



Herald of the future? Emma Goldman, Friedrich Nietzsche and the anarchist as superman

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Morgan, K. (2009). Herald of the future? Emma Goldman, Friedrich Nietzsche and the anarchist as superman. *Anarchist Studies*, 17(2), 55-80.

Published in:

Anarchist Studies

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



Herald of the future? Emma Goldman, Friedrich Nietzsche and the anarchist as superman

Kevin Morgan

In its heyday around the turn of the twentieth century, Emma Goldman more than anybody personified anarchism for the American public. Journalists described her as anarchy's 'red queen' or 'high priestess'. At least one anarchist critic was heard to mutter of a 'cult of personality'.¹ Twice, in 1892 and 1901, Goldman was linked in the public mind with the *attentats* or attempted assassinations that were the movement's greatest advertisement. The resulting notoriety helped Goldman reach wide audiences through her journalism and lecture tours, and in 1911 she cemented her reputation with her first book *Anarchism and Other Essays*. The book began with a biographical essay by her comrade Hippolyte Havel expounding what by now was the Goldman legend of the 'pure and simple' anarchist moulding hearts and minds by sheer eloquence and energy.² Refusing embodiment in party rules and structures, anarchy thus achieved symbolic representation through the force of the charismatic individual. Some years earlier, after serving a ten-month prison sentence for alleged incitement to riot, Goldman commented that the target of the prosecution was not 'little Emma Goldman' but the spirit and principles of Anarchy itself.³ These principles, conversely, could no more be abstracted from such individuals than, as anarchists themselves would have insisted, the higher ideals of social democracy could be extricated from the state and party structures through which in theory they were to be realised.

With this as its rationale, the present article explores some relatively neglected aspects of anarchism's spirit and principles through their exemplification by Goldman herself. Its point of departure is the quality of 'egotism' with which Goldman seemed at once to reconcile and confuse the commitments to individual freedom and unforced mutuality that were at the heart of anarchism's more basic ambiguity. She registered this perfectly in her first extended newspaper interview.

There are some that, if asked why they are Anarchists, will say, 'for the good of the people'. It is not true, and I do not say it. I am an Anarchist because I am an egotist. It pains me to see others suffer. ... So, because what others suffer makes me suffer, I am an Anarchist and give my life to the cause, for only through it can be ended all suffering and want and unhappiness.⁴

Goldman's outrage at human suffering, and at its terminable causes in structures of oppression, was to be demonstrated throughout her political life. What remained ambiguous, and not just in this interview, was the agency of the afflicted in the removal of these sufferings. Anarchism, in Goldman's time and for the foreseeable future, was necessarily the movement of a minority. What was less clear was whether its demonstrative forms, from assassination to the temporary occupation of public spaces, were intended as a catalyst or as a surrogate for wider mobilisations; or whether indeed they primarily served an expressive function in respect of anarchists' own collective egotism. Despite obvious differences in rhetorics and value-systems, such tensions have characterised disparate minority movements for social transformation; especially those whose minority status was linked with perceived limitations of popular consciousness. It was on these grounds, not just those of

conspiracy, that Lenin in the same period justified his notion of the vanguard party.⁵ Though Goldman's and Lenin's names are rarely linked except as contraries, anarchism too was expressly a movement of the 'Avant-Guard', upholding a better future against the tenacity of the past in the actually existing present.⁶ In her explicit legitimisation of such minorities, Goldman even spoke, as the Bolsheviks later acted, against the 'compact, immobile, drowsy mass, of the Russian peasant'.⁷ Though she was anything but a Leninist, in this perhaps lay the basis of her brief and ill-starred collaboration with the Bolsheviks at the time of war communism.

Such considerations some fresh ways of conceptualising the tensions commonly recognised as existing within anarchism. Standard accounts, like those of Daniel Guérin and David Miller, recognise a basic tension between what Guérin describes as 'social' and 'individual' anarchism.⁸ Although Guérin notes that the differences between these approaches have frequently been overstated, anarchists themselves devoted a good deal of effort to arguing through the respective claims of a Stirnerite individualism and the communistic strain at this time most identified with Kropotkin.⁹ The same tension has also served to locate anarchism somewhere between, or else transcending, socialism and liberalism. In their *History of Economic Doctrines*, Charles Gide and Charles Rist described it as 'a curious fusion of Liberal and socialist doctrines'.¹⁰ So did the anarchist Rudolf Rocker in his *Anarcho-Syndicalism*.¹¹ Michael Freeden, employing the same ideological reference points, has more recently described anarchism as an umbrella term covering distinct, perhaps incompatible tendencies.¹² Such examples could be multiplied. Given the modern predicament of reconciling principles of liberty and equality, a maximalist recognition of both, whatever the issues of rigour or practicality, at least is an attractive and defensible position to occupy. Precisely the refusal to compromise on essentials, at the cost of imprisonment, exile or political ostracisation, is the outstanding character trait brought out by Goldman's several biographers.¹³

Without calling into question her qualities of moral and political courage, I want to propose a less innocent reading of Goldman's anarchism. She was not, it is true, primarily a thinker but an animator. According to one recent biography, her life does not provide 'intellectual solution' but a personal exemplar of 'unfailing effort towards liberation'.¹⁴ Approaching the subject as a historian of communism, I have countless times encountered such exemplary lives, often of wholly admirable character. Neither in one case nor the other, however, can the intellectual and political construction of their motive-force be set aside. The slipperiness and malleability of an idea like liberation has all too often lain in imprecision as to who was to be liberated, by whom and from what. In affirming a sort of absolute value of human liberation, against oppressions identified with the existence of government itself, anarchists at first sight avoided if they did not entirely resolve such dilemmas. An unfailing vocabulary of liberation, however, could disguise quite basic transitions. With the ebb and flow of the movement with which she identified, what Goldman sometimes depicted as the liberation of the many was also reconfigured as liberation *from* the many, or the 'herd', 'mob' or even 'canaille' which now displaced the accent on the 'People'. Goldman's clear and explicit elitism may not have been inherent in anarchism itself. It does, however, suggest the need to historicise both the movement and its ideas, so that Goldman's deep ambivalence towards the masses can also be located within the contemporary literary culture to which she was at least as receptive as to she was to specifically anarchist texts. It is occasionally suggested that the history of anarchism can only properly be written by anarchists. Among the many problems with such a notion is its essentialism. Goldman was never just an anarchist,

so that all sorts of other qualifications might also be necessary to write her life, leaving nobody who could finally meet them unless it were Goldman herself. The sometimes complacent and self-serving character of her autobiography, like that of so many political figures, is warning enough against such a limitation.

The faultline revealed here does not lie between socialism and liberalism, but between respectively elitist and popular or 'democratic' conceptions of social change. Goldman's rejection of democracy, like Lenin's, reflected scepticism as to structures of oppression which the supposed authority of the people merely dissimulated. That the real authority of the people offered any immediate alternative was in both cases unclear. In Freedom's terms of logical or cultural adjacency, the 'core' anarchist concept of freedom might rather be advanced at the expense of the masses who, through docility, complicity or active persecution, threatened this quality of freedom. The same quality was embodied, not so much in particular moral or legal practices, as in the free and implicitly superior individual. Michels in his *Political Parties* assimilated this to his notion of an irrepressible tendency to oligarchy, but in older form than that of the mass party. 'These are the means utilized by the apostle and the orator: the flaming power of thought, greatness of self-sacrifice, profundity of conviction. Their dominion is exercised', he went on, 'not over the organization, but over minds; it is the outcome, not of technical indispensability, but of intellectual ascendancy and moral superiority.'¹⁵

In exploring these issues here, particular attention will be given to the fascination felt by Goldman for the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche's contempt for the masses has often been identified with the authoritarian right, and it may be that anarchism as a movement without an immediately plausible conception of popular social agency was especially susceptible to such influences. On the other hand, the contemporaneous example of revolutionary syndicalism shows how notions of mass revolt and directive minority could also become conflated in grassroots mobilisations against the existing social order. These again are suggestive of a historical moment in which the prospect of a new and higher humanity captured radical imaginations without as yet having revealed its catastrophic darker side. As it did so, in the militarism of the Great War and in the authoritarian regimes which followed, a Nietzschean rhetoric of the superman became discredited. The dilemma to which this then gave rise, of sustaining the refusal of existing structures of oppression in spite of scepticism as to the promise of epochal transformation, is one that remains with us. As one of Bolshevism's most outspoken left-wing critics in the 1920s, Goldman was among the first to experience this dilemma, as the revolution itself fell victim to the tyranny of the masses.

