, it is natural to them, they are most happy in doing that for which they are made, when they are cooking and serving others. They are the nourishers, starting with the babies at the breast and from there on their work is to nourish and strengthen and console" (*On Pilgrimage* 40). If women's sole purpose is

[16] June, Day's protagonist in *The Eleventh Virgin*, also cares more about the human beings she encounters in prison than the causes and politics that brought her to prison in the first place (Morton and Saltmarsh 238).

to nurture men and children, one might ask why Day founded the Catholic Worker movement. The answer is that she makes herself the exception to her own generalization. This is particularly ironic since she rarely excepted herself from any other difficult claim. She practiced what she believed in every other way.

Day even advocated a double standard in her antifeminist pronouncements: she once went so far as to assert that a husband does not need to consult his wife when making social action commitments, but the wife needs to consult her husband (*On Pilgrimage* 159). She accepted and reiterated the standard gender roles—excepting herself, not in word but in action. She exhibited feminist tenets like agency through her work and public speaking but did not advocate the same agency for other women. Considering her anarchism with its antiauthoritarian theory, this contradiction seems particularly problematic, but also emblematic of her internal struggles and her inability to accept some of her own contradictions.

A product and embodiment of the widespread anxiety of her historical moment, Day disregarded religion although she was drawn to it, she eschewed tradition, and she embraced feminist movements like suffrage and birth control as well as antifeminist ideas that limit women's place in society. She published workingwomen's letters that described the conditions under which they struggled and attempted to improve conditions ("Drab Futility in Workers' Letters" 3). She confronted the hypocrisy of the Church, demanding everyone from the lowest clergy to the Pope take more responsibility for the suffering of the people. She insisted that the clergy intensify their attempts to alleviate suffering instead of primarily focusing on people's souls as if all bodies and suffering were the same. She practiced everything she expected of them. However, she did not always see her own hypocrisy, particularly, her own suggestion that

women stay home and care for the children while she, a single mother, career woman, and activist moved about the world learning and growing.

Day's Conversion and Interpretation of Catholicism

For many years Day questioned the political values of the time and searched for a spiritual element embedded in both literature and anarchist theory. Then at the age of thirty, long after she left the New York literary scene,[17] she converted to Roman Catholicism. Around the same time, several writers and other members of the intelligencia converted to Christianity, frequently and specifically, Catholicism. In *Literary Converts*, Joseph Pearce asserts that this wave of converts began with G.K. Chesterton in 1922. His conversion "heralded a Christian literary revival which, throughout the twentieth century, represented an evocative artistic and intellectual response to the prevailing agnosticism of the age" (xi). The Christian literary revival was noticeably a reaction to agnosticism, not atheism. Anarchists, by nature of their political theory, also had "faith" in humanity and like their literary friends were agnostic rather than atheist. In fact, Robert Ellsberg claims that "anarchists are moralists; their stand is not so much political and economic as it is spiritual and ethical" (2). The following is a list of other literary converts to Catholicism and the year of their conversion: Graham Greene, 1926; Evelyn Waugh, 1930; Robert Lowell, 1940; Claude McKay, 1942; Allen Tate, 1950; and Siegfried Sassoon, 1957. T.S. Eliot, converted to Anglo-Catholicism (The Church of England) in 1927 (Eliot, *For Lancelot Andrews* v), the same year Day converted to Roman Catholicism. In 1931 C. S. Lewis also converted to Anglo-Catholicism much to the dismay of J. R. R. Tolkien and other Roman Catholic friends. Even a few supporters of writers like anarchist Emily Coleman, who typed

[17] She spent the years in between with her common-law husband (who was an anarchist) living on Staten Island and socializing with a quieter intellectual group of friends.

Emma Goldman's manuscript for her autobiography *Living My Life,*[18] converted to Catholicism and later joined the New York Catholic Worker. Avowed anarchist Ammon Hennesy converted to Catholicism and became a leader in the Catholic Worker movement without ever dismissing anarchism.

Whether these converts constitute an actual trend is an interesting question that moves beyond the scope of this chapter. However, we can reasonably assert that some writers reacted to the difficulties of the historical moment by turning to monotheistic, authoritarian religion. The combination of Day's love of literature, camaraderie with creative writers, and what she later describes as a haunting by God became fertile ground for her emerging political theory. Her personal conversion did not resolve her contradictory ideals. Rather, she incorporated them. Particularly, she used her anarchist beliefs to question Catholic inaction in the face of systematic oppression.

Day attempts to explain herself and her conversion in her first attempt at an autobiography, *From Union Square to Rome,* which was written for her brother and other radical friends. In the book, she doesn't point to any single event or influence that led to her conversion. She doesn't mention Holladay's suicide, O'Neill's unwillingness to comfort his dying friend or how this incident changed the way she understood herself or the world. She does point to a desperate time when she was in solitary confinement in Occoquan after a suffrage protest (*From Union Square* 4). In solitary confinement she only was allowed to read the Bible and found comfort in the Psalms. When she was allowed back to the general prison, she read *Imitation of Christ*, which she also found comforting in that it relieved her loneliness (*From Union Square* 6-7). The text may have also served as a model for her; however, it is another fifteen years before she converted. Her deepest moments of despair occurred when she was alone and those deepest

[18] In her preface, Goldman gives Coleman credit for all her work, support, and friendship.

moments, she asserts, brought her closer to her God. However, as she points out, they were only disjointed moments, not a complete sequence of events that led to her conversion.

Some of the reasoning and events behind Day's conversion can be seen in her admiration for and questioning of religion when she was a child. Throughout much of Day's childhood, she was drawn to the idea of a God although her family was not particularly religious. Her childhood friend was Catholic and stirred Day with stories of the saints. She was particularly attracted to the "nobility of giving one's life for the sick, the maimed, the leper" (*From Union Square* 46). She and her sister developed a fantasy game in which each took turns pretending she were a martyr. But Day was also troubled by her recognition that the saints were saints because they fought injustice. Thus, she asked about the cause of the injustice. "Why," she wondered, "was so much done in remedying the evil instead of avoiding it in the first place?" *(From Union Square* 46-47). She accepted the "evil" as a given and did not ask why it existed or why a great and powerful God would allow such evil. She was not questioning the fundamental reason for the existence of evil; rather she suggested that people had control over what evil they allowed.

A related question concerns avoiding evil in the first place: "Where were the saints to try to change the social order, not just to minister to the slaves but to do away with slavery?" *(From Union Square* 47). Day viewed slavery and the Capitalist system, with its emphasis on material goods, as two evil systems, and the saints attended to those destroyed by the systems. But she was frustrated with the fact that she had not heard stories of saints who challenged these systems. Eventually, Day attempted to live like the saints but also challenge the systems of oppression. In this way, she embraced Catholicism and antiauthority elements of anarchism that challenged oppressive systems. That is, Day interpreted Catholicism as already including elements of anarchism.

Day's romantic love for the saints matured as she matured. For a time in her teens, political radicals, including a few anarchists, took the place of the saints. Shortly after her conversion, Day asked why radicals couldn't be religious and, indirectly, why saints couldn't be radicals who challenged systems of oppression. She had already begun to assert the need for a combination of both. She wrote: "The fundamental aim of most radical sheets is the conversion of its readers to radicalism and atheism. Is it not possible to be radical and not atheist? Is it not possible to protest, to expose, to complain, to point out abuses and demand reforms without desiring the overthrow of religion?" ("Filling a Need" 4). She introduced a new type of political radical—one that makes room for religion and advocates change that is equivalent to personal revolution, not the revolution of the anarchist movement that dismantles religion. Although Day was not specifically combining anarchism and Catholicism here, she combined the more general categories of radicalism and religion.

Eventually, she and Maurin founded *The Catholic Worker* newspaper in order to advocate religious radicalism. They wanted "to popularize the encyclicals of the Popes in regard to social justice and the program put forth by the Church for the 'reconstruction of the social order'" (Day "Filling a Need" 4). In other words, they wanted readers to recognize the radical call for social justice and a new social order that was already present in the encyclicals. According to Day, when interpreted literally, fundamental Catholic doctrine advocated a type of anarchism.

My final example of Day's interpretation of the Catholic doctrine occurred in 1932 when, as a reporter for *Commonweal*, Day attended a laborers' protest march. The scripture and her past observations came together the moment she decided that Jesus would have been walking among the mass of ordinary, bedraggled workers. She then asserted that workers had "been

betrayed by Christianity" (*House of Hospitality* v) and also by Christians themselves who were afraid of being associated with communism. If middle class men and women lived Christian doctrine, Day asserted, they would be unable to bear the sight of these struggling workers. But instead "smug well-fed Christians . . . [sat] in their homes, cowering in fear of the Communist menace" (*House of Hospitality* v) and thereby betrayed the workers. Day incorporated anarchism and Christianity literally and practically: Christian-anarchists help their neighbors and ignore "authorities" who tell them who and what to fear.

But when a communist friend asked Day specifically how she could "believe in the Immaculate Conception, in the Virgin birth, in the Resurrections," she only said, "I believe in the Roman Catholic Church and all She teaches. I have accepted her authority with my whole heart" (*From Union Square* 144-45). She respected the hierarchy of the Church and the authority of the Pope and at the same time questioned them. The authority of her God, she thought, made her a better rebel (Marshal 82). Day's answer frustrated her friends who had witnessed her absolute need to question oppressive systems and unbelievable "facts." How was it possible for her to then claim anarchist theory as part of her philosophy when she had accepted the authority of the Church and the miraculous? Her friends asked her how she reconciled these seemingly vast differences and their inquiry parallels the larger contradiction about how the Catholic Worker movement reconciled these differences as well. In turning to Day's interpretation of anarchism, combined with the previous exploration of her Catholicism, the central contradictions in Day's philosophy become clearer.

Anarchism, Anarchists, and Day's Emerging Anarchist Theory

Having established the literary scene as a place of contradiction for Day, her conversion to Catholicism as a place of resolve, and her early attraction to religion as already incorporating elements of anarchism, this section draws out the threads of the all-encompassing and most profound tension: first, Day's interpretation of Catholicism and second, interpretation of anarchism and third, how the tension between the two defines the Catholic Worker movement.

Day's connection to the anarchist movement and famous anarchists is minimal but significant and reveals the difference between the anarchist theory of the anarchist movement (and of famous anarchists) and the anarchist theory that Day employs. Leo Tolstoy's stories first awakened Day's anarchistic tendencies (*From Union Square* 8-10), and in her youth she "yearned to walk in the footsteps of a Mother Jones or an Emma Goldman" ("A Reminiscence at 75" 425). In her early 20s, Day admired Goldman and Berkman's work, albeit from a distance. In her autobiography, Day wrote that Goldman and Berkman, "spent most of their lives in America and so represented American thought on the subject" (*The Long Loneliness* 56). Although she recognized them as representing American anarchism, her own attraction to anarchism, specifically Tolstoy's anarchism, differed from theirs. Tolstoyan anarchism emphasized nonviolent resistance, love, and tolerance, but as far as Day could tell, these elements were not integral to anarchist movement.[19]

In her early years, Day yearned to be a hero or a saint and lead the common folk out of their misery. She thought it was only a question of what political organizations most directly addressed the problematic systems that created misery. At eighteen, she was full of conflicting political theories. Aside from her attraction to both the Catholic mass and the opposing literary pub scene, Day "wavered between [her] allegiance to Socialism, Syndicalism (the I. W. W.), and

[19] For examples of Tolstoy's anarchism, see his work *The Kingdom of God Is within You* (1894) and *A Letter to a Hindu* (1908).

Anarchism" (*From Union Square* 61). Most noticeably here, Day admired community cooperation and acceptance of responsibility for the health and well being of the community. Unwilling to eliminate any political group and yet not satisfied with only one, Day divided her time between them. She wrote, "Ferrer with his schools, Kropotkin with his farming communes, the IWW's with their solidarity, their unions, these all appealed to me" (*From Union Square* 62) but none satisfied her.

In her position as reporter for *The Call,* a Marxist newspaper, Day covered peace meetings but was never sent to an antiwar anarchist meeting.[20] Although she met Alexander Berkman briefly, Day leaves no record of ever having attended an anarchist meeting of her own accord. She never met Emma Goldman, even though they both lived in New York at the same time and held several similar beliefs (*From Union Square* 56). They both opposed conscription and both were eventually arrested for their opposition: Goldman opposed the authority of the state that required men to fight a war that was not their own; Day opposed both that same authority of the state and war itself, which made her an anarchist and pacifist respectively.

When Day met American anarchist Hypolite Havel, friend of Emma Goldman, and "editor of an American anarchist paper, a Greenwich Village habitué,"[21] she tried to admire the revolutionist in him, as he had been rumored to have "been in every jail in Europe" (*From Union Square* 62). She admits that "the very fact that the anarchists were a minority" attracted her

[20] However, *The Call* did publish two stories about Goldman, one before Day joined the team of reporters and one after she left. The first article, "Japanese Radicals Condemned to Die" published Nov. 12th, 1910 was a letter Goldman wrote in defense of her friends who were condemned to die for their position as anarchists. The second article, an interview, extensively quoted Goldman. The interview, entitled "Emma Goldman Tells of Evil Conditions at Missouri Penitentiary," published on Oct. 9th, 1919 (Falk 471), described the appalling conditions of prisoners—something Day experienced herself and something which profoundly affected her. Both articles, while focused on anarchist issues, also explore issues related to Marxism, namely censorship in the case of the first article and the conditions of the oppressed in the second.

[21] Hypolite Havel helped Goldman found *Mother Earth*, served as editor, and contributed regularly to the paper. For a brief period, he was also Goldman's lover. Goldman writes, "Only the call of love sounded in our hearts, and we listened and yielded to it" (*Living My Life* 261). See *The Emma Goldman Papers* for two letters written by him in 1910.

(*From Union Square* 62). She also sympathized with the Haymarket martyrs. And yet her interest in the anarchist movement never captured her passion. She was not interested in "the American anarchism [movement] that [she] had come in touch with" (*From Union Square* 62).

Another reason for Day's lack-luster interest in the American anarchist movement was her experience with propaganda, which she associated with communism and anarchism. As a young reporter for *The Masses*, also a Marxist newspaper, Day covered strikes, peace meetings, protests, and food riots. In 1916 she covered the opening of a "birth-control clinic in the slums of Brownsville" and subsequent arrests of Margaret Sanger and her sister Ethel Byrne (*From Union Square* 74). Day wrote about Byrne's hunger strike in prison, but Day's editor encouraged her to exaggerate the facts, particularly in regard to the state of Byrne's health, in order to gain more readers' sympathy. While Day complied, she knew she was writing propaganda and she resented it (*From Union Square* 75). Upon reflection, she questioned "the value of this overemphasis of human misery and underemphasis of bravery, the courage of human beings enabling them to make the best of their surroundings" (*From Union Square* 75). In exaggerating accounts of Byrne's illness after her hunger strike, Day recognized that she had crossed a line. She rejected the anarchist and communist movements because their propaganda romanticized the suffering of everyday people. However, eventually, and perhaps ironically, anarchist theory came to mean more to her than any other political ideal.

Although Day ultimately rejected the anarchist movement, by the time she reached her mid 30s, she incorporated anarchism, in its Tolstoyan form, into her everyday life. Much of her discussion of anarchism comes from her writings after she founded the Catholic Worker movement and incorporated anarchist ideas into the Catholic Worker philosophy. But in the following examples, we can identify anarchist theory as Day places it in the historic, theoretical

context of Peter Kropotkin's work, and as she defines and defends it against her readers' fears and preconceived notions. To distinguish Tolstoyan anarchism as different from communist anarchism, individualist anarchism or other theories of anarchism popular in the United States, is to more fully understand the multilayered tension between Day's anarchism and her Catholicism.

Forester Batterham, an anarchist and Day's common-law-husband (in the mid 1920s) as well as the father of her only child, also may have influenced Day's political thought; however, there is more evidence that Day understood anarchism primarily through literature and her experiences gathering information for her newspaper articles. In her revised and rewritten autobiography *The Long Loneliness*, published in 1952, she wrote that anarchism had been called "an emotional state of mind, denouncing injustice and extolling freedom, rather than a movement" (55). The emphasis on a state of mind over a political movement reconciles some of the differences between Catholicism and anarchism, particularly, in this case, pertaining to authority and obedience.