Propaganda as the deed

At the root of Goldman's anarchism lay the idea of propaganda by the deed. In the years in which she first embraced its principles, anarchism was identified with a series of sensational *attentats* symbolising its rejection of established authority and recognition of a state of open social war. Removed in this way were heads of state or government in Italy, France and Spain, and many others simply bystanders in the affairs of state. The resulting publicity and political reaction helped generate the image of a movement at once at the margins of society and at the centre of its political consciousness.¹⁶ It was on the basis of this paradox that Goldman, without the support of party or popular mandate, established herself as a figure of national repute. Like

other anarchist propagandists, she had to challenge preconceptions of the movement as merely one of ‘bomb throwers’.¹⁷ But she also understood that precisely this misconception helped stimulate the wider interest on which her growing fame depended. It is hardly surprising that her attitude to political violence was equivocal and inconsistent. No ‘truly great Anarchist leader’, she once claimed, ever advocated violence.¹⁸ She might have added that none, in her view, should condemn it either; rather, they should indict only the present order of society that was ultimately the cause of every act of violence, whatever its immediate source. At the international anarchist congress held in Amsterdam in 1907, it was Goldman and her American comrade Max Baginski who successfully moved a resolution upholding the right of ‘Individual and Collective Terror’.¹⁹

The roots of this outlook predated her anarchism.. Born in Kovno, Lithuania, in 1869, as a girl in St Petersburg Goldman already sensed the mystique of the ‘heroes and martyrs’ executed in 1881 for the assassination of Alexander II.²⁰ These sentiments were reinforced when she first made contact with anarchism after moving to the USA in December 1885. Goldman was one of a significant political cohort radicalised by revulsion at the Haymarket executions of 1887. Effectively state reprisals for the throwing of a bomb at a demonstration in Chicago’s Haymarket Square, the failure to present any serious evidence against the five Haymarket victims secured them a place of honour in the anarchists’ martyrology cemented by the dignity and courage they showed in the face of judicial terror.²¹ Deeply moved, Goldman repeatedly invoked and commemorated their example. Chicago she described as the ‘city of the greatest American crime’, of cowardice, shame and disgrace redeemed only by the noble spirits it betrayed.²²

On two occasions, she was more directly implicated in such actions. In 1892, her comrade and lover, Alexander Berkman, also Russian-born and also inspired by the nihilists’ example, attempted the assassination of the Carnegie steel boss Henry Clay Frick.²³ Despite the *attentat*’s failure, Berkman was given a draconian twenty-year prison sentence, eventually serving fourteen of them. Goldman’s emotional identification with the ‘heroic moment’ and the figure of the hero-martyr was powerfully reinforced;²⁴ and the line she trod between the explanation and advocacy of such actions was a fine one indeed. ‘Each age’, she wrote in 1900 after the assassination of the Italian king by the anarchist Bresci, ‘has had its John Browns, its Perovskayas, its Parsons, Spies, and Angiolillos, and its Brescis, who were misunderstood, persecuted, mobbed, tortured, and killed, by those who could not reach the sublime heights attained by these men’. Perovskaya was one of the Russian nihilists executed in 1881. Parsons and Spies were two of the Haymarket victims. John Brown, the American abolitionist executed in 1859, provided an indigenous exemplar much invoked by anarchists. Angiolillo assassinated the Spanish reactionary politician Canovas in 1897. The construction of a lineage of hero-martyrs at this point remained somewhat awkwardly combined with the rhetoric of a great social ferment from below. A figures like Bresci, personifying the ‘noble’, the good and the sublime, was thus described as sprung from the toiling masses, leaving hundreds more ‘to lay down their lives to free mankind from tyranny, power, ignorance, and poverty’ – and from the ‘thoughtless multitude’ of slaves as well as tyrants.²⁵

One of these rebels was a young Polish-American called Leon Czolgosz. In September 1901, Czolgosz shot and killed President McKinley at the Pan American Exposition at Buffalo, New York, reputedly under the influence of Goldman’s oratory. Four months earlier Czolgosz had certainly attended a lecture in which Goldman defended those carrying out such acts. In the resulting furore, she was again

a particular target, and according to Havel faced a 'man-hunt' unprecedented in American history.²⁶ That Czolgosz had had no real involvement with the anarchist movement hardly mattered to her. Instead, she saw him as but the latest of the hero-martyrs whose commemoration figured so largely in the anarchist calendar. 'While the memory of despots and tyrants ... is maintained only through artificial and arbitrary means', Goldman wrote of the Haymarket victims, 'that of the pioneers and advance guards of humanity, perpetuates itself from generation to generation ... pointing the way to great and daring deeds'.²⁷ Though even Berkman had doubts as to his credentials, Czolgosz too now found his place in the anarchist pantheon.²⁸

The use of violence in and of itself thus meant little to Goldman. There is little sign even in her most inflammatory utterances of the language of retribution sometimes used by anarchists.²⁹ Instead, she brought out two themes unevenly time. One was an instrumental rationale for propaganda by the deed, precisely as a sort of political advertisement. Invoking the denial to anarchists of rights of free speech and assembly, even where these were extended to other political groupings, Goldman held that violence could be justified wherever 'the organized force – government – leaves us no other method of propaganda'.³⁰ But she also had the sense that such methods could bring results. In France, she wrote in 1896, a series of *attentats* had achieved 'more for the spreading of our principles than ten years of writing and speaking'.³¹ In North America, even as Goldman distanced herself from the promotion of revolutionary violence, it was to the 'Czolgosz act' that she attributed the anarchist resurgence in the years that followed. 'For never before', she wrote to Kropotkin in 1907, 'was Anarchism so much before the public eye as it has been since 1901'.³²

This validation of the 'Czolgosz act' at the same time reinforced a conception of political agency that was at once heroic and performative and expressed rather in the willing exposure to martyrdom than in the act which occasioned it. Dismissing the popular delusion of a terrorist conspiracy, Goldman invoked the dauntless individual whose assumption of a terrible responsibility mirrored her own aversion to the constraints of collective obligation. Czolgosz, she wrote in her article 'The tragedy at Buffalo', was a 'beautiful soul' moved by a sensitivity to suffering and injustice that set him apart from his fellows and demanded the bowing of one's head in 'reverenced silence'.³³ Whatever her doubts as to their efficacy or legitimacy, Goldman never lent her voice to what she called the 'slimy, creepy, cowardly renunciation' of those moved to such acts of violence.³⁴

Nevertheless, as the method of the *attentat* became largely superseded, this notion of its rationale left a deep imprint on the political persona with which Goldman now succeeded in reaching a wider public. As the passing of anarchy's terrorist phase gave way to the mass agitational forms of direct action and anarcho-syndicalism, Goldman supported such activities and briefly even sponsored a half-hearted syndicalist league. It is nevertheless telling that the league's manifesto should have described direct action and the general strike as its 'method of propaganda'.³⁵ Goldman herself had little idea how to organise these, and her syndicalist league amounted to very little more than its manifesto.

Instead, her principal 'method of propaganda' was the more individualistic one of the public platform and lecture tour. Testing the limits of free speech, and using the platform itself as a form of dynamite, the exemplary quality of the *attentat* was enacted in more conventional forms, as propaganda by the deed gave way to propaganda as the deed itself. Harassment by the authorities or vigilantes often called on the same qualities of political courage. Having organised the first of her cross-country lecture tours in 1897, Goldman recommenced these in 1903 on an altogether

more ambitious scale. Notoriety proved a tangible resource; her very name, she wrote to one editor, had a 'positive value'; it allowed her to exploit what she called the American 'craze for celebrities', and aroused sympathy as well as antagonism in ever wider circles.³⁶ Increasingly she spoke in English, symbolising conscious reorientation to the cultural and political mainstream, and she noted how the size and 'quality' of her audiences improved with this preponderating 'American' element.³⁷ 'It is not in the laboring man, the lowest classes, that I find my hope', she told an interviewer in 1901. 'It is the middle class and the professional people ... to whom theories of life like mine appeal.'³⁸ In her brighter moments, the emergence of a native American intelligentsia seemed to recall the Russian nihilists who had so influenced her first steps to anarchism.³⁹ To Berkman, released in 1906 and all at once having to catch up on these developments, Goldman's home was like a literary salon where the spirit of revolution seemed smothered in an atmosphere of pessimism and intellectual aloofness.⁴⁰

While continuing to draw on anarchy's communistic strand, Goldman thus symbolised a more individualist tradition through her projection of personal charisma and assumption of a privileged speaking role. Unlike later communist leadership cults, she embodied neither organisation nor even a movement but an ideal, a world-view and an affirmation of selfhood. Berkman, who was to prove ill-suited to such activities, was less impressed with the 'planless, sporadic disease, known as "touring the country"'; divorced from any organised anarchist presence he thought it a 'useless disturbance ... of the sleeping zoo'.⁴¹ Goldman nevertheless devoted up to half the year to such activities; and from 1909 she enjoyed the assistance of a road manager to make up for what she could scathingly describe as the deficiencies of local anarchist organisation.⁴²

The numbers she reached by such methods ran into the several tens of thousands. Nevertheless, with the changing conception of her public, Goldman's basic rationale for such activities also changed. Fluent in several languages, she was widely read in modern European literature, and began to hanker for more durable means of expression herself. 'My great faith in the wonder worker, the spoken word, is no more', she wrote in her *Anarchism* collection in 1911; indeed, had privately confessed as much over a decade earlier.⁴³ From 1906 her lecture tours consequently had the primary function, not only of providing her with a living, but of advertising and subsidising the monthly magazine, *Mother Earth*, which for the next decade provided the central *raison d'être* of her work. Styling itself a 'magazine devoted to social science and literature', *Mother Earth* located Goldman within the contemporary world of letters as well as an anarchist milieu. As well as signed essays and reviews, she contributed regular diary-reports from the speaking tours which were the main activities advertised in *Mother Earth* and its most dependable source of finance. Drawn away from New York by such activities, she consequently had to delegate day-to-day editorial direction: initially to Max Baginski, with whom she had initially conceived the idea for the magazine, and later to Berkman. Hers was nevertheless the dominant personality, which no party, board or readers' group existed to constrain. As she wrote in one of the paper's difficult periods: 'I have no claim on any one who does not feel the impetus to assist Nor do I propose that any one should have a claim on me.'⁴⁴

Dynamite of the spirit

One of the distinctive features of *Mother Earth* was the prominence of the writer as the embodiment of value and social purpose. Particularly under Berkman's editorship from March 1907, a space was always found for the coverage of labour struggles and the proponents of direct action. Campaigns over free speech, birth control, in due course over conscription, were also central to the magazine. Moreover, in a period of literary as well as political ferment, an eclectic mix between them was a feature of other radical papers, such as the British *New Age*. None, however, projected quite such an image of the hero as man of letters. 'For years', Goldman wrote, 'I longed to create a medium through which I might express myself in words more durable than oral language'.⁴⁵ For this validation of the role of the socially engaged writer, contemporary examples abounded. Gorky, Ibsen and Shaw were among those lionised in *Mother Earth*, both for their social iconoclasm and for their fearless commitment to its expression. All were playwrights, Gorky intermittently, Ibsen and Shaw primarily so; and in combining the immediacy of performance with the permanence of the written word the theatre was henceforth a special fascination of Goldman's. The very occasion for *Mother Earth*'s launching had been the holding of a benefit performance by a visiting Russian drama troupe with which she had become involved. Increasingly, the drama provided a subject for her lectures, featuring briefly in her first book and providing the central theme of her second book, published in 1914.⁴⁶ Her lectures on such subjects were sometimes found less radical than expected; it was hinted that Goldman was becoming worthy, even boring.⁴⁷ But far from wishing to adulterate her anarchism, Goldman herself insisted that the drama potentially posed 'a greater menace to our social fabric and a more powerful inspiration than the wildest harangue of the soapbox orator'.⁴⁸

Disenchantment in the spoken word, clearly meaning less the stage and lecture hall than the 'soapbox' and free public meeting, suggested diminished faith in the figure of the people to whom the spoken word was addressed. The writer in this register did not just represent the voice of an inarticulate majority – in Goldman's words, the 'conscious expression' of a 'dumb unrest'⁴⁹ – but a figure apart from the time and rising above it. For this conception, the most important influence, both directly and through his profound effect on the literary culture of the day, was that of Friedrich Nietzsche. Though Nietzsche's later appropriation by the Nazis has been described as a brazen exercise in 'literary unscrupulousness', his presumed identification with the intellectual origins of fascism and his open contempt for social movements like anarchism helps explain his elusiveness in the Goldman of anarchy's collective memory.⁵⁰ A recent discussion by Leigh Starcross has done something to redress the balance, but without exploring the implications of Goldman's Nietzscheanism for her anarchism.⁵¹ This, nevertheless, is more than usually necessary. Sympathetic commentators have long insisted on Nietzsche's 'polyvocality', or else cautioned against overly literal readings of Nietzschean metaphor.⁵² Just these protean and ambivalent qualities consequently demand precision in the discussion of specific applications.

That Nietzsche's political appeal was predominantly to the 'Socialistically inclined' can in part be ascribed, as it frequently was at the time, to his 'destructive kenenergy'.⁵³ As 'the primary liberatory project', John Moore suggested in his work of recovery of the anarchists' Nietzsche, anarchism in particular 'remains entitled to appropriate the work of one of the greatest iconoclasts of all time'.⁵⁴ Given the diverse, sometimes terrifying expressions of twentieth-century iconoclasm, perhaps one is also allowed, in this Nietzschean spirit of revaluation, to problematise the presumed primacy of both thinker – as Moore allows – and the project itself. In his

attacks on established religion or on the 'new idol' of the state, reproduced in *Mother Earth*,⁵⁵ Nietzsche's appeal to the radical imagination seems almost as straightforward as Moore appeared to assume. Against whom or what, on the other hand, was the destructive energy behind such concepts as the superman or will to power to be directed? Like the eugenicist sentiments that also crept into *Mother Earth*, and which themselves were not so distant from Nietzschean concerns, suggestions of hierarchy or prescriptive authority sat uneasily with a movement usually defined in terms of their refusal.

Though she first encountered Nietzsche in Europe in 1894-5, it was to Baginski's love of his writings that Goldman attributed her own deeper understanding of the philosopher's thinking.⁵⁶ It was also under Baginski's initial editorship that *Mother Earth*'s Nietzschean enthusiasms were most clearly signalled. Its opening address, signed by Goldman and Baginski, employed a Nietzschean rhetoric in appealing 'to those who strive for something higher, weary of the commonplace; to those who feel that stagnation is a dead weight on the firm and elastic step of progress; to those who breathe freely only in limitless space'. Extracts were reprinted from Nietzsche's most famous work *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, which was virtually paraphrased in the passage just cited, and from other key Nietzschean texts like *Dawn* and *Antichrist*.⁵⁷ Space was also found for the exposition of Nietzsche's individualist ethics by Helen Stoecker.⁵⁸ Under Berkman's editorship, with a reduced number of pages, the coverage was not so generous. Nevertheless, as fascination with Nietzsche gave way to his wartime demonisation in the Anglo-Saxon world, Starcross shows how Goldman stood her ground with no fewer than twenty-three lectures on Nietzschean themes between 1913 and 1917.⁵⁹

As Starcross also points out, the texts of the lectures unfortunately do not survive. Nevertheless, sufficient traces of Goldman's Nietzscheanism remain to suggest some plausible connections. Like the Russian revolutionaries who sought to reconcile Nietzsche and Marx, Goldman made no attempt to justify the former's misogyny – indeed, implicitly repudiated it⁶⁰ – or his supposed racism. Goldman was not, on the other hand, one of those who sought to explain away Nietzsche's scorn for democracy. Quite the contrary: it is abundantly clear that it was precisely his elitist vision that she found so liberating. In her autobiography Goldman at several points referred to the 'undreamed-of' heights and raptures to which Nietzsche had carried her by the beauty of his vision, the magic of his language, the 'fire of his soul' – and by the allure of the superman.⁶¹ Discussing the issue with James Huneker, one of Nietzsche's foremost American champions, she remembered insisting that it was precisely in respect of his 'aristocracy of the spirit' that Nietzsche should be regarded as an anarchist, and 'all true anarchists', conversely, as aristocrats.⁶²