Before Day described her understanding of anarchism and how she embraced antiauthoritarianism as well as obedience, she pointed to the existence of anarchism in ancient civilization. She declared, "There was anarchism in ancient Greece. Zeno believed that freedom and equality would bring out the essential goodness of human nature" (*The Long Loneliness* 55). Here, she legitimated anarchism as a viable political ideal and began to debunk some of the popular myths, particularly those that equated anarchism and violence. Day referred to Peter Kropotkin, a Russian anarchist and friend of Goldman, who, Day asserted, "looked back to the guilds and cities of the Middle Ages, and thought of the new society as made up of federated associations, co-operating in the same way as the railway companies of Europe or the postal departments of various countries co-operate now" (*The Long Loneliness* 55). Kropotkin saw

anarchism in practice in the Middle Ages and while Day did not identify which of Kropotkin's texts she refers to, Kropotkin made similar assertions in *La Conquête du Pain* (*The Conquest of Bread*), 1892.[22] In chapter three, "Anarchist Communism," he wrote:

> As soon as the communes of the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries had succeeded in emancipating themselves from their lords, ecclesiastical or lay, their communal labour and communal consumption began to extend and develop rapidly. The township—and not private persons—freighted ships and equipped expeditions, and the benefit arising from the foreign trade did not accrue to individuals, but was shared by all. The townships also bought provisions for their citizens.

In Kropotkin's estimation, collectives succeeded because citizens maintained individual authority. Their success came about organically. Day's point in mentioning Kropotkin was to explain the ways anarchism existed historically. She reminded readers that practical anarchism was not a new idea.

In the following passage, rather than referring to Kropotkin's historical work, Day quoted him directly and underscored his emphasis on analysis and questioning, a tenet of her anarchism:

> If you reasoned instead of repeating what is taught to you: if you analyze the law and strip off those cloudy fictions with which it has been draped in order to conceal its *real origin*, which is the right of the tyrannies handed down to mankind through its long and bloody history; when you have comprehended this, your contempt for the law will be very profound indeed. (*From Union Square* 45-46, my emphasis)

If readers considered the "real origin" of the law, Day says through Kropotkin, they might see the profound injustice behind it. They might see the tyranny of the wealthy, powerful few over the poor masses. Day emphasizes the difference between the law's "real origin" and the story

[22] In this text, Kropotkin specifically criticizes feudalism and capitalism then proposes a more decentralized economic system based on mutual aid and voluntary cooperation. Most importantly for our point here, he asserts that the tendencies for this kind of organization already exist, both in evolution and in human society. As with most anarchist texts, Kropotkin's can be found online, in its entirety: http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/kropotkin/conquest/toc.html

told about the origin. Her reference to this passage shows her contempt for the laws of the state, which is another element of her anarchism.

Questioning the origin of law and law itself is a step in the direction of revolutionary change. After significant change occurs, Day, again through Kropotkin, describes a communal society "where each worked according to his ability and received according to his need" (*From Union Square* 56). For this insight and his work, Day dubs Kropotkin a saint (*From Union Square* 46). He was different from the saints of her childhood since he not only challenged the systems of oppression, but he pointed to a solution. By calling him a saint, she places him within her own Catholic context and incorporates his anarchist thought into her Catholic philosophy.

In the Kropotkin example, the authority is the law and the law's origins are hidden because they are corrupt. Day indirectly asks readers why they fail to ask themselves why they do what they do. By failing to ask the question, they thereby simply accept the commercial and financial interests (instead of the welfare and individual dignity of the people) driving the government. Simply following authority whether it is state laws or social customs causes one to misunderstand one's place in the world, and for Day, one's ability to serve God.

In a second example, Day defined and defended anarchism by referring to a specific person, Father Vincent McNabb. He was a Dominican street preacher who fought for the rights of the poor and advocated anarchism, although he would have "revolted at the word anarchist, thinking it synonymous with chaos, not 'self-government' as Proudhon defined it" (Day, *From Union Square* 56). She then imagined readers' reaction and clarified: "We are not anarchists in the negative sense of that word. We have our own routines and rituals" (Coles 107). Day assumed that her readers would associate anarchism with chaos, not, in this case, with violence. The positive meaning of anarchism implied here can be teased out as we examine other examples

found in *The Catholic Worker* newspaper. Because of her awareness of the negative connotations of the word "anarchists," she repeatedly defined what she meant when she used the word: "Anarchism—the word . . . best brings to mind the tension always existing between the concept of authority and freedom which torments man to this day" (*From Union Square* 56). Finding a balance between authority and freedom was one of Day's lifelong struggles, personally, and politically. It was as difficult as incorporating the contradictory practices of Catholic authority and anarchist freedom.

Again she employed a matter-of-fact tone and did not respond to the image of violence embedded in the concept of anarchism as apparent in the social imaginary (as we have seen in chapter two of this dissertation). In fact, while she was aware her readers made a connection between violence and anarchism, Day asserted in its basic form, anarchism was nonviolent. Later she and her colleagues used the term anarchist-pacifist to describe themselves in relation to the Vietnam War.

Finally and most frequently, Day used the term anarchism by itself. In "Speaking of Anarchism," one of the few essays focused solely on anarchism, Day laments the reaction to and inaccurate interpretation of the word anarchism as she has in other essays before; however, this time she addresses not only Catholics who are wary of the word anarchist, but anarchists who are attracted to the work of the Catholic Worker but who also do not fully understand that antiauthority means more than simply anti-state authority:

> I wish people would not be so afraid of words, such as the word anarchist. I wish people would study more the early principles on which our country was founded. I wish they would really read and study and discuss as the Russian Jews do on the east side in the public squares and in the cafeterias, not to speak of the way the communists do in their workers' schools and cell meetings and caucuses . . . . (Feb. 1948 1,2 6)

Although Day did not refer to Goldman specifically, she refers to a tradition Goldman advocated: free exchange of ideas. Day also refers to people who claim to be anarchists but misinterpret the heart of anarchist theory. These self-proclaimed anarchists are,

> those who submit to no authority, talk of property as community property when it concerns someone else and as private property when it concerns them and their families; who want to live as members of a religious order and yet as a family; to be priest and judge, and not a worker; to indoctrinate rather than to toil by the sweat of their brows; to live off the earnings of others, in a system which they excoriate . . . . (Feb. 1948 1-2 6)

These anarchists within the Catholic Worker movement have misunderstood what Day (and Goldman) means by anarchism. Day complained that they want to take the place of oppressors instead of eliminating the oppressive system.

Both Catholics and anarchists involved in the Worker attempted to practice anarchism in everyday action but did not all agree on what that meant. Day struggled to explain what she meant by anarchism through literature and through practicing it in everyday action.

Anarchism, Aesthetics, and *Major Barbara*

For Day, anarchism and other political theories focused on the needs of the body without recognizing the full depth of the human spirit (which for Day includes a recognition of God) and fragments of the something more could be found in the fundamental tenets of Catholicism. But the Church's concern with the spirit and dismissal of the body left Day cold as did its reputation for attracting uncritical, obedient followers. As a result, Day incorporated the sense of body and spirit as inseparable through her literal interpretation of the works of mercy; that is, she practiced aesthetic anarchism. For Day, freedom and antiauthoritarian principles are the central tenets of anarchism.

As Day wrote repeatedly, she "did not want to compel others to think and act as she did" (Coles 96). Compelling others to submit to authority—her own or the state's—appalled her. She was sensitive to her tendency to lecture instead of show by example. The following close reading of Day's internal struggle presents this tension between wanting others to share in her vision and not wanting to pressure them to do so. This tension also parallels the larger tension between Catholicism and anarchism.

As she and others were preparing the evening meal one day at the Catholic Worker house in New York, an Ivy League student asked Day about the difference between the Catholic Worker and the Salvation Army. Day struggled with her discomfort before she answered. She knew the student was making a comparison between the portrayal of the Salvation Army in Bernard Shaw's play *Major Barbara* and the Catholic Worker. In response to the question, Day writes: "I felt my face get hot. I knew he had touched on my pride, and I knew I had better watch my every word. He'd been reading *Major Barbara* in a literature course, and he wondered whether . . . I might be an elderly Major Barbara, an American general, perhaps, of the Salvation Army . . ." (Coles 31-32). She imagines the student thinks of her as an American general who uses Catholicism as a disguise from which to impart her own morality. She is uncomfortable since there is some truth in that accusation; she is, after all, interpreting Catholic doctrine in a way few before her have and wants others to grapple with questions of faith. With this painful awareness, she writes, "My intention was, originally, to tell him about our Catholic Worker philosophy, but I realized . . . that if I did that, gave him a speech, even a short one, he'd have his worst fears confirmed: I would be the Major Barbara he half expected me to be" (Coles 31-32). If Day lectures, she will be acting as an authority on morality much the same way as the

protagonist Barbara does. And, Day realizes that her lecture might be construed as coercion. She prides herself on avoiding that trap.

The following brief analysis of Shaw's *Major Barbara* clarifies the Ivy League student's implied comparison. The Catholic Worker and the Salvation Army have similarities as do Day and the protagonist Major Barbara. But then Shaw's social critique begins. Barbara's mother, Lady Britomart claims: "Ever since they made her [Barbara] a major in the Salvation Army she has developed a propensity to have her own way and order people about which quite cows me sometimes. It's not lady like: I'm sure I don't know where she picked it up" (Shaw 351). The irony here is two fold: first, Lady Britomart herself rarely utters a sentence that is not an order of some sort. Secondly, and more to our point here, since Barbara has been rewarded with the title of major, she has been encouraged to believe that she is an authority on morality and is successfully saving souls; however, if the characters Prince and Rummy are any indication, she has not been successful.

In one scene, Prince and Rummy, two guests of the Salvation Army, await the moment they can confess, repent, and be saved. Once saved, they will be rewarded with admiration, gratitude and food. Rummy complains about the fact that she and other women must tell their sins privately but men do so publicly: "Rummy: Thats whats so unfair to us women. Your confessions is just as big lies as ours: you dont tell what you really done no more than us; but you men can tell your lies right out at the meetins and be made much of for it; while the sor o confessions we az to make az to be whispered to one lady at a time. It aint right, spite of all their piety" (Shaw 368). Rummy isn't complaining about the fact she has to lie in order to satisfy the Salvation Army workers but about the injustice of the repentance policy in which men are rewarded publicly and everyone applauds whereas the women's sins are somehow more

shameful and must be whispered in private—repeatedly—to each female Salvation Army volunteer. Female sinners receive no public admiration for their confessions or lies about their sins.

Price responds with a fundamental criticism of the Salvation Army: its hypocrisy. Price says, "Right! Do you spose the Army 'd be allowed if it went and did right? Not much . . ." (368-69). In this scene even the uneducated, unemployed, poor men and women know that the Salvation Army does not actually "do right" and in fact would not be allowed to. One might assert that those who would not allow them to "do right" are the ones with money and power. But despite their complaints, Rummy and Price do what is expected of them—lie—in order to get the goods and services the Salvation Army offers.

Aside from comparing the Catholic Worker to the Salvation Army, the Ivy League student also compares Day and Major Barbara. In Act I of the play, Major Barbara joins the Salvation Army in order to save souls. She "discharges her maid; lives on a pound a week" (Shaw 344). Day lived in voluntary poverty, and like Barbara, was intent on offering substance to the disenfranchised. Barbara did not recognize the hypocrisy of her organization at first. Day, on the other hand, was vigilant (although not always successful) in her avoidance of hypocrisy. So, for example, neither she nor other Workers accepted financial assistance from the government or the church.

Andrew Undershaft, Barbara's father, eventually shows her her own arrogance and how, despite her best efforts, she is part of the oppressive system. He announces that "All religious organizations exist by selling themselves to the rich" (389). Undershaft drives home his point when he demonstrates that Jenny Hill, one of the volunteers at the Salvation Army, "would think you were laughing at her if you asked her to stand up in the street and teach grammar or

geography or mathematics or even drawing room dancing; but it never occurs to her to doubt that she can teach morals and religion" (415). The implication is that Jenny isn't educated enough to be able to have an informed opinion, and yet she thinks her morality is the right and only one. And Barbara, despite her education, has the same approach as Jenny.

If this implication were not clear enough, Shaw clarifies his view in the preface to the play. He describes several conditions which must be fulfilled before teachers of the world "will cease to scoff at its religions" (339). The last condition speaks most directly to Day's concerns and her internal struggle. Shaw writes, "Creeds must become intellectually honest. At present there is not a single credible established religion in the world" (339). Day founded the Catholic Worker because she wanted the Catholic creed to be intellectually honest.

Intellectual honesty required that Day avoid anything that looked remotely like coercion. She knew that if she weren't careful, the Ivy League student would think she was like Major Barbara, so she described the actual day-to-day work instead: "So I said very little, almost nothing. I told him how we work here, how the cooking and the serving get done, and I said we are grateful for any help we can get, from anyone who comes here and wants to help us. He kept staring at me, right into my eyes, and I tried to look right back and not shift my glance, for fear he would think I wasn't telling him *all*" (Coles 32). She prevented herself from lecturing and instead focused on the practical, logistical elements because she practiced anarchism by refusing to be anyone's master. Day thought the student was waiting for her to explain what she expected of each guest, perhaps a confession of some sort.

Her reaction to the Ivy League interlocutor was also telling. After a moment of her own discomfort, she observed:

> He was trying to cut some celery and potatoes and not doing as good a job, right off, as he may have thought he could do. I think that I took some satisfaction in

> his clumsiness—my pride. I thought to myself, 'They don't teach them how to make soup at Yale or Harvard. Dorothy, your tongue is wicked; mind your manners,' I told myself. (Coles 31-32)

To lecture the young man was to assume the role of authority. Instead she chose to teach her philosophy through daily chores. That night she prayed for herself because the student taught her something she knew "but needed to keep knowing through being reminded: that there is pride in us, even when we're fighting it, and there is a Major Barbara side to a lot of us—I should say, to me" (Coles 31-32). For Day, *Major Barbara* pointed to hypocrisy, and the difference between how one is living and what one is espousing. Day struggled to practice anarchism and ignore her pride. In an interview with Coles, Day emphasized this point, "It is important to us to make it clear what we're doing; it is important that we not tell the world to follow us or tell the world that our way is the way to go, to be" (Coles 113). Refusing to tell people what to do or be was at times difficult for Day and she was painfully aware of this as her sensitivity to the student's comments about the Salvation Army show.

Throughout her adult life Day made every effort to avoid didacticism. Like Shaw, she saw it as weakness in many religious movements and guarded against it within herself. Her radical friends pointed to "Catholicism's dogmatic beliefs and its historic alliance with repressive regimes" (Jordan xii). Day was particularly sensitive to and about her own weakness regarding dogmatic beliefs and moral superiority, a weakness she called pride.

Day recognized and guarded against hypocrisy whereas Major Barbara eventually accepted it. Day also distinguished between her interpretation of Christian charity and charity that gives to the poor while being part of the system that oppresses the poor. Like the Salvation Army in Shaw's play *Major Barbara*, Day noted that the Catholic Worker had "been accused of lining up with Wall Street and private enterprise, and the rich opponents of state control and

taxation" ("The Scandal of the Works of Mercy" 104). Her plan was different: "anarchists that we are, we want to decentralize everything and delegate to smaller bodies and groups what can be done far more humanly and responsibly through mutual aid, as well as charity, through Blue Cross, Red Cross, union cooperation, [and] parish cooperation" ("The Scandal of the Works of Mercy" 104).[23] Day's use of the term "anarchists" here is fairly straightforward. Anarchists opposed large organizations, whether governmental or religious, in favor of smaller, grass-roots groups who helped laborers create their own guidelines.[24] As represented in Shaw's play, the Salvation Army was part of the system of oppression.

Both Catholic Workers and anarchists asserted a fundamental need for change and, ironically for anarchists, both asserted their "faith" in humans' willingness to help one another. The anarchists insisted that once systems of authority such as the church and state were dismantled and the revolutionary dust settled, people would naturally form egalitarian communities; the Catholic Worker asserted anarchist principles on the margins of the political and social system. They too thought the solution lay in building communities from the ground up. They too advocated revolution but of a different nature, a revolution from within, or what they termed a personalist revolution.

For Day that personalist revolution was inextricably connected to pacifism. In her essays she joined anarchism and pacifism, sometimes employing the term anarchist-pacifist or anarchist philosophy. The term anarchist philosophy came about first, but since the public often associated

[23] As the movement changed over time, many Catholic Workers refused to take money from even these organizations or the Catholic Church. They only accepted money from individuals who supported their work with the poor as well as their political beliefs that sometimes led to civil disobedience. Today, the collectives within each Catholic Worker house make decisions about from whom they will accept money.

[24] Publicly admitting anarchist tendencies in 1949 was no small act, since the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) was already investigating anti-American and/or pro-communists activities. While McCarthyism was in its infancy, anything remotely un-American drew fire. Neither Day nor the individuals who supported her were immune.

anarchism with violence, Catholic Workers emphasized their non-violent stance by inventing the term "anarchist pacifist."