The cult of the *Attentat*, whether in word or deed, can thus be more fully appreciated as the expression of a sensibility lifted above mass slavishness and mediocrity. Writing of Czolgosz, forsaken and yet 'tower[ing] above our stifling social existence', Baginski evoked another of Nietzsche's most famous works in alluding to the 'human, all-too-human' failure to recognise in his action the 'bursting of a human heart under the pressure of an unbearable life'.⁶³ Famously, Nietzsche denounced in anarchism the very worst expression of *ressentiment* or the resentful slave-morality of modern democracy.⁶⁴ He also, however, provided a language with which the anarchist hero could be depicted as a sort of overman. Berkman in recalling his own failed *Attentat* in his *Prison Memoirs* of 1912 described the revolutionary as one emancipated from the 'merely human' and transcending the instincts of pity or self-regard.⁶⁵ R. Hinton Thomas mentions that a German anarchist on trial for

involvement in an assassination attempt even cited Nietzsche as part of his defence.⁶⁶ Though unfortunately he provides no details, Nietzsche's view that the value of an act, was determined by its origin, not its results, was clearly relevant.⁶⁷ Goldman, by the time she wrote *Living My Life*, had so far discarded instrumentalist arguments for propaganda by the deed as to describe Berkman's 'heroic moment' as exposing a 'merely utilitarian' rationale for political action in favour of the 'inner forces' to which alone the idealist was apparently accountable.⁶⁸

If the deed nevertheless gave way to the word, among the potent influences in this direction was the example of Nietzsche himself, in whom the writer appeared as at once social critic, diagnostician and a sort of seer possessed of distinguishing powers of insight and exposition. Even within his native Germany, Nietzsche provided a reminder of the writer's cathartic energy in age of extending party machinery. Among the more loosely coordinated milieux of American radicalism, as in the politically repressive environment of Tsarist Russia, the possible purchase of such interventions was greater still. Predictably, Goldman described the role of the artist in Nietzschean terms, as the 'gradual transvaluation of existing values'.⁶⁹ One wonders whether she also noticed Nietzsche's habit of describing as *Attentaten* his 'warlike' forms of verbal iconoclasm; or how in *Beyond Good and Evil* he invoked the threat to a flaccid, vacillating 'scepticism' of 'some new explosive ... a dynamite of the spirit, perhaps a newly discovered Russian nihiline'.⁷⁰ 'I am not a man, I am dynamite', Nietzsche wrote in his testament *Ecce Homo*.⁷¹ Goldman's public utterances – also *kriegerisch*, also like a 'drawing [of] the sword' – can in this sense also be seen as *Attentaten* and the planting of combustible materials. Goldman was familiar enough with the metaphor to describe the modern theatre as the 'dynamite' that shook the social pillars and Ibsen as the 'dynamiter' of social sham and hypocrisy.⁷²

The result was that *Mother Earth* repeatedly invoked the writer as a seer, particularly under Baginski's editorship. One contribution linked Nietzsche with the 'great Anarchistic playwright' Ibsen and the still greater Shaw. In their insight into the 'irretrievable defects of humankind', these were said to be at one in conceiving of a 'race of Better People than the human race' and thus of the Supermen and Superwomen who would live their lives 'beyond good and evil'.⁷³ Immediately after the magazine's opening editorial, Maxim Gorky's evocation of the 'stormy petrel' of the revolution provided another such image of prophetic insight.⁷⁴ Visiting the USA amidst considerable publicity after the 1905 revolution, Gorky's 'public intellectual profile' combined Nietzschean projections with the exposure of alleged marital irregularities and outspoken support for workers in struggle.⁷⁵ As his initial acclaim gave way to controversy and denunciation, the parallel evidently registered with Nietzsche's neglected genius.⁷⁶ Evoking the episode in *Mother Earth*, Leonard D. Abbott, one of its inner circle of contributors, thus pictured him as 'a very Christ of the proletaire', arms outstretched, message as yet unheeded. 'Like a Nietzschean Superman he turned to the mountains', Abbott continued, '... and worked all the Summer, persistently, ceaselessly ... his grim, impenetrable figure standing out in bold relief against a panorama of almost Alpine grandeur'.⁷⁷ The mountain imagery, like that of limitless space evoking Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*, suggested aspiration and the impulse to freedom, but also a somewhat ambivalent relationship with the teeming cities left behind.

Begetters of the future

There is more to anarchism here than what Kropotkin described as the ‘left wing’ of socialism.⁷⁸ Casually, Goldman linked Nietzsche with Kropotkin himself in evoking a popular anti-authoritarianism maintained ‘wherever the people have retained their integrity and simplicity’.⁷⁹ While true enough of Kropotkin, this had little support in Nietzsche’s writings.⁸⁰ Certainly, it was tangential to the attraction these had for Goldman, which had little to do with an imagined past, at least as evoked by Kropotkin. Kropotkin in works like *The Conquest of Bread* celebrated the myriad forms of free association he believed were independent, and eventually would supersede, the state. Goldman’s Nietzschean individualism, on the other hand, took a bleaker view of every existing institution, even extending, in her essay on ‘The child and its enemies’, to the counter-cultural activities of the anarchist and other radical movements. ‘The spirit of an Emerson or a Goethe is rare indeed’, she wrote; in the ‘free individual’ capable of withstanding such moulding pressures, or in educational initiatives allowing the ‘free unfoldment’ of the child, lay the main hope of the ‘free community’ of the future.⁸¹

One of the basic issues this posed was touched upon in the preface to Goldman’s *Anarchism*. Defending Nietzsche’s ‘giant mind’ from his shallow critics, Goldman insisted that his ‘vision of the *Uebermensch* also called for a state of society which will not give birth to a race of weaklings and slaves’.⁸² Such an argument, though widely advanced by left-wing Nietzscheans,⁸³ rested on dubious foundations. For Nietzsche, as for anybody using the term intelligibly, the notion of aristocracy could not be universalised, but presupposed what he called the pathos of distance and a ‘select’ species capable of raising itself to a higher existence. It therefore presupposed ‘slavery in some sense or other’; and in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* Nietzsche roundly denounced the ‘tarantulas’ of equality. ‘For what were my love of the Superman if I spoke otherwise?’, he asked rhetorically, envisaging a future of ‘more and more’ war and inequality.⁸⁴ Bruce Detwiler, in his penetrating discussion of Nietzsche’s ‘aristocratic radicalism’, quotes a passage from *The Will to Power*:

Aristocracy represents the belief in an elite humanity and a higher caste. Democracy represents the disbelief in great human beings and an elite society: ‘Everyone is equal to everyone else.’ ‘At bottom we are one and all self-seeking cattle and a mob.’⁸⁵

In his attacks alike on Christians, socialists and ‘the ever more frantic baying ... of the anarchist dogs’, Nietzsche’s objection was to levelling, egalitarian instinct he characterised as the ‘animalisation of man to the pygmy animal of equal rights and pretensions’.⁸⁶

For Nietzsche’s left-wing followers, one must acknowledge the issue of whether the presently exceptional was to become generalised, as Goldman and others implied; or whether the tension of higher and lower was more basic to the human condition, or at least to the realisation of Nietzsche’s higher values. Practically speaking, however, this hardly mattered; for in either variation, the transcendent qualities of the future provided the basis for a searing critique of the present, its dominant ‘slave’ morality included. This, indeed, was what Nietzschean anarchism had in common with maximalist forms of socialism; for it was precisely in prefiguring the future that inhered the exceptionality of the few who stood apart from the herd. ‘Do I exhort you to love of your neighbour?’, he asked in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. ‘I

exhort you rather to flight from your neighbour and to love ... of the most distant man and of the man of the future...'⁸⁷

Against this, Walter Kaufmann's attempted reconstruction of an antipolitical Nietzsche invoked his concept of 'eternal recurrence' to show how far removed Nietzsche was from either racist or progressivist notions of the overman as a sort of *telos* towards which humankind was developing. 'The goal of history', Kaufman cites him, 'cannot lie in the end [*Ende*] but only in its highest specimens'.⁸⁸ Scattered across history, no teleology could have united the higher specimens that Nietzsche thought of as supermen. In notes entitled 'Anti-Darwin' written in 1888, Nietzsche categorically stated that 'man as a species' was not progressing to a higher level, and that the genius of a Caesar – or of Goldman's Goethe and Emerson – was *sui generis*.⁸⁹ Nevertheless, like Kaufman's insistence that Nietzsche was not primarily a social or political thinker, this hardly helps explain the political influence his writings did undoubtedly come to exercise, particularly to radicals of both left and right. Crucially, it also underplays the almost messianic claim on the future which the superman concept represented. Already in *The Gay Science* (1882) of his milder 'middle period' Nietzsche invoked the 'Argonauts of the ideal' and described the presently misunderstood as the 'premature-born of a yet undemonstrated future'.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, it was in *Zarathustra*, published in 1883-5 and the most politically resonant of Nietzsche's works, that the motif was especially insistent. Impotent in the face of history, it was over the future alone that the will to power was effective. The narrator is presented as seer and creator, walking among men 'as among fragments ... of that future which I scan'.⁹¹ The quality of nobility, more precisely of a 'new' nobility, was also associated with the notions of prophecy and prefiguration, as 'begetters and cultivators and sowers of the future':

Let where you are going, not where you come from, henceforth be your honour!
Your will and your foot that desires to step out beyond you – let that be your
new honour! ...

O my brothers, your nobility shall not gaze backward, but *outward*!
You shall be fugitives from all fatherlands and Forefatherlands!

In his next work *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886) Nietzsche again invoked the 'men of the future' who even in the present sought to '[compel] the will of millenia on to new paths':

To teach man the future of man as his *will* ... and to prepare for great enterprises
and collective experiments in discipline and breeding so as to make an end of
that gruesome dominion of chance and nonsense that has hitherto been called
'history' ...⁹²

Again in *The Antichrist* written two years later, the breeding and willing of a higher type marks out the future from the merely fortuitous appearance of such beings in the past.⁹³ According to the English anarchist Herbert Read, Nietzsche's compelling attraction was that of a mind 'that soared into the future' – what Nietzsche described in *Zarathustra* as 'the free Future'.⁹⁴

One could perhaps imagine a conception of the heroic or the superman in which its necessary differentiation from the presently inadequate or inferior was left implicit; like an *Über*-Samuel Smiles invoking tales of self-help without including those that ended up in failure. This was not, however, the case with Goldman, for

whom the *Übermensch* concept, while mapping uncertainly onto the future itself, allowed the clearest differentiation of those who in an age of mediocrity already prefigured that future. She did not, like some left-wing Nietzscheans, depict Nietzsche's view of democracy as wrong-headed or superficial.⁹⁵ On the contrary, Huneker in his short story 'A sentimental rebellion' rightly brought out Goldman's note of brusque contempt for the 'mob'.⁹⁶ Indeed, this was almost inseparable from the cult of the *Attentat*, whether in the literal or merely literary sense. The setting aside of conventional morality and the sanctification of the revolutionary martyr thus licensed a scorn for the ignorant mass whose indifference both required such acts and was left untouched by them. On the tenth anniversary of Czolgosz' death, *Mother Earth* was in large part given over to such issues, including a piece by Baginski on Stolypin's execution and yet another of Goldman's tributes to Czolgosz. In this she roundly condemned the 'mob soul, so appalling in its massiveness', and especially the 'cowardice and moral weakness' of the radicals by whom Czolgosz was forsaken, 'even like Christ'. It was in precisely such terms that Goldman in her memoirs depicted Berkman and 'our brave Chicago martyrs' ('the people ... forge their own chains and do the bidding of their masters to crucify their Christs'); or that Berkman himself described his release from prison as 'The resurrection', or those omitted to commemorate such figures were labelled 'Judas'.⁹⁷

Like all metaphors, this one was susceptible to different inflexions. Goldman was even to refer to the Russian revolution, 'nailed to the Bolshevik cross', and the martyrdom of an entire people.⁹⁸

The Christ-like figure of the hero was thus set against the slavish figure of the 'victim', bent and worn, rather than as an epitome of the broader collective hero-figure of the 'people'.⁹⁹ The language of slavery, transmuted into slavishness, did not merely condemn the capitalism, but diminished and dehumanised those whose uncontested plight this was. Alpine scenery fades in Goldman's memoirs for the glimpse of New York steel sheds 'where human beings, half man, half beast', toiled like the galley slaves of a bygone era:

'The children of hell', I said, 'damned to the everlasting inferno of heat and noise.' Sacha had given his life to bring joy to these slaves, but they have remained blind and continued in the hell of their own forging.¹⁰⁰

A tension between the idealisation of labour and its present debased condition was frequently in evidence, indeed was one possible rationale for the revolution. Hence, in almost the same breath Goldman could invoke the 'sublime and inspiring vista' of labour 'conscious of its power' and risen from its present 'pale, trembling, cringing condition', while contrasting this with the present 'mocking, fiendish monster, sapping the life element from its slaves'.¹⁰¹ In her article 'Minorities versus majorities', given pride of place in the *Anarchism* collection, she nevertheless gave voice to the frankest elitism. With the triumph of 'numbers', and the replacement of the craft worker by 'brainless, incompetent automatons', the individual was subjugated to 'the inertia, the cravenness, the utter submission of the mass'. As Goldman invoked the 'individual giants' to whom all human progress was due, it was clear that this was no mere indictment of capitalism but a philosophy and world-view. 'Ours is merely a poignant repetition of the phenomenon of all history: every effort for progress, for enlightenment, for science, for religious, political, and economic liberty, emanates from the minority, and not from the mass.' Always the few were 'misunderstood, hounded, imprisoned, tortured, and killed'. Always the mass 'clings

to its masters, loves the whip, and is the first to cry Crucify! the moment a protesting voice is raised ...¹⁰²

This contempt for the mob helps explain why Goldman turned to Nietzsche as a subject for her lectures after 1913. Doubtless, she sought to vindicate him against the presumed association with Prussian militarism. Like Johann Hertzfelde's adoption of an English name, the choice of subject was in itself tantamount to defiance of nationalist passions. But the war itself, and the mass emotions it engendered, provoked a new sensitivity to the brutality of the mob. Already encountering Jingoism during the Anglo-Boer war, Goldman had described how not the government but the 'people themselves' posed the greatest threat to free speech. 'By the "people"', she went on, 'I do not only mean the ignorant, whisky-saturated, patriotism-maddened workers, but also the mental wage slaves: clerks, bookkeepers, cashiers, typewriters, commercial travelers, and other flunkeys to money and titles'.¹⁰³ In 'Minorities versus majorities' the sabre-rattler Roosevelt embodied the worst sort of mob psychology, and the shame of the mass was conveyed by its willingness to serve as the instruments of violence and coercion.¹⁰⁴ With the wider conflagration after 1914, radicals and individualists of all kinds saw in the machinery of total war, supposedly driven by 'democracy', a sort of consummation of the tyranny of the 'herd' or 'mob'. In a *Mother Earth* editorial, Nietzsche, with Stirner, was thus saluted for having 'brilliantly and passionately arraigned the State, the moneyed mob, the parasitic aristocracy and above all the cringing submissive canaille – all of whom are the real cause of the war'.¹⁰⁵ A four-line poem of Morrison Swift appears to sit easily in the same volume.