Anarchist-pacifists: Another Contradiction?

When Day employed the term anarchist-pacifist to describe her philosophy, she challenged the interpretation of anarchism as inherently connected to violence. While Day did not make defining anarchism one of her primary goals, she consistently dismissed the violence associated (fairly or not) with anarchism. At the same time she recognized that a few anarchists committed violent acts. Pacifism, on the other hand, historically and consistently meant nonviolence. Thus, anarchist-pacifism was an extreme pacifism. Practically this meant that Catholic Worker anarchist-pacifists refused to participate in any state mandate or commercial enterprise that supported war: Workers did not pay taxes, participate in conscription or the draft, obey air drills or support warfare in general. They did not contribute in any way to the production of war materials, which means they did not work for or invest in corporations or even the stock market. Day asserted that anarchist-pacifism was actually Catholic doctrine.

In 1950, Day wrote that her pacifism and anarchism made her "persecution conscious" ("Charles O'Rourke—The Death of a Beloved Apostle" 1-2). Because both her pacifism at any costs and her anarchism annoyed her readers, she explained what she meant: "Man must be responsible, in other words, to exercise his freedom which is God's greatest gift to him. The greatest message which Peter Maurin had for us was this reminder of man's freedom" ("Charles O'Rourke—The Death of a Beloved Apostle" 1-2). If the greatest gift is freedom, simply obeying authority without thinking or analyzing—whether the authority is the state, a priest or someone else—is the greatest insult to Day's God. Insofar as this precept is antiauthoritarian it

resonates with anarchism and insofar as it opposes obedience to the Pope, bishops, and priests it appears anti-Catholic. But what Day said here is that freedom to follow one's conscience is more important than obedience to either another human or an institution.

And yet, Day herself accepted the authority of the Church when it came to ideas that could not be explained logically, such as immaculate conception. She asserted that the point at which questioning of authority stops and faith begins could only be determined by the individual her/himself. But that point, along with the contradictions at work in her concept of anarchist-pacifism, lead to her readers' confusion, one that she recognized and endeavored to address.

Anarchism and pacifism were already, according to Day, inscribed in the Bible. To prove her point, Day quoted Matthew 23:8: "Call no man Master for ye are all brothers." The anarchism element in this quotation is its antiauthoritarian call to refuse to obey a man/master. Practically this mean that one may then refuse to obey state mandates such as registering for the draft. Day asserted that this passage synthesized "the pacifism that Peter [Maurin] preached, and . . . the anarchism too that he talked of" ("The Incompatibility of Love and Violence" 1-2). But the pacifism in this verse is not that obvious.[25] We might speculate that Day interpreted pacifism here in the word "brothers." Her logic might have gone something like this: since we are all related (brothers), then we will find nonviolent ways to settle our differences.

In 1954 the terms anarchism and pacifism were still disturbing for her readers, but Day made no apology. She wrote: "When it is said that we disturb people too much by the words pacifism and anarchism, I can only think that people need to be disturbed, that their consciences need to be aroused, that they do indeed need to look into their work, and study new techniques of love and poverty and suffering for each other" ("Are the Leaders Insane?" 1). Readers were disturbed by what they understood as the contradictory nature of the words and the extremism

[25] A much more obvious pacifist mandate from the Bible is "Thou shall not kill."

that both words call to mind, but Day pointed out that opposing war required an antiauthoritarian anarchistic attitude.[26] Day then listed a few questions readers might ask themselves to help them make their own decisions: "Each one of us must make our decisions as to what he should do . . . . Should one register for the draft? Should one accept conscientious objector status in the army or out of it, taking advantage of the exceptions allowed, but accepting the fact of the draft? Should one pay tax which supports this gigantic program?" ("Are the Leaders Insane?" 1). Each question calls attention to the antiauthoritarian nature of pacifism and emphasizes thoughtful consideration of the issues. The questions forced readers to think about the extent to which they would go to demonstrate their pacifism and their commitment to their faith. Day doesn't attempt to replace one master, the state, with another, herself, but rather introduces questions meant to encourage everyone to think for him/herself. How that demand can be reconciled with Day's faith in Catholic doctrine is a difficult but not irresolvable question, one that points to the sustaining tension in her project. The mediating force between freedom (of thoughts) and faith will turn out to be Day's conception of love-as-service.

In 1957 Day publicly connected love and anarchism via service to others. When people asked what the Catholic Worker meant, Day responded, "One may answer: voluntary poverty. Another says: an unjudging care for the destitute. Another says: mutual aid; still another: the family. Every House of Hospitality is a family with its faults and virtues, and above all, its love" ("On Pilgrimage—Fall Appeal" 2). Day asserted that through every aspect of what the Catholic Worker did and what it said, there was one constant: love. Everything was meant to be done,

[26] Dorothy Day and other members of The Catholic Worker approached the dominant just-war tradition in the Catholic Church in two ways: "First, they used just war criteria to challenge the conduct of World War II, notably the obliteration bombing of Germany and the atomic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. (Protestant pacifists also condemned civilian bombing on those grounds.) They argued that the technology of mass destruction inevitably violates the principles of proportionality and civilian sanctuary, rendering all modern war unjust. This position was the basis for so-called 'nuclear pacifism' during the Cold War" (Chatfield).

through, with, around, within, and steeped in love. Tolstoy, Kropotkin, and Dostoyevsky had already introduced the combination, but Day took their literature and turned it into daily action. This conception of love as service and service as daily action steeped in love points in the direction of a dissolution of the larger contradictory forces in this chapter; it introduces the way in which anarchism complements rather than opposes Catholicism.

Day writes, "Even those dread words, pacifism and anarchism, when you get down to it, mean that we try always to love, rather than coerce, 'to be what we want the other fellow to be,' to be the least, to have no authority over others, to begin with that microcosm man, or rather, with ourselves" ("On Pilgrimage—Fall Appeal" 2). Through their refusal to manipulate, lecture, or demand confessions (as the Salvation Army did), Catholic Workers, Day asserted, show love. While taking responsibility for themselves, workers recognized that other people might not do the same. Day quoted Douglas Lavine, "When they do not, one must simply try to understand them, given their sufferings and their backgrounds, and accept them" (O'Connor 80). At the same time, this did not mean Day simply accepted everyone as they were and expected them to accept themselves—quite the opposite in fact; Day believed it was her duty to provoke others into reflecting on their actions. Among most Catholics, the term anarchist was already a provocation.

By 1970 with the United States fully engaged in the Vietnam War, *The Daily News* looked Catholic Workers "squarely in the eye and identified [them] as a group of pacifist-anarchists," a category Day gladly accepted ("On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal" 1, 2, 11). In her longest analysis of the topic, Day explained what she meant by anarchist-pacifist in her May "On Pilgrimage" column. In this remarkable essay, Day supported her point with references to the Weather Underground, Saint Paul, Cardinal Newman, and a document from the "Pastoral

Constitution." The words anarchist-pacifist "should go together," she declared, "especially at this time when more and more people, even priests, are turning to violence . . ." ("On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal" 1,2, 11). If people accepted anarchist-pacifism, then they would refuse to fight wars even though they would be jailed for it. Although she doesn't name the Weather Underground, she unmistakably referred to events that involved them as an example of the increasing violence: "In the last three weeks three young people were blown to bits in a house on Eleventh Street, just off of Fifth Avenue, reportedly in an attempt to make bombs to blow up banks, department stores, the offices of giant corporations, all those impregnable homes of high finance in this affluent society" ("On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal" 1,2, 11).[27] Day feared the violence that attracted people whose original intentions were positive: the Weather Underground responded to the violence the United States perpetrated in other countries. She insisted that she could not judge them, but she felt called to action to prevent such violence.

In the same column, Day referred to Saint Paul to help her define "The Catholic Worker's idea of anarchism, the positive word" ("On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal" 1, 2,11). For Day, the positive aspects of anarchism were connected to liberty and expressly each individual's authority to govern him/herself. She pointed to Saint Paul who said that those who follow Jesus have no law. Then she quoted Galatians 5: "For such there is no law."[28] The "such" refers to those who follow Jesus. Day explains: "For those who have given up all ideas of domination and power and the manipulation of others are 'not under the law.' For those who live in Christ Jesus . . . for those who have washed the feet of others, there is no law. They have the liberty of the children of God" ("On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal" 1, 2,11). In short, Day asserts that those

[27] For the story, see Douglass Robinson's "Bombs, Dynamite and Woman's Body Found in Ruins of 11th St. Townhouse." *New York Times*, March 11, 1970, p. 1.

[28] According to both the King James and the Douay-Phems translations of the Bible, the exact quote is "Against such there is no law" (Galatians 5). Using "for" instead of "against," despite their oppositional meanings, changes the tone only slightly.

who humble themselves before others and refuse to master or be mastered are free. To take this one step further is to confront again the contradiction between freedom and faith: are they free then, to obey their God?

Day wrote, "'If there is no law,' I have been asked many times, 'then why are you a member of the Roman Catholic church, the authoritarian church?'" ("On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal" 1, 2,11). In answer to this question, Day turned to an event in the life of Cardinal John Henry Newman that described the primacy of conscience: "During a time of war for England . . . he was asked at a banquet whether he would go against his country if the Pope called a war unjust. He answered that if he were asked to drink a toast it would be to conscience first, and then to the Pope" ("On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal" 1,2,11). In providing this example, Day confronts her friends' main criticism: blind obedience to the authority of the Church. In this example Newman only indirectly asserted he would follow his conscience. The phrase "drink a toast to" appears strangely distant from the complexity of the question. Perhaps Day meant that if one follows one's conscience first and foremost, then one takes responsibility for avoiding the hypocrisy of the Church.

Finally Day quoted the second Vatican Council in order to clarify Newman's statement and to show how the Church supports following one's conscience: "In the depths of his conscience man detects a law which he does not impose on himself but which holds him to obedience . . . . For man has in his heart a law written by God. To obey it is the very dignity of man. . . . Conscience is the most secret core and sanctuary of man. There he is alone with God whose voice echoes in his depths" ("On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal" 1, 2,11). Although she doesn't specify her source here, she cites the "Pastoral Constitution: On the Church in the

Modern World – Gaudium Et Spes," proclaimed by Pope Paul VI on December 7, 1965.[29] Written in response to the Vietnam War, this passage encouraged men who did not support war to refuse to register for the draft. In these and other essays, Day asserted both obedience and refusal to obey. The seemingly contradictory stance is clarified (or at least made clearer) by recognizing that Day equated following one's conscience with obedience to God. And the anti-authority and freedom elements of anarchism that appealed to Day might be translated as the freedom to follow or obey one's conscience rather than freedom to follow or obey human law. It may be that obedience to God's law is an anarchistic obedience insofar as God's law, so conceived, demands the evaluation of conscience over all else. Part of the problem is that although the term "law" is used in religion (God's law) and politics (state law), they designated two very different things.

The issue is further complicated by people who claim to be following their conscience but also commit violent acts. Day asserted that even the violent revolutionaries were following their conscience: "One must follow one's own conscience first before all authority, and of course one must inform one's conscience. . . . All those young ones and older ones, who are committing themselves to violent revolution as the only way to overcome evil government, imperialism, industrial capitalism, exploitation—in other words evil—are not only following their conscience but also following tradition" ("On Pilgrimage--Our Spring Appeal" 1, 2,11). In other words, the Weather Underground Organization (and other groups) committed violent acts in an attempt to challenge the systems of oppression and in doing so followed their consciences, but they also followed the tradition of revolutionaries before them. They fought abstract systemic violence with anonymous, focused violence. One might argue that Day criticized the Weather

[29] For the complete statement, see http://www.christusrex.org/www1/CDHN/v4.html. It was also later cited in the "Declaration on Conscientious Objection and Selective Conscientious Objection from United States Conference of Catholic Bishops," Oct. 21, 1971 (http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/peace/declarat.shtml).

Underground for following tradition because they were *following* instead of developing an original strategy. They repeated what had been done before: they chose a target, made a bomb, carried out the violence and claimed responsibility only in the anonymity of the group. Day hoped to present a new solution, one that did not use violence in order to oppose violence. Anarchist-pacifism became concrete in the daily work of the Catholic Worker because the absolute authority of conscience established freedom while service-in-love established radical daily action as freedom's realization.

Practical Anarchism within the Catholic Worker Movement

The Catholic Worker employed anarchist theory in the everyday running of the houses of hospitality as well as in the financing and publishing of the Worker newspapers. (That is, they refused to tell each other what, how, or when to do it—prepare dinner, write an article, or clean the dining room, unless asked. They did not demand labor in return for food, shelter, or clothing but accepted it when offered.) But neither the members of the higher echelon of the Catholic Church nor anyone in the anarchist movement were eager to claim an affiliation. The Church was embarrassed by the radical antiauthoritarian basis of the Worker and the anarchists by the acceptance of religious authority. Catholics demanded Day explain her anarchism and anarchists her Catholicism. Critics and friends frequently questioned the interwoven, contradictory influences of Catholicism and anarchist philosophy on Day's writing and the Catholic Worker movement. They questioned how these two could grow close enough together to exist in the confines of one movement. For Day, one did not exist without the other. As we have seen, her explanation of anarchism frequently included references to the Bible and her Catholicism demanded following her conscience even when it meant disobedience to the state.

Marc Ellis, a Catholic Worker, provides a practical example of anarchism in action at the New York Catholic Worker. Bundles of papers were brought to the Worker and had to be carried upstairs to be folded, sorted, addressed and tied in bundles. Fifty to a hundred thousand copies (or more) were mailed each month. Ellis writes: "Volunteers, as well as people from the house, pitch in. When people get tired and drop out of the line, gaps develop and the load becomes heavier, especially when you have to walk upstairs to reach the next person. There is a wealth of labor on the first floor but no one is asked to help. Personal initiative only: not even a gentle coercion is allowed" (100).

Despite the obvious need for help carrying the papers, none of the people who come for a meal are asked to help. Day insisted that personal example was "the only trustworthy means of influencing others" (O'Connor 80). Change happens, she asserted, on the terrain of a lived life.

Day accepted an invitation to speak at the annual anarchist conference at Hunter College in March, 1974. In her May "On Pilgrimage" essay, Day addresses the questions on her Catholic readers' minds: Why would anarchists invite Day to speak? What could she say to people who do not believe in her God? Day explained her strategy: "I did not 'talk Jesus' to the anarchists. There was no time to answer the one great disagreement which was in their minds--how can you reconcile your Faith in the monolithic, authoritarian Church which seems so far from Jesus who 'had no place to lay his head," and who said "sell what you have and give to the poor,'--with your anarchism?" (1).The question she articulates on behalf of her critics does not ask why she accepts the authority of the Church and all its hypocrisy, nor does it question her belief in Jesus as a messiah. It criticizes the vast difference between the theory and practice of the Church and how she could possibly reconcile the hypocrisy of the Church with an anarchism which

advocates personal freedom and personal responsibility. The anarchists view the Church as representing the wealthy oppressor and Jesus the oppressed workingman.

Two other implications are worth mentioning. First, her words imply the acceptance of the existence of a man named Jesus. Secondly, they imply that Jesus's teachings are similar to anarchist theory: both Jesus and anarchists work to better the situation of the common folk. It is as if Day expected the anarchists to understand and admire her efforts to lessen the misery of poor people because it is their work too. But they do not understand why Day would join an organization that agrees that helping the poor is necessary but also participates in oppression, much like the Salvation Army in Shaw's play *Major Barbara.*

Despite this problematic tension, anarchists largely accepted Day, primarily because of her long-term and passionate commitment to her work. Anarchists invited her to speak at their annual conference because, Day says, "I have been behind bars in police stations, houses of detention, jails and prison farms, whatsoever they are called, eleven times, and have refused to pay Federal income taxes and have never voted, they accept me as an anarchist" ("On Pilgrimage" 1974 1).[30] While she did not advocate revolution, her willingness to lose her freedom for reasons coinciding with anarchist theory and to continuously do so over her lifetime endeared her to the anarchists.

And for her part, Day accepted anarchists: "And I in turn, can see Christ in them even though they deny Him, because they are giving themselves to working for a better social order for the wretched of the earth" ("On Pilgrimage" 1974 1). Instead of confronting the question in the minds of the anarchists about her faith head on, Day focused on the parallels between Christ's teachings and anarchist doctrine, specifically the tenets that challenge the conditions of

[30] During a confrontation between police and students, a policeman with blood streaming down his face beat Day with his club and broke two of her ribs. Ironically, the original cause of the confrontation was a group of Catholic college students who broke up a peace meeting Day was attending (*From Union Square* 77).

oppression. She saw Jesus in the work of the anarchists, in their compassion and desire to address injustice at the risk of their own well-being, and they recognized her as a living personification of their struggle even through they were unable to reconcile that with her faith. In the end, this example adds another layer to our solution to the anarchism and Catholicism tension: Day interpreted anarchism as a state of mind that encouraged a type of questioning of Catholic theology.