Out of the soot-heap of a nation sunk in greed;
Out of the hell-swamp of a people in black need,
The cry goes up for men of brains or will of steel,
Who are not sheep, who follow not, who stand alone, who lead.¹⁰⁶

Who could say whether wills of steel were needed to prosecute the war or bring it to a close? Swift, whose ideas in many respects resembled Goldman's, but who was later discredited by supposed fascist proclivities, was by 1917 to countenance American military preparedness as the threat began to mount of an extension of the war.¹⁰⁷

Untimely revolution

According to Thraxas, copied by Goethe into his notebook, 'he who hates vices hates mankind'.¹⁰⁸ In any genuine project of societal transformation the tension this implies can be detected. On the one hand, there is usually an optimistic understanding of human potentiality and the vision of a better society. Differing in the details of its social arrangements, and in the means of its achievement, this typically envisages the unforced fulfilment of this potentiality through the positive qualities of association or, at very least, the extinction of forces making for social conflict. In such a vision lies the emancipatory dynamic shared by anarchism and other radical social movements. It is why Kropotkin found it natural to locate the anarchists on or to the left of the socialists. It also helps explain the tremendous dedication and commitment to which these movements gave rise, and patterns of disinterested activism which again might be regarded as a shared characteristic. As an anarchist, Goldman once put it, even after

the genuine conviction had passed, she felt indeed was ‘inseparably allied with the future’.¹⁰⁹

Alliance with the future meant ambivalence regarding the present. David Miller makes the point that Goldman, like Kropotkin, did not envisage the ‘conscious minority continuing to play a role *after* the revolution’.¹¹⁰ This might have been more reassuring had the prospect been less remote, and had Goldman given more attention to the problems it involved. Unlike Kropotkin, however, she was commended in *Mother Earth* precisely because she eschewed ‘fancy pictures’ of a co-operative future.¹¹¹ However vague, fantastical and even messianic its forms, it was nevertheless difficult even to imagine the better humanity of the future without also affirming the corresponding limitations of the actually existing humanity of the present. The Nietzschean overman, despite some tortuous exegeses, was never just the product of self-overcoming. Always it carried the sense of innate difference which, in terms of Nietzschean metaphor, involved indiscriminate dehumanisation. Whether registered in terms of victimhood, acquiescence or collusion in the systems that oppressed them, the compact majority was constructed as a problem or threat with, at best, hitherto unrealised potential as the agent of emancipation. This in turn gave rise to a strong self-identity as a form of leadership. For anarchists this was not primarily expressed as a set of party structures, hierarchical or otherwise. Equally, in her pre-eminence and unequal access to resources Goldman was unconstrained by such structures. As much as almost any other movement, anarchist history has been written in terms of its leading figures.¹¹²

These tensions were not specific to anarchism. In an 1901 article, Goldman rounded off a typical diatribe against the ‘fools and slaves’ of the American workers with an important caveat: ‘of course’, this referred only to the ‘average worker’ – the sort that socialists in anglophone countries thought of as ‘Henry Dubb’.¹¹³ ‘The intelligent worker of America’, Goldman went on, ‘is the intelligent worker of the world; he stands up for his rights, and works with those whose aim in life is the establishment of equal liberty in all phases of life’.¹¹⁴ This language of the intelligent worker helps to locate her anarchism within a wider culture of militancy, whose chief expressions in this period included syndicalism. The French revolutionary syndicalist Emile Pouget, whose writings were featured in *Mother Earth*, thus denounced the mass suffrage as empowering the ‘unconscious and inactive’ at the expense of ‘the minority who carry the future within themselves’.¹¹⁵ Georges Yvetot, author of the anti-militarist *Nouveau Manuel du Soldat*, described the crowd as ‘stupefied by work and alcohol, by the prejudices of the family, the school and the barracks’.¹¹⁶ Hubert Lergardelle, founder and editor of *Le Mouvement socialiste*, expounded a more considered philosophy of the *syndicats* as the movement of an elite in the interests of the mass.¹¹⁷ Within the USA, the syndicalist W.Z. Foster provided the quintessential rationale for the ‘militant minority’ in his pamphlet of 1912, *Syndicalism*:

In every group of human beings ... there are to be found a certain few individuals who exercise a great influence over the thoughts and actions of the rest of the mass of individuals composing the group. They are the directing forces of these groups – the sluggish mass simply following their lead. They are natural leaders and maintain their leadership through their superior intellect, energy, courage, cunning, organizing ability, oratorical power, etc., as the case may be.¹¹⁸

Because of its protean character, histories have anarchism have sometimes projected a strong sense of its defining qualities in order to construct it as coherent narrative subject. A classic account like George Woodcock's, while faithfully registering differences within anarchism over the question of organisation, retrospectively provides a sort of surrogate for organisation in the form of this shared identity. Frequently, as in Woodcock's case, this allows the accommodation of thinkers like Tolstoy, not necessarily regarding themselves as anarchists. It also, as in the same instance, allows the marginalisation of thinkers like Nietzsche, whose names were similarly linked with the anarchists, but in contexts that may now seem more troubling.¹¹⁹

It is precisely Nietzsche's susceptibility to diverse and often contradictory readings that demands the political historian's attention. A Nietzschean strain has clearly been identified in explorations of the deeper roots of Bolshevism.¹²⁰ Without reducing Nietzsche to a proto-fascist, it also offers insight into the 'modernist' elements within European fascism.¹²¹ The distinctions between these movements mattered profoundly. They were literally an issue of life and death. But at the same time the fundamentally metaphorical character of ideological families, which had no genetic basis and were subject to myriad forms of ideological and prosopographical miscegenation, needs also to be registered. As Allan Antliff observes, there was not one but many 'anarchisms', in harmony, conflict or uneasy coexistence, and at different moments of formation or decline. But by the same token these 'inherently multiple and equivocal discourses' were usually harmonising, conflicting and coexisting with the similarly disparate non-anarchisms which helped to define them, and from which they might variously emerge, or equally sink into.¹²² For activists and public figures like Goldman, the issue involved quite basic moral and political choices, which sadly were rarely so straightforward as that between 'the liberatory project' and the 'repressive project'.¹²³ Recovering this particular anarchism is a reminder that these choices were always difficult ones and could be made in unpredictable and sometimes unsettling ways.

There is a passage in Goldman's autobiography in which she describes her horror at hearing Gorky justify Bolshevism on grounds of the ignorance and backwardness of the Russian masses. 'No Russian writer had ever spoken in such terms before', she comments, as if she had never herself described these masses as compact, drowsy and immobile.¹²⁴ Both had been avid Nietzscheans; both attracted, even intoxicated, by the vision of the *Übermensch*. In the first year of Soviet power, Gorky employing the very Nietzschean title *Untimely Thoughts*, condemned the Bolsheviks precisely on grounds of their persecution of the higher culture of the intelligentsia.¹²⁵ Goldman, far slower than Kropotkin to take the measure of the Bolshevik conception of power, in this time very period defended the revolution, as the triumph of the overman or the herd was as yet unclear. The story had not, even then, produced its final twist. Gorky, as is well known, made his piece with the Bolsheviks and was lionised by Stalin's Russia. Through its recognition was politically unthinkable, as Nietzsche became tarred with the Nazi brush, a link was now established between the god-building of the 1900s and the Stalinist remaking of man, and a Nietzschean rhetoric resurfaced in the vanguardism of the Komsomol. Goldman, meanwhile, once she had registered what seemed to her the catastrophic failings of the regime, gave voice to these with indomitable honesty. Her elitism, however, remained undisturbed; and if she now beheld the fulfilment of Bakunin's prophesy of a communist ruling caste, its apparent acceptance by labour movements both in Russia and beyond seemed to her yet another demonstration of the

majoritarian tyranny or ineptitude. The paradox of Goldman's elitist libertarianism still awaited resolution.

¹ Johann Most, *Freiheit*, 18 June 1898, cited Candace Falk et al, eds, *Emma Goldman: a documentary history of the American years. 1. Made for America, 1890-1901* (henceforth: *Documentary History*, 1), Berkeley Cal., University of California Press, 2003, 335.

² Hippolyte Havel, 'Biographic sketch' in Emma Goldman, *Anarchism and Other Essays* (1910), New York: Dover Publications, 1969 edn, pp. 38-40.

³ *New York World*, 20 August 1894 in *Documentary History*, 1, p. 207.

⁴ Goldman, interview with Nellie Bly, *New York World*, 17 September 1893 in *Documentary History*, 1, p. 157.

⁵ Marcel Liebman, *Leninism Under Lenin*, Merlin edn, 1980, pp. 29-37.

⁶ Goldman, 'Light and shadow in the life of the Avant-Guard', *Mother Earth*, February 1910, pp. 383-91. This was the title Goldman gave the series of reports from her lecture tour appearing in *Mother Earth* between February and June 1910.

⁷ Goldman, 'Minorities versus majorities' in her *Anarchism and Other Essays*, p. 76.

⁸ Danel Guérin, trans. Mary Klopper, *Anarchism: from theory to practice* (1965), New York & London: Monthly Review Press, 1971, edn, pp. 3-7; David Miller, *Anarchism*, London & Melbourne: Dent, 1984, part 1. Miller's chief 'varieties' of anarchism are philosophical anarchism, individualist anarchism and communist anarchism

⁹ See for example Max Nettlau, 'Anarchism: communist or individualist? – Both' (1914) in Peter Glassgold, ed., *Anarchy! An anthology of Emma Goldman's Mother Earth*, New York, Counterpoint, 2000, pp. 79-83.

¹⁰ Charles Gide and Charles Rist, *A History of Economic Doctrines: from the time of the physiocrats to the present day*, Harraps, 1917 edn, p. 614.

¹¹ Rudolf Rocker, *Anarcho-Syndicalism*, Secker & Warburg, 1938, pp. 21-5.

¹² Michael Freeden, *Ideologies and Political Theory: a conceptual approach*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 311-12.

¹³ Among her biographers, Alice Wexler stands out for her willingness to acknowledge difficult political as well as personal issues; see Wexler: *Emma Goldman; an intimate life*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1984; and *Emma Goldman in Exile: from the Russian Revolution to the Spanish Civil War*, Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1989. Candace Falk, *Love, Anarchy and Emma Goldman*, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1984, is strongest on the personal aspects.

¹⁴ 'Forging her place: an introduction' in *Documentary History*, 1, p. 83; Theresa Moritz and Albert Moritz, *The World's Most Dangerous Woman. A new biography of Emma Goldman*, Toronto: Subway Books, 2001, p. 6.

¹⁵ Robert Michels, *Political Parties. A sociological study of the oligarchical tendencies of modern democracy* (1915), New York: Transaction Publishers edn, 1999, p. 326.

¹⁶ Murray Bookchin, *The Spanish Anarchists. The heroic years 1868-1936*, New York: Free Life Books, 1977, pp. 120-1.

¹⁷ Miriam Michelson, 'A character study of Emma Goldman', *Philadelphia North American*, 11 April 1901, *Documentary History*, 1, p. 444.

¹⁸ Goldman, interview in *New York Sun*, 6 January 1901 in *Documentary History*, 1, p. 426.

¹⁹ Goldman, 'The international anarchist congress', *Mother Earth*, October 1907 in Candace Falk et al, eds, *Emma Goldman: a documentary history of the American years. 2. Making Speech Free, 1902-1909* (henceforth: *Documentary History*, 2), Berkeley Cal., University of California Press, 2005, p. 242.

²⁰ Goldman, *Living My Life* (1931), New York: Dover edn, 2 vols, 1970, p. 28.

²¹ George Engel, Adolph Fischer, Albert Parsons and August Spies were executed in November 1887; Louis Lingg avoided the same fate by committing suicide. Two other defendants had their death sentences commuted to life imprisonment.

²² See for example 'On the road', *Mother Earth*, May 1907, pp. 128-9.

- ²³ For Berkman's background and motivations, see Alexander Berkman, *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist* (1912), London: C.W. Daniel edn, 1926, ch. 1.
- ²⁴ Goldman, *Living My Life*, p. 507.
- ²⁵ Goldman, 'Gaetano Bresci', *Free Society*, 2 June 1901 in *Documentary History*, 1, pp. 455-6.
- ²⁶ Havel, 'Biographical sketch', pp. 30-1; for the Czolgosz affair, see 'Forging her place: an introduction' in *Documentary History*, 1, pp. 73-9.
- ²⁷ Goldman, 'The crime of the 11th of November', *Mother Earth*, November 1911, pp. 263-6.
- ²⁸ See e.g. the reprinting of 'The tragedy at Buffalo', *Mother Earth*, October 1906 and the article on Czolgosz by Max Baginski in the same issue; also Goldman, 'In justice to Leon Czolgosz', *Mother Earth*, October 1909, pp. 239-41; Goldman, 'October twenty-ninth, 1901', *Mother Earth*, October 1911, pp. 232-5.
- ²⁹ See David Miller's discussion of these issues in his *Anarchism*, London & Melbourne: Dent, 1984, ch. 8.
- ³⁰ Goldman, 'An open letter', *Free Society*, 17 February 1901 in *Documentary History*, I, p. 435.
- ³¹ *Firebrand*, 24 May 1896 in *Documentary History*, 1, pp. 237-8.
- ³² Goldman to Kropotkin, 31 May 1907, in Candace Falk et al, eds, *Emma Goldman: a documentary history of the American years. 2. Making Speech Free, 1902-1909* (henceforth: *Documentary History*, 2), Berkeley Cal., University of California Press, 2005, p. 227.
- ³³ Goldman, 'The tragedy at Buffalo', *Free Society*, 6 October 1901 in *Documentary History*, I, pp. 471-8' also 'Emma Goldman defines her position', *Lucifer, the Lightbearer*, 11 November 1911, *Documentary History*, 1, pp. 479-80.
- ³⁴ Goldman cited Glassgold, *Anarchy!*, p. 315.
- ³⁵ The manifesto is cited in William Z. Foster, *From Bryan to Stalin*, London: Lawrence & Wishart edn, 1937, p. 59.
- ³⁶ Goldman to *Metropolitan Magazine*, 4 December 1903 in *Documentary History*, 2, p. 167; Goldman, *Living My Life*; Havel, 'Biographic sketch', p. 31.
- ³⁷ Goldman, 'A review of the New York activities', *Mother Earth*, April 1914, pp. 53-4.
- ³⁸ Miriam Michelson, 'A character study of Emma Goldman', *Philadelphia North American*, 11 April 1901, *Documentary History*, 1, p. 443.
- ³⁹ Goldman, 'Two months and after', *Mother Earth*, January 1915, p. 365; [Goldman, *Living My Life*, pp. 154, 335, 469].
- ⁴⁰ Berkman, *Prison Memoirs*, p. 493.
- ⁴¹ Berkman to Goldman, 12 March 1905 in *Documentary History*, 2, p. 152.
- ⁴² See e.g. Goldman, 'On the road', *Mother Earth*, May 1907, p. 132.
- ⁴³ Goldman, 'Preface', in *Anarchism and Other Essays*, p. 41; Goldman to Maz Nettleau, 31 (sic) June 1900 in *Documentary History*, 1, p. 412.
- ⁴⁴ Goldman, 'The joys of an agitator', *Mother Earth*, November 1908, p. 349; see also Glassgold 'Introduction: the life and death of *Mother Earth*' in Glassgold, *Anarchy!*, pp. xv-xxxvi for a useful account of the magazine.
- ⁴⁵ Goldman, 'To my readers', *Mother Earth*, December 1906, pp. 7-8.
- ⁴⁶ Goldman, 'The modern drama: a powerful disseminator of radical thought' in her *Anarchism*, pp. 241-71; Goldman, *The Social Significance of the Modern Drama*, Boston: Richard Badger, 1914.
- ⁴⁷ Margaret Anderson, 'Emma Goldman in Chicago', *Mother Earth*, December 1914 in Glassgold, *Anarchy!*, p. 87.
- ⁴⁸ Goldman, *Social Significance*, p. 5.
- ⁴⁹ Goldman, 'Modern drama', p. 241.
- ⁵⁰ See for example Glassgold's *Mother Earth* anthology *Anarchy!*, where this theme hardly figures. Nietzsche's appropriation by the Nazis is contested by Walter Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: philosopher, psychologist, antichrist*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974 edn, p. 304
- ⁵¹ Leigh Starcross, "'Nietzsche was an anarchist": reconstructing Emma Goldman's Nietzsche lectures' in John Moore, ed., with Spencer Sunshine, *I Am Not a Man, I am Dynamite! Friedrich Nietzsche and the anarchist tradition*, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Autonomedia, 2004, pp. 29-39.
- ⁵² See for example Daniel Colson, 'Nietzsche and the libertarian workers' movement' in Moore, *I Am Not a Man*, pp. 12-16.
- ⁵³ *Nation*, 12 June 1913, cited Patrick Bridgwater, *Nietzsche in Anglosaxony. A study of Nietzsche's impact on English and American literature*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1972, pp. 17-18.
- ⁵⁴ Moore, 'Attentat art: anarchism and Nietzsche's aesthetics' in Moore, *I Am Not a Man*, p. 127.
- ⁵⁵ February 1913, pp. 409-11.
- ⁵⁶ Goldman, *Living My Life*, p. 239.