Catholic Racism and Catholic Worker Integration

When they opened a house of hospitality on 115 Mott Street and welcomed in their neighbors, Day and her colleagues set out to transform abstract love into everyday action. Their neighbors from the Bowery were primarily poor immigrants and poor African Americans. As the Worker focused on the needs of the individuals who entered their doors, cultural and racial awareness became an organic and integral element in the Worker movement.

The Catholic Worker movement was radical not only in its service to the poor but in its inclusiveness in a time when white Christian clergy and congregants were still excluding or segregating immigrants and minorities.[31] The anarchist movement was not explicitly exclusive, but its leaders, including Emma Goldman, did not address institutionalized racism or recognize the daily racism faced by people of color. More dramatically, the anarchist leaders, like most of the people and organizations in the United States in the early part of the twentieth century,

[31] The Catholic Worker took a less direct approach to protesting the lynching of African Americans than did non-secular organizations like the International Labor Defense (ILD) or the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching (ASWPL) founded by Jessie Daniel Ames in 1930. Although not its main focus, the ILD took up questions of racist practices and defended the Scottsboro men accused of rape. Jessie Ames "and her co-founders obtained the signatures of 40,000 women to their pledge against lynching. Despite hostile community opposition and physical threats, they conducted petition drives, lobbying and fundraising across the South to work against lynching" (Davis 194). The Catholic Worker strongly condemned lynching and published articles that humanized African Americans written by both whites and African Americans. Day, unlike Goldman, frequently traveled to the South and reported incidents of racial injustice and lynching which she published in *The Catholic Worker* paper.

tended not to pay much attention to the lynching of African American men and women. Since the anarchist movement focused on liberty, it seems particularly egregious that its leaders overlooked this ultimate violation, and it is difficult not to attribute their silence to an implicit racism or at best a Euro-centrism.[32]

In the first edition of *The Catholic Worker* newspaper, Day writes a letter, called simply, "To Our Readers," which directly addresses its intended audience: the unemployed and "those who think that there is no hope for the future, no recognition of their plight" (4). The letter also calls "attention to the fact that the Catholic Church has a social program—to let [readers] know that there are men of God who are working not only for their spiritual, but for their material welfare"(4). Day and Maurin recognized New Yorkers' desperation and isolation and offered hope through a Catholic social program. Unlike many other programs of the day,[33] Day's "social program" included the radicalization of Catholics of all races, nationalities, and economic statuses. While the Church emphasized "eternal life" and took no responsibility in confronting racism, Day argued that reducing suffering in the material world was just as important as the afterlife itself; and she recognized that African Americans were one group of people who suffered both economically and socio-politically.

The conscious inclusiveness evident in Day's letter can also be seen in the paper's financing and headlines. In its infancy, the paper was already supported by a variety of clergy and common folk—of mixed ethnicities—in a time when segregation and animosity between

---

[32] It could also be a Northern centrism, as many anarchists and anarchist sympathizers lived in the northern states.

[33] For example, the Ku Klux Klan had its own "social program" and claimed roots in Protestant Christianity. See Patrick O'Donnell and David Jacobs' *The Ku Klux Klan: America's First Terrorists Exposed* (2006) for more information.

races was the norm. In the following passage, Day explains the unorthodox financing of the paper, and the sacrifice made to produce it:

> The money for the printing of the first issue was raised by begging small contributions from friends. A colored priest in Newark sent us ten dollars and the prayers of his congregation. A colored sister in New Jersey, garbed also in holy poverty, sent us a dollar. Another kindly and generous friend sent twenty-five. The rest of it the editors squeezed out of their own earnings, and at that they were using money necessary to pay milk bills, gas bills, electric light bills. ("To Our Readers" 4)

The nature of the financial support would suggest that the paper had little stability, and yet enough money was donated every month to produce the paper—for the next seventy years.[34] The content of the paper also shows Day and Maurin's determination to focus on contemporary issues, bring scripture into everyday acts of fighting injustice, and expose exploitation in all its forms.

The first issue of the *Catholic Worker* contained Maurin's "Easy Essay," twelve articles about labor and working conditions, and two articles about the exploitation of African Americans. The front-page headline declared: "Negro Labor on Levees Exploited by U.S. War Department." The subtitle read: "Much publicity but nothing done. Seven 12-hour days a week at 10 cents an hour. Workers charged for water." In this article, Day quoted the NAACP, the American Federation of Labor, and a few U.S. Senators. She exposed how the War department benefited from the cheap labor of African Americans and described the horrific conditions of workers. Through this article, the newspaper fulfills one of its promises—recognizing the plight of people not frequently recognized. Other articles also reported on the conditions of workers of other ethnicities; however, articles about the plight of African Americans received more space in the paper because of the intense, ambient racism of the day.

[34] Over the course of those seventy years, many Catholic Worker newspapers were published in cities throughout the United States and abroad, but the New York paper is the original and most enduring.

Another article published in the first issue of the paper called "Is the problem Black or White?" quoted extensively from articles previously published in other newspapers. For example, Day quoted Rev. J T Gillard's "The Negro Challenges Catholicism" first published in *Commonweal.* The article describes African Americans' disappointment with the Catholic Church: "The Church [is] pregnant with promise, but Catholics [are] still-born with prejudice" (3). This sentiment challenged readers to examine their attitudes. Day also quoted Father Gillis of the Paulists whose radio address was censored in the South because some listeners objected to the subject (3). In that radio address, Gillis outlined many of the hypocrisies African Americans faced: They were "taxed for parks, libraries, and other places of instruction and entertainment which [they were] not permitted to use"; "in many states, [they were] denied membership to white churches . . .. [They dared] not take communion with the whites" and yet they were encouraged to serve God as if they had equal rights (3). Few papers run by whites addressed the exploitation, hypocrisy, and racism that African Americans faced and fewer still brought in a religious element. In confronting the racism within the Church*, The Catholic Worker* won the affection of many people, including but not limited to African Americans. It also became a thorn in the side of the Catholic Church.

These articles gained the attention of Arthur Falls, an African American physician. His story is important because while it exemplifies success of the movement to address racial injustice, it also indicates problems within the Catholic Worker philosophy. Falls experienced racism in Catholic organizations and consequently was thrilled with the Catholic Worker's obvious concern for blacks. His first letter to Day described his surprise when he read *The Catholic Worker*: "I was struck with wonder . . . . Most Catholic publications have been silent on the injustices suffered by colored people both within our Catholic institutions and without"

("Letters and Comment" 4). He also suggested that as a gesture of solidarity Day change the masthead which depicted two white workmen to include a black workman. Ever sensitive to practicing everything she preached, Day accepted this suggestion and changed the masthead.[35] As a result, Falls became involved in the movement.

When Falls's article, "Communist Says, 'Welcome Negro Brothers!'" appeared on the front page of *The Catholic Worker,* it created a controversy. In the article Falls compared the inclusion of African Americans (and other minorities) at an event held by the communist International Labor Defense (ILD) and the exclusion of African Americans from the social programs offered by several Catholic parishes in the same neighborhood. The ILD event was organized by an international group of people who welcomed everyone. There was no segregated seating and so people, Falls recalled, naturally sat in groups of friends and neighbors who were a mix of nationalities. The parishes, in contrast, offered a whites-only program for mothers with infants and another, again whites-only program, for orphan boys. Falls ended his article: "To which appeal would you be more likely to respond: to the "beautiful liturgy" and sound theology of the Church, or to the practical demonstration of ILD? And then place yourself in the position of a real Catholic, either white or colored, in the Central Section of Chicago. What would you think?" ("Communist Says, 'Welcome Negro Visitors'" 8). Falls exposed the hypocrisy of the Church: the difference between theory and practice. Catholic doctrine is, in theory, inclusive. Day often quoted Matthew 22:36-40 which commands, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." But the actual practices of the parishioners (not just racist parishioners) excluded blacks. Falls's assertion that communism was the logical choice tapped into white people's fear that blacks were going to join the communist party and start a revolution. The Communists

[35] The Worker kept the same masthead until 1985, five years after Day died. The masthead then became a black workman and a white woman with a child. The depiction of Jesus remains white with Aryan features.

offered equality in practice as well as doctrine. In his own life, Falls's commitment to equality for African Americans and his commitment to the Catholic Church collided when, if theory and practice were consistent, they ought to have intersected. Falls was determined to bring them together and found the Catholic Worker a supportive place to begin.

From 1934 until 1936, Falls wrote a semi-regular column called "Chicago Letter" for *The Catholic Worker*, and by 1936 he was the first African American to open his own Catholic Worker house in Chicago.[36] However, Falls deviated from Day's larger vision of the Catholic Worker: he sponsored a credit union and developed a lending library filled with self-help books instead of a soup line or a house of hospitality (Sicius 339-340). He never believed that a new society could develop simply out of doing works of mercy. Blacks needed to be self-reliant, he said. And that meant participation in the capitalist system. Day was troubled by Falls's approach because she saw him leading African Americans into the middle class. The middle classes were capitalists who survived by exploiting others and racism was one of the products of capitalism. Nonetheless, she published articles about Falls's work in *The Catholic Worker*. Eventually, Falls became a strong voice for racial equality within the Catholic Church (McKanan 39).

The problem in the Catholic Worker philosophy that Falls's story highlights is voluntary poverty. Falls rejected it himself and encouraged others to do so as well. Although Falls was middle class, many blacks and other minorities in his neighborhood were poor, and not by choice. Those who made it out of poverty, even the most religious Catholics, were not likely to

[36] Other African Americans who started houses of hospitality include, but are not limited to, Llewellyn Scott and Helen Caldwell Riley. Scott ran The Blessed Martin Home and worked part time for the government in order to financially support his mother and sister. In one year he served over 17,780 meals (Day, "The Tale of Two Capitals" 69). Helen Caldwell Riley started her house of hospitality in Memphis "because several children had been burnt to death after being locked in a garage by their parents who had gone out to the cotton fields to earn enough to pay the rent for that old garage which was their home. So Helen rented a big store on Beale Street, where young women would come in before daylight and deposit their babies and a can of evaporated milk and would not return until after dark" (Day, "Fear in Our Time" 5,7).

voluntarily experience the poverty they or their parents fought so hard to escape. In short, volunteering at the Catholic Worker was a middle class luxury.

Despite Day's successful start in attracting people of all ethnicities, and the Workers' continued commitment to this goal, African Americans' and other minorities' involvement in the larger movement varied greatly, partly due to Catholic policies and partly due to economic realities. Falls's diversion from the basic tenets of the Worker shows how he envisioned the solution to poverty. Day appreciated Falls's work, yet at the same time she simply did not want him to create more capitalists. Her anarchism taught her that capitalism created poverty and that producing more capitalists of any race meant the poverty would simply shift from one person to the next. At the same time, her anarchism prevented her from dictating how Falls should run his Catholic Worker house. He was following his conscience even though, to her mind, he was ill informed.

The Catholic Worker did not set out to confront racism but found itself often doing so in the course of following its basic tenets. Once confronted with racist protests against its indiscriminate regard for the poor, Day and Catholic Workers found themselves on the front lines as the U.S. began to struggle with the end of legal segregation. The Baltimore Catholic Worker did not intend to build interracial communities; they simply opened their doors and welcomed people in. But interracial living was not socially or legally acceptable in Baltimore in 1964. In fact, the Baltimore police closed the Catholic Worker there, calling it "a public nuisance. It was inter-racial at a time when it was against the law to have both black and white under the same roof in a hostel" ("The Case of Cardinal McIntyre" 1,6,8). In response, Catholic Workers began more aggressive protests and participated in civil disobedience ("The Case of Cardinal McIntyre" 1,6,8).

The second example of a clash with racism involves Day risking her life. In the early 1960s, Day visited Koinonia, an interracial community in Americus, Georgia. Due to the community's support of young black men who wanted to enter a white college, the community drew attention to itself. One night when she and another woman were standing guard, white men drove by in a car and peppered them with shots ("Fear in Our Time" 5). Although frightened, neither woman was injured. Day and other Workers consistently risked their lives in order to voice their objection to the silent acceptance of segregation and other racist practices.

Day fought racism through established means as well. Women's International League for Peace and Justice (WIL) appointed her to the Interracial Committee in July of 1934.[37] She described the first meeting and their goals: "There were a dozen there, and everyone seemed to be in the humor for hard work and definite action . . . . We are going to do a good deal of investigating of complaints as to churches, schools and institutions where there is said to be discrimination against the Negro and take up specific examples and try to rectify them" ("Day by Day" 4). This grassroots organization addressed racism from the ground up—by investigating claims of discrimination. Here, Day and Workers confronted racism in a very practical way, particularly because the 1930s were a high-water mark of racism in U.S. history.

By the 1960s, when many organizations joined the ranks of those fighting for the rights of African Americans and other minorities, Day traveled in the South and witnessed institutional racism. Her column "On Pilgrimage" published in *The Catholic Worker* centered on her observations. During a trip to Mississippi in the mid sixties, Day reminded readers that parochial schools in the South still did not admit black students and asked her readers why. Then she briefly described the threats her white friends received from their neighbors when black friends

[37] For more about this committee, see Linda Schott's *Reconstructing Women's Thoughts: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom before World War II,* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1977. 135-144.

visited them. Finally and most horrifically, she lists three incidents of brutal abuse and murder of African Americans that occurred within a week of her arrival ("On Pilgrimage" 1965 1-2,6). She was not working with the civil rights movement or registering people to vote; instead she was centered on bringing her Catholic readers the simple facts and connecting them to Catholic doctrine. She recorded atrocities much the same way as Ida B. Wells did: as a way of remembering events, holding officials responsible, and stirring readers into action.

In 1934, Day knew that Mary, an African American woman who needed a place to stay indoors during the day, might be faced with racism if she stayed at a nearby women's co-op. Day confronted the white residents. She writes, "I [did not] expect too much of the girls in the way of freedom from race prejudice, since I know very well that Catholics of means and better education are not free themselves from it" ("Day by Day" 7). If white people still remain racist despite their education, she implies here, why then, would white workingwomen be free from it? Day indirectly addresses the common misperception that education frees people from racism. She reminded the girls about how the "Lord washed the feet of his disciples the night before he suffered and died . . . and told them how we all should serve each other, whether we are white, black or yellow" ("Day by Day" 7). The girls happily accepted Mary, which surprised and pleased Day. Although by contemporary standards this story offers little evidence of confronting racism, by 1934 standards, Day has shown sensitivity to Mary in two different ways: one, by recognizing the fact she has been wandering the streets during the day and, two, by protecting her against the possible racism she may have encountered through the white women at the co-op. When Day calls upon Jesus's teachings as a way to discourage racism, her words are effective. Yet, in her reliance on the authority of Jesus, she encourages the girls to suppress racism rather

than confront their own fears. That is, Day doesn't confront the issues behind racist attitudes (i.e. fear). She simply asserts that Jesus accepted everyone and so should they.

Fighting racism was just one of the ways in which the Catholic Worker challenged many policies and practices of the Catholic Church. For Day, fighting poverty by addressing the needs of her neighbors was something every common person could do. The Catholic Workers' persistence eventually radicalized many congregants and spurred reconsideration of the meaning behind the works of mercy.

In a time when the Catholic Church adhered to racist practices, the Catholic Worker Movement confronted racism and advocated integration. Racial injustice was not originally a central focus of the Worker movement. This makes it all the more remarkable that the Worker movement, and Day personally, found it necessary to confront the issue. Much of the resistance, and, as these instances show, the violence directed toward civil rights advocates in the fifties and sixties occurred because whites feared the end of segregation; they were afraid Blacks would seek retribution. A white family simply inviting a black family to dinner, or a black person sitting in the front of a bus, could and did lead to violence. If the Worker movement came to be involved in the civil rights movement, it was as a result of no explicit policy other than the commitment to seek out suffering and poverty wherever it was found and to greet it with a service of love.

In America in the late-twentieth century this concern for the poor brought the Worker movement into the midst of the civil rights movement because of America's economic racism, not because of Day's direct attention to questions of race. The marriage of Catholicism and anarchism within the Catholic Worker movement produced a racial sensitivity best understood not through an original concern for race but through the influence of literature. In particular Day

read Theodore Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* and then adopted his concept of a harsh and dreadful love as a way to integrate her contradictory impulses.

Dostoyevsky: Anarchism and Catholicism Combined through Harsh and Dreadful Love

Throughout her life, Day admired Russian novels. In particular, their depiction of forgiveness and harsh or unromantic love appealed to her. The forgiveness theme resounded through Day's burgeoning political and spiritual thought and brought her to Catholicism. Day writes in her autobiography: "Dostoevski and Tolstoi made me cling to a faith in God and yet I could not endure feeling an alien in it. I felt that my faith had nothing in common with that of Christians around me" (*The Long Loneliness* 41-42). Perhaps what she saw in the Russian novels was the practical application of Christian theology. Christians did not appear to be practicing their faith as literally as Day imagined they should. Their faith did not seem to educate their everyday actions.

For Day, Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*, which focuses on the difficulty of love in everyday action, exemplifies the practical application of Christian theology. Day most frequently referred to Father Zosima in book two, chapter four, "A Lady of Little Faith." In this section, a society woman asks Zosima how to convince herself there is an afterlife; the monk responds, "By the experience of active love . . . . In as far as you advance in love you will grow surer of the reality of God and of the immortality of your soul" (Dostoyevsky 48, Miller 9). In other words, if she loves actively without thought of consequence or reward, she will no longer question the existence of God, her faith, or the afterlife. But the woman does not know what he means by "active love." She tells him she loves humanity but expects a repayment of love with love. Father Zosima then asks: "If the patients whose wounds you are washing did not meet you

with gratitude, but worried you with his whims, without valuing or remarking your charitable services, began abusing you and rudely commanding you, and complaining to the superior authorities of you . . . what then? Would you persevere in your love, or not?" (Dostoyevsky 48). Much to her shame, she discovers that she expects "repayment at once . . . praise and the repayment of love with love" (48). She discovers that sacrifice was only the beginning of service to others. Not only must one sacrifice, Zosima implies, but one must do so without requiring recognition on the part of the person one is helping, or others witnessing. Further, the person being helped may not only be ungrateful but also may try to harm the one who is offering help. This ungratefulness often "happens when people are in great suffering" (Dostoyevsky 48). This notion of love as suffering is both Christian and anarchistic: Christian in its service to others and anarchistic in its refusal to be authorized by any logic of compensation other than the person completing the loving action. Day told this story to new volunteers who believed that the act of giving was uncomplicated: their help, in whatever form they choose, would be gratefully received and people's needs would be simplistic—food, shelter, for example.

Father Zosima answers that "love in action is a harsh and dreadful thing compared to love in dreams. Love in dreams is greedy for immediate action, rapidly performed and in the sight of all. Men will even give their lives if only the ordeal does not last long and is soon over, with all looking and applauding as though on the stage" (Dostoevsky 49).[38] The suffering in this romanticized idea of love is brief. Love in dreams needs a witness or authority to approve of it, "But active love is labour and fortitude, and for some people, too, perhaps a complete science," Zosima explains to the society woman. "But I predict," he continues, "that just when you see with horror that in spite of all your efforts you are getting further from your goal instead of

[38] The "looking and applauding" harkens back to Shaw's *Major Barbara* where Rummy complains that she does not receive public affirmation for her (false) confessions because they are whispered to each individual Salvation Army worker.

nearer to it—at that very moment you will reach and behold clearly the miraculous power of the Lord who had been all the time loving and mysteriously guiding you" (Dostoevsky 49). When this society woman realizes the difference between the romantic and the harsh love, she will have already begun to understand God's love. Father Zosima points to the difference between the romantic idealized love in dreams, fairy tales, and romance novels and the love expressed in everyday actions. Romantic love, or romanticized love, often implies there is no suffering or sacrifice involved as if it came as naturally as sleep. Actual love or "harsh" love may pass unacknowledged and unrewarded. Day frequently referred to Zosima as a way of showing the difference between theory or theology and practice as well as the difference between romanticized love and harsh love. Zosima's words combine the Catholic doctrine of giving freely with the antiauthoritarian message of the anarchists.

Day described the Catholic Workers' "faith in love as the ultimate reality: 'When one loves, there is at that time a correlation between the spiritual and the material. Even the flesh itself is energized; the human spirit is made strong. All sacrifice, all suffering is easy for the sake of love . . . . This is the foundation stone of The Catholic Worker movement" (Miller 10). She warned against the sentimentality of love and the expectation that love begets love. In particular, she told volunteers who came to work and live among the poor that they would not live in "the glow of gratitude of those whom one has helped" (Miller 10). Finally she argued that "Love in practice was harsh and dreadful" (Miller 10).[39] She did not romanticize love nor the work nor the gratitude/ingratitude of the people she served, and this set her apart. Day followed Father Zosima's teachings; she employed Dostoyevsky's harsh and dreadful love in everyday practice.

[39] One might argue that Day's celibacy within this love-as-service maintains an intensity and tenderness reminiscent of sex. It attempts to replace physical gratification with a respect for the dignity of the individual.

Conclusion

Both Day's friends from the New York literary scene and her readers of *The Catholic Worker* newspaper originally accepted the definition of anarchism as antiauthoritarianism which resulted in violence and/or chaos and believed that Catholicism meant blind obedience. Given such views, the contradiction between anarchism and Catholicism is clear. However, Day calls into question the validity of these perceptions. Day's interpretation of anarchist theory and Catholic doctrine are not as far apart as was once thought; for example, both claim primacy of conscience and both focus on the dignity of the individual. If Day's interpretation is accurate, the Bible advocates anarchism through the teachings of Jesus in which, ironically, followers of Jesus have no master. And anarchists, according to Catholic Workers, are already moralists in that their stance is spiritual and ethical (Ellsberg 2). If both anarchism and Catholicism attend to the spiritual and ethical, then they appear analogous rather than contradictory. If anarchism is viewed as a state of mind removed from a political movement as Day viewed it, then again the contradictions with Catholicism dissipate. Day addressed the association between anarchism and Christianity within Kropotkin's,[40] and separately, Dostoyevsky's work as a way of helping her readers understand Catholic Worker philosophy. Through these works, Day proposes a new radical who makes room for religion.

Instead of resolving the apparent contradictions between her desire for intellectual conversation in the New York literary scene and her desire to obey religious doctrine, Day nurtured them. She nurtured them until she understood how they both pulled her, not in completely different directions as she and her New York friends first thought, but in an unprecedented direction, to another plane: Day turned theory into daily practice by serving others

[40] Oscar Wilde once compared Kropotkin to Jesus (Wilde x).

without expecting gratefulness in return. She leaned toward anarchism when the urge to indoctrinate became strong and then toward Catholicism when her spirit lagged, then back to anarchism as a state of mind that encouraged questioning of the racist policies of the Catholic Church. Her antiauthoritarian emphasis comes across quietly as she urged her readers to act upon their consciences. She, like Goldman, practiced her aesthetic anarchism in daily life.

In the end, while neither Catholics nor anarchists practiced racial equality in their respective groups, when Day combined Catholic doctrine and anarchist theory in her Catholic Worker movement, racial sensitivity was a natural outgrowth. Day stubbornly refused to validate contemporary prejudice with verbal agreement or silent acceptance. From the 1930s onward, Day and other writers of *The Catholic Worker* continuously challenged popular racist beliefs by presenting facts and prodding readers' consciences.

Despite, or rather because of all the apparent contradictions both in Day's life and in the movement she and Maurin founded, Day employed Dostoyevsky's harsh and dreadful love as a way of explaining how contradiction was possible without being contradictory. This love combined the antiauthoritarian elements of anarchism with the obedience of Catholicism and is grounded in the commitment to the dignity of the individual. Day responded to suffering with love as service and daily action. For her, suffering was the great humanizer.

Conclusion

> "Liberty without socialism is privilege, injustice; socialism without liberty is slavery and brutality."
> ~ Bakunin, "1873 Statism and Anarchy"
>
> "I cannot imagine a free society without beauty, for of what use liberty, if not to strive for beauty? Not the kind of beauty the art for art's sake exponents clamor for, but beauty of personality, human relationship, and the finer things in nature or in life."
> ~Goldman, Letter to Henry Alsberg, March 24th, 1931

Distinct from other currents of anarchism in its attention to lived experience as the site for aesthetic inquiry, and also different from other aesthetic inquiries in its explicit attention to creative freedom, Goldman and Day's aesthetic anarchism challenges the historical conceptual frameworks for both political anarchism and literary aesthetics.

As a gendered response to the tumultuous early years of the twentieth century, aesthetic anarchism offers a lens through which to view Goldman and Day's lives, one that reframes questions about moral resistance and the nature of political action. Aesthetic anarchism reconsiders these questions by relocating them among the mundane chores and choices of everyday living. Thus, although Goldman builds her beautiful ideal of anarchism on literary passages and Day builds her philosophy of a "harsh and dreadful love" on literary and biblical passages, the terrain of their aesthetic anarchism is their lived experience. The following five sections offer distinct lenses with which to view this aesthetic anarchism.

Violence

In her youth Goldman viewed violence as one form of revolution that was necessary before the anarchist vision could be reached. However, apart from her minimal involvement with Berkman's propaganda by the deed, Goldman did not participate in violent action. Even in Russia when her anarchist friends were being imprisoned and killed, Goldman did not arm herself. Despite her radical orientations towards politics, sexuality, and aesthetics, Goldman clearly had her limits. She writes, "If revolution cannot solve the need of violence and terror, then . . . . I am against revolution" (Drinnon, *Nowhere at Home* 90). To the extent that this sort of remark underscores a horror of political and revolutionary violence, it also underscores the paradox of the political revolutionary: if anarchism is the elimination of state power and state violence, replacing it with a mode of communal life in which individuals are left free to create their own lives, then isn't violence justified in the achievement of that future? Goldman attempted to bypass this question by insisting that one's own life even more so than any state apparatus or structure was the true home of the revolution. And this is why hers was an active public, political life. Goldman tirelessly attempted to engage the public, reframe the social imaginary, and incite her audiences to radically create themselves by seeking out new forms of expression and beauty in their own lives.

Goldman lived out her political convictions not as an underground revolutionary but as a public "media" figure. Unlike American political activist and suffragette Inez Mulholland, Goldman did not have the advantage of being stunningly beautiful and a sweetheart of the media. Instead she had an intensity that either frightened or won the private admiration of interviewers. Most of the sensationalized newspaper reports of her activities had little to do with the intimacy of interviews; these reports were often responding to a generalized public fear. But for Goldman, any press coverage was good coverage because it gave her a chance to present the nuances of her

anarchism. She knew that most of the public would not be able to understand why, for example, she might defend Leon Czolgosz, particularly when she claimed not to approve of his act. It was more important to her that she be faithful to her own interpretation of anarchism than to gain more members under what she saw as directly contradictory to her stated goals. That is, had she condemned Czolgosz, she might have lessened the disgrace which fell upon the movement.

In the final analysis, whereas Bakunin advocated the violent destruction of the present political state, and Kropotkin focused on the construction, logistics and organization of anarchism, Goldman wavered in between. She finally landed on the side of construction, where by construction she meant educating the workers to their rights, not as citizens of a state, but as human beings. Thus, she asserted in 1928, an anarchist revolution should be "understood as a process of reconstruction rather than what we believed it to be until now, a process of deconstruction" (Letter to Berkman, June 29th, 1928). Though, characteristically, she adds that the change is "bound to be violent and [anarchists] will need to be ready for the defense" (June 29th, 1928).

Goodness

Goldman's friend Frank Harris writes that unlike other political activists, Goldman practiced her beliefs (*Bernard Shaw* 34).[1] She did not "merely preach the new philosophy," Hippolyte Havel, another comrade observed, "she also persist[ed] in living it—and that is the one supreme, unforgivable crime" (Haaland 67). Both Goldman and Day recognized this difference between theoretical and practical work, and recognizing in the latter a fundamental anarchism they nonetheless accepted the risk that comes with all unprincipled action, all work that would

[1]For an analysis of Frank Harris and Emma Goldman's friendship, see chapter two of this dissertation.

redefine the principles themselves of goodness and justice, namely the risk that anarchistic faith may end up justifying a crime. It was a price they were willing to pay.

In her autobiography, Day "described her search for God and the miracle of human kindness as similar to the anarchist's search for utopia and the miracle of human solidarity" (Diggins 56). The parallels between human kindness and human solidarity are not difficult to see—in order to have solidarity, there must be kindness and with kindness there is solidarity—but to claim that Day's God might be similar to an anarchist utopia is more difficult. Both Day and the anarchists are searching for a way to understand and live in a world that is marked by injustice. Day's God comforts her with the promise of an afterlife and a recognition of the present state of misery in the world. The anarchist utopia parallels the promised afterlife where violence is no longer necessary, each has according to her need, and aesthetics is the measure of a full human life, not merely a term for the fine arts.

Although avidly antireligious, Goldman's anarchism parallels a religious fanaticism—but a religious fanaticism that centers on the body as well as the spirit. Instead of having faith in a god, she puts her faith in the capacity of humans to get along well enough to create their own societal structure. One might even argue that she attempts to "convert" the masses to the doctrine of liberty as opposed to accepting their habitual complacency. She frequently described anarchism in religious terms and spoke of the "faith" she had (or at times didn't have) in the ability of the masses to create an anarchist ideal. For both Goldman and Day, anarchism makes "the self as sacred as it is autonomous" (Diggins 61). In other words, the aesthetic anarchism at work in both Goldman and Day's projects involves each in a profession of faith, faith in a world to come. In this sense the tension in Goldman's relation to violence, like the tension in Day's relation to the authority of the Church, turns out not to be a contradiction to be overcome but a

sustaining tension with the power to disturb the present. Faith is neither a prediction nor a calculation. A different sort of thinking is at work here, what Kant in his aesthetic theory might call a regulative idea. A regulative idea is a concept that cannot be grasped in normal experience. "Perfection" for example, or "beauty" function as regulative ideas. Such ideas are strictly speaking anarchic, not determined by time and space, but they are real nonetheless, functioning in the background of all our thinking, informing and regulating our most fundamental understanding of our world and ourselves.

Every goal is the projection of a future state or condition, and so all action based on a goal amounts to an act of faith. Perhaps what Goldman and Day share most of all is their willingness to accept that action for the sake of the good is not a matter of calculus, not a perfect equation, not the working out over time of a principle or "arche," but action for the good involves, rather, faith in a future where that faith itself informs and shapes the present.

In his work *Anarchist Morality*, Kropotkin advises: "Be strong . . . and once you have seen unrighteousness and recognized it as such – inequity in life, a lie in science, or suffering inflicted by another – rise in revolt against the iniquity, the lie or the injustice. Struggle! To struggle is to live, and the fiercer the struggle the intenser the life. That is what the science of morality tells us. The choice is yours." Although Bernard Shaw's fight does not reach the extremes that both Day and Goldman's do, his work points to those extremes and, often, laughs at them for their optimism. All three writers address the injustice they witness in thoughtful, artful, and provocative ways.

Literature

Through his drama, Shaw disturbs his audience by pointing to a manifestly unjust social and political system. Earlier in his career, Shaw lectured in public squares and demanded injustice be addressed. In the end he chose to fight this battle through the written word not only in his drama but also in the many public debates in which he engaged with other writers such as H.G. Wells and Benjamin Tucker. Often accused of putting his politics before his art, making of his art didactic social criticism, I have argued that when viewed from outside the confines of traditional aesthetic criticism (that is, when viewed through a feminist anarchist lens), Shaw lands on the side of art, not mere polemics or politics. This is why Goldman finds his work so useful. It entertains audiences where entertainment becomes transformative. Goldman "believed the originality of art is tied to revolutionary politics" (Clark 49) and conversely that revolutionary politics must be steeped in aesthetic sensibility.

While Goldman and Day resisted unjust laws and injustice in their daily works, Shaw aimed his dramatic pen at many of these same injustices and hoped that transformation would result. All three writers have confidence in traditional aesthetic sites as places of transformation. Differences arise when Goldman and Day take the literary literally. That is, questions of aesthetics on a traditional site such as poetry or drama become transformed into everyday action on the aesthetic anarchism site. Thus drama represents the "spirit of revolt" and Goldman and Day become that spirit of revolt through the practice of their aesthetic anarchism.

Though consigned to an appendix because he is neither an anarchist nor a socialist, T. S. Eliot serves as a useful point of contrast to this discussion of aesthetic anarchism. The contrast is informative because it is impossible to deny that Eliot's *The Waste Land* constitutes if not a radical critique then a radical re-envisioning of the modern world. It is equally incontestable that Eliot's poetry marks a radical break with traditional poetic forms. From the limited perspective

of this dissertation, then, what Eliot serves to illustrate is that the creation of new aesthetic forms may or may not constitute an aesthetic response to perceived injustice. Not all criticism is protest and not all protest is political action. Eliot is able to safely recycle the most traditional of political and social views even as he produces works of radical poetic genius.

Sexuality

It would be difficult to find a more perfectly symmetrical contrast than Day and Goldman's interpretations of the role of sexuality in a life devoted to beauty and good works. Goldman studied Freud and Havelock Ellis and thought about the "full significance of sex repression and its effect on human thought and action" (*Living My Life* 173). She worked to reverse puritan ideals that identified sex solely with the work of procreation and the attendant claim that sex outside of marriage is immoral. Goldman countered that sex without love, in or outside of marriage, is immoral. This radical move challenged traditional conceptions of sexuality and emphasized sex as loving and pleasurable for women as well as men.

Through her character June, Day went so far as to assert that women joined political organizations in order to meet men, instead of joining organizations because they were inspired by principles. Unlike Goldman's assertion that sexual relations are among the social relations that defined political association, June/Day looks at the similar sexual relations and calls them false and destructive. Once Day founded the Catholic Worker movement, she found no role for sexuality and was thus able to spare herself its dissatisfactions. Goldman pursued an active—and for the time scandalous—sexual life that was anarchic and proudly unconstrained, but as a result, and in contrast to Day, Goldman was unable to escape the dissatisfactions attending sexual love. Perhaps the most important point to be made here—and not coincidentally a point of

commonality in this contrast—is that both Goldman and Day paid careful attention to this aspect of life (Day scrupulously avoiding it, Goldman scrupulously pursuing it) and thus each took responsibility for her sexual life, radically recreating, each in her own way, the role of sexual love in the life of a creatively political woman.

Archives

Recent access to Goldman's papers has encouraged reconsideration of her life. Approximately thirty libraries now own microfilm copies of *The Emma Goldman Papers Project*. More own the first two volumes of her papers (there will eventually be four volumes). This access to primary documents as well as recently published scholarship, including *Feminist Interpretations of Emma Goldman* (2007), encourages readers, scholars and fans to recognize that neither Goldman's demonization by the press from the 1890s through the 1920s nor her romanticization by feminists in the 1970s fully accounts for her complexity and contradictions. *The Goldman Papers* as well as a re-release of Goldman's autobiography, *Living My Life* (2006) brings Goldman back into the foreground of at least an academic (if not a public) social imaginary and allows scholars to begin the long process of reconstructing the complex work of this complex woman. My scholarship contributes to the task of marking Goldman's complex place in feminist, literary, and political history against a backdrop of early-twentieth-century activism.

Thus, the Goldman/Shaw correspondence to which I have devoted considerable attention can be shown to comprise a narrative. The careful reading of the correspondence required to identify that narrative line also presents new questions for scholars, only a few of which I have addressed. The Goldman/Shaw letters and the related correspondence I have examined answered

the question of who was involved in ghost editing Harris's biography on Shaw, a question that Shavian scholars had considered but which, without the narrative line of the letters, they were unable to fully resolve. The correspondence provided a narrative underlying the production of Harris's text on Shaw. And it opened several questions about Goldman's work as ghost editor of other texts such as the Taylor text she mentions in her complaint about not getting paid enough for editing/writing the Shaw text.

My examination of her letters and related correspondence also opens questions about Goldman's relationship with other literary figures and provides evidence suggesting she may have been ghost writing/editing other texts for or with Scully. We know that after she was deported from the U.S. it became harder for her to secure lecture halls and attract audiences, particularly in England but also in Canada. She earned money through her writing, so it would not be surprising to find Goldman had written and/or edited texts that do not carry her name, hints of which may only be found in her voluminous correspondence and in the archived and quite extensive government documents—surveillance records, warrants—documenting the government's efforts to gather information and pass legislation to deport her.

If Goldman represents the anarchist figure haunting the literary imagination and Day the anarchist haunting the Catholic imagination, then Shaw, only tangentially related to anarchism, represents a response to the extremes of anarchism: humans are neither good enough to be left without an imposed political order, nor should they be evil enough to create a revolution and kill for the sake of their ideal.

Appendix
Gender and Anarchism in Modernism: The Case of *The Waste Land*

In his book *Anarchist Modernism: Art, Politics and the First American Avant-garde*, Allan Antliff argues that anarchism added "coherence and direction to modernism in the United States between 1908 and 1920" (2). Antliff does not directly assert that anarchy means organization, but adding "coherence and direction to modernism" makes anarchism an organizing force. Thus, as outlined in the introduction (recall G.K. Roberts in the O.E.D.), anarchism is connected to both chaos and organization; this time Antliff uses it in relation to modern literature.

In an essay published in *Modernism/Modernity*, Redding asserted that the "spectral figure of the anarchist" haunted the modern imagination ("Dream Life" 11). He reiterates that claim in his book and further explains, "One fracture criss-crossing the epistemic fault line of aesthetic modernism is the person of the anarchist, who challenges the political engines of the will to knowledge and forces confrontations" (*Raids* 118). Because anarchists were attempting to rid themselves of oppressive authority—violently when necessary—they caught the imagination of those literary figures who also wanted to rid themselves of authority and sentimentality, and

begin anew. In the figure of anarchist who haunts the modern imagination then, aesthetics, violence and politics merge.[2]

Modernism

Like the word "anarchy," the meanings of "modernism" and "modernity" have shifted over time.[3] Modern inventions such as the internal combustion engine caused changes in traditional ways of life. These forms of industrialization created more opportunities for jobs, travel, and leisure. Peter Gay outlines one condition that allowed for these changes: the expansion of the railroad and other forms of transportation made it easy for passengers and freight to traverse great expanses of land and sea and to do so repeatedly. New and faster forms of transportation allowed factories to increase production and movement of products (Gay 17). Some families left their farms or their fishing boats because they were no longer able to compete with the low prices larger, mechanized businesses offered. They sought jobs in the cities. These jobs were often menial factory work devoid of satisfaction with or connection to the product of their labor (the polar opposite of Peter Kropotkin's anarchist economic system). In short, urbanization occurred. The factory system and the economic growth it produced overwhelmed traditional forms of life and artists and writers responded. Economic growth "was the precondition of mass production and with that the mass consumption of consumer goods

[2] For example, anarchists haunt Henry Miller's *Tropic of Cancer*, Upton Sinclair's *Boston*, Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent,* and Henry James' *The Princess Casamassima*.

[3] The concrete changes in modernity include technological advances like the typewriter, telephone, and factory machines (and with these advances came a new kind of exploitation of workers that Goldman and Day fought), which changed the way people lived their lives. For this standard analysis of modernity as the collapse of traditional forms of social bonding see, Douglas Kellner's *Critical Theory, Marxism and Modernity*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1989, p.3.

including the fine arts" (Gay 18). Economic growth also produced a greater demand for art and literature, including art that might make sense of these dislocations.

In the study of modern literature, scholars originally focused on interpreting the artistic work itself, but more recently they widened the lens with which they viewed these works; sociologists of literature began examining cultural trends, the process of producing and publishing texts, and how literature became a "consumer good." These later scholars ask questions "about the profession and politics of authorship; the institution of publishing; the relationship between literature and the marketplace; the mechanisms of canon formation; the history of reception; and the networks of connection and influence, discipleship, and affiliation, all of which shape literary achievement and reputation" (Felski, "Modernist Studies" 504). By exploring archival and incidental documents, scholars gain a new understanding of the process of producing and the commercial success of modern literature.

Lawrence Rainey was one of the first scholars to explore the marketing and commodification of modern literature and his work shifted the focus of modernist studies. Rita Felski categorizes his branch of scholarship as the sociology of literature. Following this scholarly tradition, Rainey's work suggests that modernism, "is a strategy whereby the work of art invites and solicits its commodification, but does so in such a way that it becomes a commodity of a special sort, one that is . . . integrated into a different economic circuit of patronage, collecting, speculation, and investment . . ." (3). Rainey uncovers the interwoven network of people who bought, published, and collected works and turned them into commodities. Some works landed at the forefront of public attention because of their promotion, not necessarily their literary merit. For example, Rainey's work sheds light on how T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* won *The Dial* magazine's literary award before it was read by judges and even

before it was completed. As commodities, modern texts become intricately encumbered in capitalism. This is particularly significant when these texts contain anarchist elements.

In her essay "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of Modern/Modernity/Modernism," Susan Stanford Friedman points to a recent trend in modernist scholarship: attempting to define "modern," "modernity," and "modernism." She quotes a wide variety of scholars—from Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane to David Harvey—to show the contradictory meanings that comprise these terms. Within these examples, the term "anarchy" occasionally appears. For example, Friedman claims David Harvey's *The Condition of Postmodernity* has been "influential across the disciplines in modernist studies" but also accuses him of "sliding back and forth between 'anarchy' and 'organization' as the defining modes of High Modernism with only occasional allusion to the tension between these meanings" (502). If Harvey means chaos when he uses the term anarchy, then Friedman is accusing him of not addressing the tension between chaos and organization, the same tension in the meaning of the word anarchy described above. In effect then, Friedman criticizes Harvey because he simply relies upon a binary opposition (chaos/order) instead of delving into the tension at play in the distinction. Here, the tension in the meaning of the word "anarchy" echoes a tension within the discourse about modernism. More importantly for our purposes, Friedman, through Harvey, has pointed to a specific problem in defining modernism, and indirectly suggests that there is a tension, not an opposition, between anarchy/chaos and organization.

Within his introduction to *Modernism: the Lure of Heresy. From Baudelaire to Becket and Beyond*, Peter Gay, in effect, dismisses Friedman's and other scholars' concerns about defining modernism. Gay begins, "Modernism is far easier to exemplify than to define" (1). His text provides concrete examples from a variety of genres: prose and poetry, music and dance,

architecture and design, drama and the movies, painting and sculpture. Scholars, Gay boldly asserts, already recognize what makes a work modernist and points to T. S. Eliot's poem *The Waste Land* as an example. Indeed, despite the plethora of contradictions around defining modernism, scholars such as Rita Felski and David Ayers have outlined a few basic characteristics and themes that seem to be accepted by other scholars (or at least not contradicted by them).

Felski writes that literary modernism is "characterized by such features as aesthetic self-consciousness, stylistic fragmentation, and a questioning of representation . . ." (*The Gender of Modernity* 13). Modernist texts also shared a criticism of the changes brought about by the pressures of urbanization and industrialization (Felski, *The Gender of Modernity* 13). David Ayers similarly claims that modernist literary themes include the "nature of selfhood and consciousness, the autonomy of language, the role of art and of the artist, the nature of the industrial world, and the alienation of gendered existence" (x). Felski doesn't offer a solution to the problem of defining modernism. However, the general move among scholars is to narrow the meaning of this term so that it refers only to texts that employ experimental writing.[4]

T.S. Eliot and Women

The Waste Land contains many characteristics of modernist literature listed by scholars Rita Felski, David Ayers and Peter Gay and it represents the masculinist aesthetic to which

[4] Of the three primary writers explored in this dissertation, only Shaw's work could be said to be classically modernist and even that may be controversial. While Peter Gay does not claim Shaw was a modernist, he includes several references to Bernard Shaw in his text on modernism. For example, Gay points to Shaw's "casual attachment to modernist techniques" (350), and calls Shaw a "perceptive critic" (29). As for Shaw's work itself, Gay notes that "*Major Barbara* and *Pygmalion* survive by sheer wit and the author's good humor" and that like Chekhov, "Shaw worked on the margins of modernism. Along with Bertolt Brecht . . . [Shaw] was a playwright most scornful of art for art's sake" (350). This last line suggests that Shaw thought that art served a purpose, and for Shaw was that was often a humorous critique of social and political norms. His critiques endeared him to many readers and theatre-goers of all political persuasions.

Emma Goldman, Bernard Shaw, and Dorothy Day respond.[5] A comparison between the drafts and Eliot's final version of *The Waste Land* suggests that the increasing number of women in the literary workplace affected their representation (or absence) in literary texts.[6] In short, Eliot edited out positive images of women in his poem because he felt they represented the sentimental and, more personally, he felt threatened by women's increasing public presence and agency as evidenced by his correspondence, particularly letters to Ezra Pound.

Eliot, Pound, and Joyce fought to maintain control of the literary culture and the marketplace. This exercise in exorcism can be divided into two interrelated parts. First, these writers wanted to suppress writing they considered to be feminine, which was often women's writing. When writing to his father about the *Egoist*, Eliot says he "struggles to keep the writing as much as possible in Male hands, as I distrust the Feminine in literature [. . .]" (*Letters* 203-204). Second, they exorcise the feminine within their own writing. Joyce writes that *The Waste Land* ends poetry for the ladies, a phrase which Birrell claims praises "the tough, hard and unsentimental style associated with men's writing, a kind of writing which implied careful control over one's emotions and avoidance of self-indulgent personal expression (T. Gilbert 196). In a letter to Pound, Eliot complains of "the feminization of modern society" (*Letters* 96) and then recognizes the threat: "it is imprudent to sneer at the monopolization of literature by women" (*Letters* 96).

Eliot had professional and mentoring relationships with literary women: Djuna Barnes, Virginia Woolf, Marianne Moore, and Katherine Mansfield among others. Yet Eliot made odd

---

[5] If "anarchy" as defined in the OED means chaos, then this poem has been criticized as anarchistic as well. However, thoughtful examination of the anarchistic elements in this poem is beyond the scope of this appendix. For general connections between anarchism, modernism, Judaism, and Emma Goldman see, Marilyn Reizbaum's "Yiddish Modernisms: Red Emma Goldman." *Modern Fiction Studies* 51.2 (2005) 456-481.

[6] Goldman seems to be making her way into Eliot studies—minor reference by minor reference. See James Miller's *T. S. Eliot: The Making of an American Poet 1888-1920*. University Park, PA: Penn State UP, 2005. p. 56.

comments and often gave half-hearted praise to their writing. For example, Eliot "gave some critical attention to Barnes and Moore and then his interest waned" (T. Gilbert 197). His introduction to Djuna Barnes's *Nightwood* provides a more detailed example as it shows his lackluster support. Eliot explains his process of reading the text almost as if his process is more important than the merits of the text itself. He warns the reader of possible confusion: "When I first read the book I found the opening movement rather slow and dragging, until the appearance of the doctor. And throughout the first reading, I was under the impression that it was the doctor alone who gave the book its vitality; and I believed the final chapter to be superfluous" (Barnes xxi). He becomes slightly more generous a few sentences later when he explains that after multiple readings, characters "became alive" and the last chapter is actually essential. The introduction indicates luke-warm support at best. Recently, his introduction led contemporary scholars to question "his editorial cuts in the drafts of *Nightwood*" (T. Gilbert 197).

Eliot responded similarly to Virginia Woolf. In Woolf's journal, she writes that she felt depressed after Eliot's visits because she didn't know how he actually felt about her work. In 1920 she writes, "He completely neglected my claims to be a writer" (*Diary II*, 67). Teresa Gilbert claims that Woolf's "impression was probably well grounded, since Eliot indirectly corroborated her suspicions two years later in a letter to his brother Henry" (197). In that letter, Eliot writes, "there is certainly no contemporary novelist except D. H. Lawrence and of course Joyce in his way, whom I care to read" (Letters I, 617).

Teresa Gilbert lists other literary women who thought Eliot appreciated their work but whom Eliot derided in letters to his male literary friends: Eliot considered Mansfield's writing feminine and unimportant (198). H.D.'s text *Hymen* received the comment "monotonous" and lacking in the element of surprise; he disliked the "neurotic carnality" in her work (*Letters I*

488). Of Gertrude Stein, he said, "Her work is not improving, it is not amusing, it is not interesting, it is not good for one's mind,' ("Charleston, Hey" 595). He called Amy Lowell's *Tendencies in Modern American Poetry* "a very foolish book" (*Letters I* 221). And yet to view only his negative comments about literary women is to misunderstand Eliot's relationships with women. His letters also suggest "a continuing need for caring women" (Scott 124). Early on in his career Eliot admits: "I am very dependent on women (I mean female society); and feel the deprivation at Oxford . . ." (*Letters* 75). While the previous negative comments are directed toward specific women and work, these positive comments refer to women in general or perhaps to a difference between professional appreciation and personal relationship.

Eliot's romantic and familial relationships with women were also conflicted. He loved Emily Hale during 1912 (*Letters*, xxi) and Vivien Haigh-Wood, his first wife. Vivien encouraged, irritated, and inspired him; she also edited his work. But they had a difficult relationship: both Vivien's "The Paralyzed Woman" and Eliot's *The Waste Land* expose their pain and despair. As Eliot's friendship with literary women was undercut by his fear, so too was his love for his wife. He committed Vivien to an insane asylum and never visited or wrote her a single letter; he did, however, spend her money. Here again we find a conflicted Eliot who loved and respected his wife and yet was unwilling to continue to care for her. He had his own bouts with depression and nervous breakdowns and perhaps visiting an institution was too difficult.

Eliot's correspondence also shows that he was quite devoted to his mother Charlotte Eliot. Perhaps he fulfilled his responsibilities to her because she, unlike other women in his life, dominated him. Charlotte, a literary woman herself, "painted and wrote poetry directed toward finding a celestial paradise" (Scott 123). By traditional standards, her poetry was feminine, even sentimental, in nature. Perhaps having identified with her poetry as a child, T.S. found himself

rebelling against sentimentality as an adult. Eliot scholar Lamos writes: "Lyndall Gordon claims that 'Eliot accepted his mother's domination in good humour' and Peter Ackroyd stresses that Eliot 'was genuinely devoted to his mother,' yet his love for his mother coexisted with thinly veiled hostility toward female power" (80). Critics have argued that Eliot's hostility toward women's agency was representative of many men's during this time period because, in part, men and women were competing for the same jobs.[7] For Eliot, the personal became political and poetical.

In his revisions of the poem, he eliminated positive references to the maternal. The changes that Eliot makes between the manuscript and the final version of *The Waste Land* parallel his personal struggles and a larger tension raised in this dissertation: the challenge to traditional ideas about gender and femininity implicit in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century writing.

The Waste Land: A Case Study in Gender Relations

Three references to the maternal in the manuscript disappear in the final poem. The original title of the first section, "He Do the Police in Different Voices," provides the first reference to a verbally expressive mother. Betty Higden, a character in Charles Dickens's *Our Mutual Friend*, is the speaker of the preceding title. The pronoun "he" refers to Sloppy, Betty's adopted son. With motherly pride and maternal authority, Betty says, "I do love a newspaper . . . You mightn't think it, but Sloppy is a beautiful reader of a newspaper. He do the police in different voices" (Dickens, ch xvi).[8] Here, Betty Higden describes Sloppy, but he himself has no voice. As the title of the section of the poem is the same as Betty's last line here, one could

[7] See Rita Felski's *The Gender of Modernity*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995.

[8] Editor Valerie Eliot includes this passage in her editorial notes (fn 1 125).

reasonably argue that the entire section is meant to further define or explain what she means: to give space, dialogue, and meaning to the maternal voice. However, this affirmative portrayal of the maternal vanishes before the final draft. The mother's voice is silenced when the title of this section becomes "The Burial of the Dead."

A second reference to a mother figure also appears in the "He Do the Police in Different Voices" section of the manuscript. Unlike Betty Higgins, the reader is not certain whether Myrtle, the madam of a brothel, is literally the mother of a child, but like Betty, Myrtle acts maternally both in regard to the women in her house and to the speaker. She protects the women in her "decent house" by refusing the drunken speaker's request for a woman (Eliot line 31, page 5).[9] As proprietor of the brothel, Myrtle provides the speaker with a bed, a bath, and a breakfast of ham and eggs (32, 5). Then she says, "And now you get a shave" (33, 5). When Myrtle tells the speaker what he can and cannot have, the speaker feels reassured. Like Eliot, he accepts the maternal figure's authority and love. However, the deletion of this affirmative maternal character in the final manuscript might be symbolic of Eliot's rejection of maternal authority and love; it also helps him define himself as a poet separate from his mother and her poetry.

The Duchess from John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* is the last mother who speaks for herself. In Webster's original text, the Duchess secretly marries Antonio. She thinks he is behind her when she says, "You have cause to love me, I entered you in my heart/ Before you would vouchsafed to call for the keys" (III. ii. 69-70 qtd. in Valerie Eliot fn2, 105). But when she turns around, Ferdinando, the Duchess's brother and enemy, stands there. The Duchess, Antonio, and the children flee shortly thereafter. But Fernando captures them, locks them in a tower and then kills them. The Duchess cannot protect herself and her children. In Eliot's

[9] I include line and page number for clarification. See T.S. Eliot, *T.S. Eliot The Waste Land: A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts Including the Annotations of Ezra Pound*. ed. Valerie Eliot (New York: Hardcourt Brace, 1971).

version, the Duchess's lines are changed slightly at first: "You have cause to love me, I did enter you in my heart/ Before ever you vouchsafed to ask for the key" (38-39,105). Then the Duchess speaks only one line before the speaker summarizes his interpretation of the moment:

> But I know you love me, it must be that you love me
> Then I suppose they found her
> As she turned
> To interrogate the silence fixed behind her. (68-71,107)

The Duchess slowly disappears from the text: she speaks two lines in the first version, then one and then no lines—not even a reference to her—in the final version of the poem. Here, text as embodied voice distances itself from mothers and mothers' voices. The title of this section, "The Death of the Duchess," foreshadows her elimination. Not only do Betty Higden, Myrtle and the Duchess disappear completely in the final draft of *The Waste Land*, the maternal voice disappears; that is, the only mothers left in the final draft are spoken about; they have no lines of their own.

In contrast to previous mothers, a generic mother who appears in the manuscript does not speak. She represents security and comfort and earns only a one-word mention: mother. In this example, a sailor (perhaps Phlebas) tells a story about first seeing icebergs on the horizon:

> And dead ahead we saw, where sky and sea should meet,
> A line, a white line [. . .]
> Towards which we drove.
> My God man there's bears on it.
> Not a chance. Home and mother. (75-79, 61)[10]

This passage is a vision of a shipwreck. Walking on the iceberg with the bears is a necessity and the speaker may die and never make it to home and mother. Then, perhaps to lessen the importance of his fear, he makes a joke: "Where's a cocktail shaker, Ben, here's plenty of cracked ice" (80, 61). The longing returns in the last line of this section: "Remember me" (81,

[10] "Home and mother" appears again in very similar version on line 2 page 69.

61). Who does the speaker want to remember him? His mate Ben (an old term for sailor)? Most likely, in the face of danger, the speaker is still thinking about his mother and his mortality. It is no surprise then when she too disappears in the final poem.

The second time the word "mother'" appears, it acts as an adjective: "Women grown intellectual grow dull/And lose the mother wit of natural trull" (54-55, 41). This loaded reference appears in the middle of the Fresca section, which has many references to prostitutes including "trull." The conflation of "trull" and mother in "mother wit," meaning innate maternal wisdom suggests a mother prostitute. The conflated reference to mother and prostitute reappear later in the same section in the form of Mrs. Porter, madam of a Cairo brothel. Mrs. Porter and her daughter were well-known to Australian troops, and the troops created risqué lyrics to the tune of a popular ragtime song (Parker). In the following lines Eliot refers to the song:

> The sounds of horns and motors, which shall bring
> Sweeney to Mrs. Porter in the spring.
> O the moon shone bright on Mrs. Porter
> And on her daughter
> They wash their feet in soda water. (III. 197-200)

According to Eliot's notes, line 197 refers to Day's poem "Parliament of the Bees"(fn197, 147). The sounds of horns and motors could also refer to the soldiers' imagined end of the Gallipoli campaign (Parker) and bring Sweeney, Eliot's name for a brutish man in earlier poems, back to his mother/prostitute. Lines 198-200 are, I believe, the actual lines to the song. In the last line, the troops are not singing about the women's feet (Asher 44). Although literally a mother, Mrs. Porter hardly seems maternal as she allows her daughter to prostitute herself. Perhaps because of this, she, as mother, prostitute, and married woman (indicated by the "Mrs".) is the first and only mother who reappears in the final draft, unchanged. Because Mrs. Porter is more of a prostitute than a mother she does not represent sentimentality.

The only other reference to the maternal in both drafts is Highbury, metaphorical mother. In the manuscript she appears three times: "Highbury bore me" (8, 13 51) and "Highbury's children/Played under green trees and in the dusty Park" (8-9 51). None of these images is particularly loaded with meaning or emotion. The innocuous Highbury in the manuscript does nothing more than birth the speaker. While "Highbury bore me," appears in the final draft, the line becomes a comparison between what these towns have done for or to the speaker: "Richmond and Kew/Undid me" (III. 293-4). The maternal is simply not very important here.

The final draft of *The Waste Land* contains three references to the maternal not found in the manuscript; a murdering mother, a lamenting mother, and a son lamenting the loss of his mother. In the first example, Eliot alludes to the Tereus and Philomela story three times in three different sections of the poem. In the story, Procne kills her son Itys to avenge the rape and mutilation of her sister Philomela. Procne's husband Tereus is the rapist. He cuts out Philomela's tongue so she cannot tell anyone what happened. But Procne discovers the truth and punishes her husband by killing their son. Twice Itys, the loving son, attempts to throw his arms around his mother. Once he succeeds and dispels her murderous thoughts with his innocence. The second time he tries to hug her, she stabs him, cuts his body in pieces and feeds them to her husband Tereus (North 46-50). When the sisterhood bond and the maternal bond conflict, sisterhood wins. Procne represses her maternal love in favor of revenge. Here is Eliot's summary of the tale:

> The change of Philomel, by the barbarous king
> So rudely forced; yet there the nightingale
> Filled all the desert with inviolable voice
> And still she cried, and still the world pursues,
> 'Jug Jug' to dirty ears.
> And other withered stumps of time
> Were told upon the walls . . . . (II. 99-104)

Eliot refers to the rape again in lines 203-206:

> Twit twit twit
> Jug jug jug jug jug jug
> So rudely forc'd
> Tereu

In all three allusions, Eliot focuses on Philomela, her ineffectual attempts to communicate ("Jug Jug") what has been done to her, the innocent, seemingly powerless victim. Procne, the powerful and dangerous sister/mother, is here too although not as obviously as Philomela. In the early versions of this story, the Olympian Gods turn all three characters into birds. In Ovid's version, Pronce becomes a nightingale, Philomela, a sparrow, and Tereus, a hoopoe. Thus, the "twit twit" in the above line then might allude to Pronce, the "jug jug" to the voiceless sparrow Philomela and Tereu to Tereus. In line 428 the allusion to Philomela is clearer: "Quando fiam ceu chelidon—O swallow swallow" (Translation: When shall I become like the swallow?). Eliot may have hidden the mother figure in this section in order to eliminate any suggestion of sentimentality in the poem and also to assert his own manhood symbolically.

The Waste Land is still what it was written to be: crises ridden, chaotic (or anarchistic) and fragmented. Between the manuscript and the final draft, the poem becomes defined by what it is not—not feminine, not maternal. Thus, the final draft is a reaction to the maternal. The striking out of the maternal voice suggests that Eliot found a way out of the crisis with the feminine. And yet, the maternal echoes through the vague allusion to Philomela, the lamenting mother, and the boy mourning the loss of his mother. But more important than these echoes, the missing maternal (the echo) has a presence in its absence.

In the end, it is not certain whether the references to the maternal in the final draft of *The Waste Land* were eliminated because Eliot thought they made the poem sentimental with their

pride, love, or sexuality,[11] or for other aesthetic reasons. The shift away from the maternal in the poem suggests Eliot's own movement away from maternal figures in his life. More importantly, *The Waste Land* is defined by what it is not: unified and maternal.

Through Eliot's drafts, the marks of exclusion of the maternal suggest a relationship between Eliot's elimination of the positive references to women in his poem and women's increasing presence in the public sphere. Eliot's poem is his response to an element of his historical moment: the changing power and presence of women in the public sphere. As such, it informs our understanding of the forces at play on the aesthetic anarchism of Emma Goldman and Dorothy Day.

[11] For evidence of Eliot and Pound's decision to rid their writing of sentimentality, see *The Letters of T.S. Eliot*, ed. Valerie Eliot. New York: Mariner Books, 1990.

Works Cited

"Anarchy." Def. 1, 2. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Third Edition.1993. Print.

"Anarchy." Def. 1, 2a. *Oxford English Dictionary Online.* 8 June 2009. Web.

"Anarchy." *Wikipedia.* 10 June 2009.Web.

Anderson, Margaret. "Emma Goldman in Chicago." *Mother Earth.* 9.10, 1914: 320-24. Print.

"'APXH'." Liddell and Scott. *Greek-English Lexicon* (abridged). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982. Print.

Asher, Kenneth. *T.S. Eliot and Ideology.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.

Bakunin, Mikhail. "1873 Statism and Anarchy." *Bakunin on Anarchy: Selected Works by the Activist-Founder of World Anarchism*. Ed. Trans. Sam Dolgoff. Preface by Paul Avrich. New York: Knopf, 1972. Print.

Barnes, Djuna. *Nightwood*. New York, NY: New Directions Publishing. 2006, 1936c.

Berrigan, Daniel. Introduction to *The Long Loneliness: An Autobiography by Dorothy Day.* New York: Harper and Row Pub., 1952. Print.

Blatt, Martin. *Free Love and Anarchism: The Biography of Ezra Heywood*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1989.

Bochner, Jay. "The Marriage of Rogue and The Soil." *Little Magazines and Modernism.* Eds. Suzanne Churchill and Adam McKible. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. Print.

Boulton, Agnes. *Part of a Long Story: Eugene O'Neill as a Young Man in Love.* London: Peter Davis, 1958. Print.

Brooks, Van Wyck. *The Confident Years, 1885-1915*. London: JM Dent, 1952. Print.

Castoriadis, Cornelius. *The Imaginary Institution of Society.* Trans. Kathleen Blamey. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987. Print.

Chatfield, Charles. "Dorothy Day, the Catholic Worker, and American Pacifism." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. May 1951: 1-2. *The Dorothy Day Library on the Web.* 1 May 2009. Web.

Churchill, Suzanne and Adam McKible. *Little Magazines and Modernism.* VT: Ashgate, 2007. Print.

Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." Eds. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen. *Signs*, 1.4 Summer 1976: 875-893. *JSTORE*. Web. 18 May 2010.

Clark, Suzanne. *Sentimental Modernism: Women Writers and the Revolution of the Word.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991. Print.

Coles, Robert. *Dorothy Day: A Radical Devotion*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1987. Print.

Conor, Liz. *The Spectacular Modern Woman*: *Feminine Visibility in the 1920s.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2004. Print.

Cowley, Malcolm. *Exiles' Return: A Literary Odyssey of the 1920s*. New York: Viking Press,1934. Print

"Czolgosz, The Anarchist Who attempted to Kill the Chief Executive, Confesses to Police that Murderous Assault Is Result of Conspiracy, Emma Goldman Arrested in Chicago, Being the Only Accomplice." *San Francisco Call.* Sept 11, 1901. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 47.

David, Henry. *The History of the Haymarket Affair: A Study in the American Social-Revolutionary and Labor Movements*. New York: Russel and Russel, 1964. Print.

Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race & Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1983. Print.

Day, Dorothy. "Are the Leaders Insane?" *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. April 1954:1,6. Print.

----. "The Case of Cardinal McIntyre." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. July-August 1964:1,6,8. Print.

----."Charles O'Rourke—The Death of a Beloved Apostle." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. July/August 1950: 1-2. Print.

----. "Day by Day." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. June 1934: 7. Print.

----. "Day by Day." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. August 1934: 4. Print.

----. "Drab Futility in Workers' Letters." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. May 1933: 3. Print.

----. *The Eleventh Virgin*. New York: Albert & Charles Boni, 1924. Print.

----. "Fear in Our Time." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. April 1968: 5,7. Print.

----. "Filling a Need." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. May 1933: 4. Print.

----. *From Union Square to Rome.* New York: Arno Press, 1938. Print.

----. *House of Hospitality.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1939. Print.

---. "The Incompatibility of Love and Violence." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. May 1951: 1-2. *The Dorothy Day Library on the Web.* Web. 1 Oct. 2009.

----. "Is the Problem Black or White?" *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. May 1933: 3. Print.

----. *Loaves and Fishes.* Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1997, 1963c. Print.

----. *The Long Loneliness: An Autobiography.* New York: Harper and Row Pub., 1952. Print.

----. *On Pilgrimage.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1999. Print.

----. “On Pilgrimage.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. March 1965: 1, 2, 6. *The Dorothy Day Library on the Web.* Web. 15 Oct. 2008.

----. “On Pilgrimage.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. October 1950:1, 2. *The Dorothy Day Library on the Web.* Web. 15 Oct. 2008.

----. “On Pilgrimage.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. March 1965: 1-2,6. Print.

----. “On Pilgrimage.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. January 1974: 1-2, 4. Print.

----. “On Pilgrimage—Fall Appeal.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. November 1957: 2. *The Dorothy Day Library on the Web.* Web. 15 Oct. 2008.

----. “On Pilgrimage—Our Spring Appeal.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. May 1970: 1,2, 11. *The Dorothy Day Library on the Web.* Web. 15 Oct. 2008.

----. “To Our Readers.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. May 1933: 4. *The Dorothy Day Library on the Web.* Web. 20 Oct. 2008.

----. “The Pope and Peace.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. February 1954: 1,7. Print.

----. “A Reminiscence at 75.” *Commonweal.* 90 (1973):424. *The Dorothy Day Library on the Web.* Web. 15 Oct. 2008.

----.“Reflections During Lent- Part 4:Obedience." *Ave Maria*. 17 Dec. 1966: 20-23. Print.

----. “The Scandal of the Works of Mercy.” *Commonweal*. 51 (1949): 104. Print.

----.“Speaking of Anarchism.” *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. February 1948: 1,2 6. Print.

----. “Wide Scope Noted.” *The New York Times*. 7 Sept. 1939: 33. Print.

Diggins, John Patrick. *Eugene O’Neill’s America: Desire Under Democracy*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2007. Print.

Dolgoff, Sam. *Bakunin on Anarchy: A New Selection of Writings nearly all Published for the First Time in English by the Founder of the Anarchist Movement.* New York: Knopf, 1972. Print.

Domas, Louis J. Report to George B. Billings, Commissioner of Immigration, Boston MA. Surveillance Files. Department of Commerce and Labor, U.S. Government. Nov. 19th, 1907. *The Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 56.

Drinnon, Richard. *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 1961. Print.

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

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brother Karamazov*. Ed. Ralph E Matlaw. Trans. Constance Garnett. New York: W.W. Norton, 1976. Print.

Edwards, Shoshana. "The Worthy Adversaries: Benjamin R. Tucker and G. Bernard Shaw" in *Benjamin R. Tucker and the Champions of Liberty: A Centenary Anthology*. Eds. Michael E. Coughlin and Mark A. Sullivan. New York: Michael E. Coughlin, 1986. *Uncle Taz: The First Anarchosophic Web Page in the World*. 12 Oct. 2009. <http://uncletaz.com/liberty/shaw.html>.Web.

Eliot, Valerie, ed. *The Letters of T.S. Eliot.* New York: Harcourt, 1988. Print.

Eliot, Tomas Sterns. *The Letters of T.S. Eliot*. Ed. Valerie Eliot. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1988.

---. *For Lancelot Andrewes.* New York: Doubleday, 1929. Print.

---. *T.S. Eliot The Waste Land: A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts Including the Annotations of Ezra Pound.* Ed. Valerie Eliot. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1971. Print.

---. "Tradition and the Individual Talent." *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methune,1922. Print.

Ellis, Mark. *A Year at The Catholic Worker*. New York: Paulist Press, 1978. Print.

Ellsberg, Robert. "Sacco and Vanzetti." *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. July-August 1977: 1-2. Print.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "The American Scholar." 1837. *Ralph Waldo Emerson Texts.* Ed. Jone Johnson Lewis. 1 January 2010. <http://www.emersoncentral.com/amscholar.htm>. Web.

Emma Goldman. American Experience. PBS. 11 March 2004. Transcript. 20 Apr. 2003 <www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/goldman/filmmore/pt.html>. Web.

"Emma Goldman, High Priestess of Anarchy, Whose Speeches Inspired Czolgosz to His Crime." *Chicago Tribune.* Sept. 8th, 1901. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 47.

Falls, Arthur. "Communist Says, 'Welcome Negro Brothers!'" *The Catholic Worker* [New York]. April 1934: 1. Print.

Falk, Candace, Barry Pateman, et. al. Eds. *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of The Americans Years. Making Speech Free, (1902-1909).* Vol. 2 Chicago: U of Illinois P, 2007. Print.

---. Barry Pateman, et. al. Eds. *Emma Goldman: A Documentary History of The American Years. Made in America. (1890-1901)*. Vol. 1 Berkeley : University of California Press, 2003. Print.

---. Ronald J. Zboray and Daniel Cornford. Eds. *The Emma Goldman Papers: A Microfilm Edition*, 69 reels. Alexandria, Va. : Chadwyck-Healey, 1990-1993. Microform.

---. *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman.* New Brunswick, NJ : Rutgers UP, 1990. Print.

Felski, Rita. *The Gender of Modernity.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995. Print.

---. "Modernist Studies and Cultural Studies: Reflections on Methods." *Modernism/modernity.* 10.3 September 2003: 501-517. *Project MUSE*. Web. 18 Jan. 2009.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of Modern/Modernity/Modernism." *Modernism/modernity* 8.3 September 2001: 493-513. Print.

Froula, Christine. *Modernism's Body: Sex, Culture and Joyce.* New York: Columbia UP, 1996. Print.

Gay, Peter. *Modernism: The Lure of Heresy. From Baudelaire to Becket and Beyond.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2008. Print.

Gibbs, A.M. *Bernard Shaw: A Life.* Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2005. Print.

---. *A Bernard Shaw Chronology.* New York: Palgrave, 2001. Print.

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *No Man's Land: The Place of the Women Writer in the Twentieth Century.* Vol. 1 New Haven: Yale UP, 1989. Print.

Gilbert, Teresa. "T.S. Eliot and the Feminist Revision of the Modern(ist) Canon." *T.S. Eliot and Our Turning World.* Ed. Jewel Spears Brooker. New York: St. Martin Press, 2001: 191-204. Print.

Glassgold. Peter, ed. *Anarchy: An Anthology of Emma Goldman's Mother Earth.* Washington D.C.: Counterpoint, 2001. Print.

Golding, Alan. "*The Dial, The Little Review* and the Dialogics of Modernism." *Little Magazines and Modernism.* Suzanne Churchill and Adam McKible, eds. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. Print.

Goldman, Emma. "Anarchism: What It Really Stands for." *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat, 1910. Print.

---. *The Emma Goldman Papers: A Microfilm Edition*, 69 reels. Eds. Candace Falk, Ronald J. Zboray and Daniel Cornford. Alexandria, Va. : Chadwyck-Healey, 1990-1993. Microform.

---."George Bernard Shaw: A Biographical Sketch." Unpublished Manuscript. n.d. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 54, item 12.

---. Introduction. *The Social Significance of Modern Drama.* New York: Applause Theatre Books, 1987. Print.

---. Letter to Alexander Berkman. Dec. 17th, 1927. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 19.

---. Letter to Alexander Berkman. June 29th, 1928. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 20.

---. Letter to Alexander Berkman. Feb. 20th, 1929. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 20.

---. Letter to Alexander Berkman. Dec. 12th, 1931. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 25.

---. Letter to Arthur Ross. Sept 7th, 1928. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 20.

---. Letter to Ben Reitman. May 31st, 1909. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 3.

---. Letter to Bernard Shaw. March 2nd, 1937. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 39.

---. Letter to Bernard Shaw. May 7th, 1937. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 39.

---. Letter to Cassius Cook. Sept. 29th, 1935. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 35.

---. Letter to Evelyn Scott. Nov. 21st, 1927. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 36.

---. Letter to Frank Harris. August 7th, 1925. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 15.

---. Letter to Frank Scully. Nov. 18th, 1931. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 25.

---. Letter to Havelock Ellis. Nov. 8th, 1925. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 15.

---. Letter to Henry Alsberg. March 24th, 1931.*The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 23.

---. Letter to Tom Bell. July 1st, 1937. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 40.

---."The Life and Works of George Bernard Shaw." Unpublished Manuscript. n.d. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Ed. Candace Falk. Microform. Reel 60.

---. *Living My Life*. 2 vols., 1931. New York: Dover, 1970. Print.

---. "Major Barbara." *The Social Significance of Modern Drama.* New York: Applause Theatre Books, 1987. Print.

---. "Majorities and Minorities." *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat, 1910. Print.

---. *My Disillusionment with Russia.* New York: Doubleday, Page and Co, 1923. Print.

---. "Prisons." *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat, 1910. Print.

---. "Psychology of Political Violence." *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat, 1910. Print.

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

---. "Victims of Morality." *Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman.* Ed. Alix Kates Shulman. New York: Random House, 1972. Print.

---.*The Social Significance of Modern Drama.* New York: Applause Theatre Books, 1987. Print.

---. "The Traffic in Women." *Anarchism and Other Essays.* New York: Dover Publications, 1969. Print.

---. "What I Believe." *Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings & Speeches by Emma Goldman.* Ed. Alix Kates Shulman. New York: Random House,1972. Print.

Goodway, David. *Anarchist Seeds Beneath the Snow: Left-Libertarian Thought and British Writers from William Morris to Colin Ward.* Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2006. Print.

Haaland, Bonnie. *Emma Goldman: Sexuality and the Impurity of the State*. New York: Black Rose Books, 1993. Print.

Harris, Frank. *Contemporary Portraits.* Forth Series. New York: Brentanos, 1923. Print.

---. *Bernard Shaw: An Unauthorized Biography Based on First Hand Information.* NY: Simon and Schuster, 1931. Print.

Holzman, Michael. "Anarchism and Utopia: William Morris's *News from Nowhere." ELV*. 51.3 Autumn 1984: 589-603. *JSTORE.* Web. 18 July 2009.

Irigaray, Luce. *Elemental Passions.* Trans. Joanne Collie and Judith Still. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Jordan, Patrick. Introduction. *Dorothy Day: Writings from Commonweal*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2002. Print.

Kauffman, Reginald Wright. *The House of Bondage.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Gregg Press, 1968, 1910c. Print.

Klejment, Anne. *Dorothy Day and The Catholic Worker: A Bibliography and Index.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1986. Print.

Kropotkin, Peter. "Anarchism." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 1910. *Anarchy Archives.* Web. 14 November 2009.

---. *Anarchist Morality. Anarchy Archives.* Web. 15 August 2010.

---. *The Conquest of Bread (La Conquête du Pain*). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons,1892. Trans. 1906. *Anarchist Archives.*Web. 12 Dec. 2008.

---. *Mutual Aid*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1989. Print.

---. ed. *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters:1911-1925.* v. 1-4. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1965. Print.

---. *Shaw: An Exhibit.* Austin, TX: Humanities Research Center, The University of Texas, 1977. Print.

Lamos, Colleen. "The End of Poetry of Ladies: T.S. Eliot's Early Poetry." *Deviant Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.

Laurence, Dan. H., *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1983. Print.

Marshall, Peter. *Demanding the Impossible: The History of Anarchism.* Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2010, 1992c. Print.

Marshik, Celia. *British Modernism and Censorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

McKanan, Dan. *The Catholic Worker after Dorothy Day: Practicing the Works of Mercy in a New Generation.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press. 2008. Print.

Miller, William D. *A Harsh and Dreadful Love: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*. New York: Liveright, 1973. Print.

Morton, Keith and John Saltmarsh. "A Cultural Context for Understanding Dorothy Day's Social and Political Thought." *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movements: Centenary Essays.* Marquette Studies in Theology, no. 32. Eds. William J. Thorn, Phillip M. Runkel, and Susan Mountin. Milwaukee: Marquette UP, 2001. Print.

North, Michael. *The Waste Land: Authoritative Text*. New York: Norton, 2001. Print.

O'Connor, June. *The Moral Vision of Dorothy Day: A Feminist Perspective.* New York: Crossroad, 1991. Print.

Parker, Rickard. "The Waste Land." *Exploring "The Waste Land."* 30 March 2007. Web.

Pearce, Joseph. *Literary Converts: Spiritual Inspiration in an Age of Unbelief.* London: Haper Collins, 1999. Print.

Peters, Margo. Introduction. *Mrs. Warren's Profession: A Facsimile of the Holograph Manuscript by Bernard Shaw*. New York: Garland Pub, 1981. Print.

Porter, David. *Vision on Fire: Emma Goldman on the Spanish Revolution*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2006. Print.

Pound, Ezra. *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound 1907-1941*. Ed. D.D. Paige. New York: New Directions,1971.

The Radical Periodicals in the US. First series 1888-1960. Preface by Dorothy Day. New York Library, 1969. Print.

Rainey, Laurence. *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Popular Culture.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1998. Print.

Redding, Arthur. "The Dream Life of Political Violence: Georges Sorel, Emma Goldman, and the Modern Imagination." *Modernism/Modernity* 2.2 (1995): 1–16. *Project Muse.* Web. 10 Jan. 2009.

Reizbaum, Marilyn. "Yiddish Modernisms: Red Emma Goldman." *Modern Fiction Studies.* 51.2 Summer, 2005: 456-481. *Project Muse*. Web.15 Jan 2010.

Schott, Linda. *Reconstructing Women's Thoughts: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom before World War I.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1977. Print.

Shaw, George Bernard. *Bernard Shaw and Alfred Douglas: A Correspondence*. Ed. Mary Hyde New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1982. Print.

---. *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters.* Ed. Dan H. Laurence. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1965. Print.

---. "Major Barbara." *Selected Plays with Prefaces*. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co., 1948. Print.

---. *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. Ed. Leonard Conolly. Orchard Park, New York: Broadview Editions, 2005. Print.

---. *Mrs. Warren's Profession: A Facsimile of the Holograph Manuscript*. New York: Garland Pub, 1981. Print.

---. "Preface on Bosses (The Millionairess)." *Bernard Shaw: The Complete Prefaces Vol. 3: 1930-1950.* Eds. Dan H. Lawrence and Daniel J. Leary. London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1997. Print.

---. *Selected Plays with Prefaces*. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co., 1948. Print.

---. "What's in a Name? How an Anarchist Might Put It." *Liberty.* April 11th, 1885:7. *Uncle Taz: The First Anarchosophic Web Page in the World*. <http://uncletaz.com/liberty/shaw.html>. 17 March 2009. Web.

---. "The Zurich Anarchist Conference." *Freedom*, 1893. *Dan Laurence Collection*, University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada. Print.

Shulman, Alix Kates, ed. *Red Emma Speaks*. New York*:* Humanity Books, 1986. Print.

Sicius, Francis. "The Chicago Catholic Worker." *A Revolution of the Heart.* Ed. Patrick Coy. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1988. Print.

Szladits, Lola. *New in the Berg Collection 1970-72.* New York Public Library Collection. New York: BNYPL, 1973. Print.

Terrell, Mary Church. *A Colored Woman in a White World.* Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2005. Print.

Thompson, Francis. "The Hound of Heaven." *The Oxford Book of English Mystical Verse*. Ed. D.H. S. Nicholson & A. H. E. Lee. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1917. *Internet Archive.* 6 March 2009. Web.

Thorn, William, Phillip Runkel, and Susan Mountin, eds. *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary Essays.* Marquette: Marquette UP, 2001. Print.

Thoreau, Henry David. *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*. Civil Disobedience. Ed. Jone Johnson Lewis. 7 January 2008. <http://www.transcendentalists.com/civil_disobedience.htm >. Web.

Tobin A. I. and Elmer Gertz. *Frank Harris: A Study in Black and White*. Chicago: Madeleine Mendelssohn, 1931. Print.

Weintraub, Stanley, ed. *The Playwright and the Pirate Bernard Shaw and Frank Harris: A Correspondence*. University Park, Penn: Penn State UP, 1982. Print.

Wells, Ida B. *Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells.* Ed Alfreda Duster. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970. Print.

---. "Lynching Laws in Georgia: a Six-weeks' Record in the Center of Southern Civilization, as Faithfully Chronicled by the "Atlanta Journal" and the "Atlanta Constitution"; also the Full Report of Louis P. Le Vin, the Chicago Detective Sent to Investigate the Burning of, the Torture and Hanging of Elijah Strickland, the Colored Preacher, and the Lynching of Nine Men for Alleged Arson." 1899. *African American Perspectives: Pamphlets from the Daniel A. P. Murray Collection, 1818-1907.* 10 Oct. 2009. Web.

---.*Southern Horrors and Other Writings: The Anti-Lynching Campaign of Ida B. Wells, 1892-1900.* Ed. Jacqueline Jones Royster. Bedford Books: Boston, 1997. Print.

Wexler, Alice. *Emma Goldman in Exile: From the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1989. Print.

"Wide Scope Noted in Catholic Papers: Publications in U.S. Show Their Freedom Especially in Politics, Ridder Says." *New York Times*. 7 Sept. 1939: 33. Print.

Wilde, Oscar. *DeProfundis: The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*. Ed. M. Holland New York: Harper Collins, 2003. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *Diary, Vol II.* New York: Harvest Books, 1980. Print.