- ⁵⁷ E.g. *Mother Earth*, June 1906, pp. 15-7; August 1906, pp. 41-6; April 1907, pp. 82-5; June 1907, p. 175.
- ⁵⁸ Stoecker, 'The newer ethics', *Mother Earth*, March 1907, pp. 17-23.
- ⁵⁹ These are listed in Starcross, '“Nietzsche was an anarchist”', pp. 37-9.
- ⁶⁰ See Goldman, interview, *Chicago Inter Ocean*, 8 August 1908 in *Documentary History*, 2, p. 286. 'I used to read what the leading philosophers wrote about women. That's what led me to champion the cause of women and devote my life to their emancipation'.
- ⁶¹ Goldman, *Living My Life*, p. 172.
- ⁶² Goldman, *Living My Life*, p. 190.
- ⁶³ Baginski, 'Leon Czolgosz' (1906) in Glassgold, *Anarchy!*, pp. 16-21. *Human, All-too-Human* was the title of a book of Nietzsche's published in 1878.
- ⁶⁴ See e.g. Saul Newman, 'Anarchism and the politics of resentment' in Moore, *I Am Not a Man*, pp. 107-26.
- ⁶⁵ Alexander Berkman, *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist* (1912), London: C.W. Daniel edn, 1926, pp. 7-8.
- ⁶⁶ R. Hinton Thomas, *Nietzsche in German Politics and Society 1890-1918*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983, p. 50.
- ⁶⁷ See for example Nietzsche, trans. R.J. Hollingdale, *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886), Harmondsworth: Penguin. 2003 edn, pp. 62-3; Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo*, p. 151: 'I likewise lack a reliable criterion of a pang of conscience ... I should ... as a matter of principle prefer to leave the evil outcome, the consequences, out of the question of values. ... To honour to oneself something that went wrong all the more because it went wrong – that rather would accord with my morality.'
- ⁶⁸ Goldman, *Living My Life*, pp. 190, 507. In Berkman's *Prison Memoirs*, on the other hand, a propagandist motivation is still clearly stated.
- ⁶⁹ Goldman, 'The modern drama', p. 241.
- ⁷⁰ Friedrich Nietzsche, trans. R.J. Hollingdale, *Ecce Homo* (written 1888), Harmondsworth: Penguin edn, 1979, pp. 81, 85; checked against Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari, eds, *Nietzsche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, section 6, vol. 3, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969, p. 315; Nietzsche, trans. R.J. Hollingdale, *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886), Harmondsworth: Penguin. 2003 edn, pp. 80, 136.
- ⁷¹ Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo*, p. 126.
- ⁷² Goldman, *Social Significance*, pp. 8, 11. It would be interesting to trace the analogy further. Both in London, where it was frequented by 'elderly anarchists', and in Bristol, which Goldman discovered the most resilient anarchist grouping in the British provinces, radical book shops in the 1910s and 1920s were known as 'the Bomb Shop'.
- ⁷³ John Franklyn Phillips, 'A railway episode', *Mother Earth*, June 1907, pp. 194-6.
- ⁷⁴ Gorky, 'Song of the storm-finch', reproduced in Glassgold, *Anarchy!*, pp. 153-4.
- ⁷⁵ See Edith W. Clowes, 'Gorky, Nietzsche and god-building' in Nicholas Luker, ed., *Fifty Years On: Gorky and his time*, Nottingham: Astra Press, 1987, p. 132; Mary Louise Loe, 'Gorky and Nietzsche: the quest for a Russian superman' in Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Nietzsche in Russia*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986, pp. 251-73.
- ⁷⁶ Alexander Kaun, *Maxim Gorky and his Russia* (1931), New York: Benjamin Blom edn, 1968, appendix 1: 'Maxim Gorky in the United States'.
- ⁷⁷ Leonard D. Abbott, 'An impression of Maxim Gorki', *Mother Earth*, March 1908, pp. 32-4.
- ⁷⁸ Kropotkin, 'Anarchism' (entry for *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, written 1905) in Roger N. Baldwin, ed., *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets: a collection of writings by Peter Kropotkin*, New York: Dover edn, 1970, p. 285.
- ⁷⁹ Goldman, 'Peter Kropotkin', *Mother Earth*, December 1912, pp. 325-7.
- ⁸⁰ As regards Nietzsche's supposed linking with Kropotkin in a cult of simplicity, one can certainly find incidental references to the greater 'relative mobility of taste and reverential tact' of the lower orders than of the *demi-monde* (*Beyond Good and Evil*, p. 264). But even this judgement was immediately followed by the identification of the plebeian mind with intemperateness, narrow envy and self-assertiveness.
- ⁸¹ Goldman, 'The child and its enemies', *Mother Earth*, April 1906, pp. 7-14; also Goldman, "“La Ruche” (The Beehive)', *Mother Earth*, November 1907, pp. 388-94.
- ⁸² Goldman, 'Preface', p. 44.
- ⁸³ See for example Kline, 'Foreword' in Rosenthal, *Nietzsche in Russia*.
- ⁸⁴ Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, p. 192; *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, pp. 123-6.
- ⁸⁵ Bruce Detwiler, *Nietzsche and the Politics of Aristocratic Radicalism*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1990, p. 101 and ch. 5 passim.

- ⁸⁶ Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, pp. 72, 87-9, 124-5.
- ⁸⁷ Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, pp. 86-8.
- ⁸⁸ Walter Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: philosopher, psychologist, antichrist*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974 edn., pp. 149, 311 and ch. 11 passim.
- ⁸⁹ Cited Kaufman, *Nietzsche*, p. 328.
- ⁹⁰ Cited Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo*, p. 101. For the 'middle period' in which Nietzsche's hostility to democracy was somewhat tempered, see Detwiler, *Nietzsche*, pp. 15-16 and ch. 8.
- ⁹¹ Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, p. 161.
- ⁹² Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, p. 126.
- ⁹³ Cited Kaufman, *Nietzsche*, p. 312.
- ⁹⁴ Read cited Bridgwater, *Nietzsche in Anglosaxony*, p. 93; Nietzsche, *Zarathustra*, pp. 120-2.
- ⁹⁵ See for example A.L. Tait, 'Lunacharsky: a "Nietzschean Marxist?"' in Rosenthal, *Nietzsche in Russia*, pp. 275-92.
- ⁹⁶ James G. Huneker, 'A sentimental rebellion' in his *Visionaries*, New York: Scribners, 1905.
- ⁹⁷ Goldman, *Living My Life*, p. 304; Berkman, *Prison Memoirs*, 'Observations and comments', *Mother Earth*, December 1907.
- ⁹⁸ 'Emma Goldman on the Bolsheviks', *Freedom*, May 1922, p. 31.
- ⁹⁹ See e.g. Goldman, 'Alexander Berkman' (1906) in Glassgold, *Anarchy!*, p. 15.
- ¹⁰⁰ Goldman, *Living My Life*, pp. 113-14.
- ¹⁰¹ Goldman, 'Labor Day', *Mother Earth*, September 1908, pp. 297-9.
- ¹⁰² Goldman, 'Minorities versus majorities', pp. 69-78 passim.
- ¹⁰³ Goldman, 'Observations and suggestions', *Free Society*, 22 April 1900 in *Documentary History*, 1, p. 395.
- ¹⁰⁴ Goldman, 'Minorities versus majorities', pp. 73-4, 77.
- ¹⁰⁵ 'Observations and comments', *Mother Earth*, January 1915, p. 34.
- ¹⁰⁶ Morrison I. Swift, 'Real men and women', *Mother Earth*, May 1915, p. 103.
- ¹⁰⁷ See William O. Reichert, 'The melancholy political thought of Morrison I. Swift', *New England Quarterly*, 49, 4, 1976, pp. 542-58.
- ¹⁰⁸ G.H. Lewes, *The Life and Works of Goethe; with sketches of his age and contemporaries*, London & Toronto: Dent, 1908 edn, p. 55.
- ¹⁰⁹ Goldman to Ben Reitman, 15 April 1926.
- ¹¹⁰ Miller, *Anarchism*, p. 96.
- ¹¹¹ William C Owen, 'Proper methods of propaganda', *Mother Earth*, August 1908, pp. 250-1.
- ¹¹² This is not to overlook the excellent accounts of historians like Jean Maitron in France and William D. Rubinstein, David Goodway and John Quail in Britain. But it characteristic of accounts like George Woodcock, *Anarchism. A history of libertarian ideas and movements*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975 edn; and Paul Avrich, *Anarchist Portraits*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- ¹¹³ See Stuart Macintyre, *A Proletarian Science. Marxism in Britain, 1917-1933*, Cambridge University Press, 1980, pp. 205-8;
- ¹¹⁴ Goldman, 'An open letter', *Free Society*, 17 February 1901 in *Documentary History*, 1, p. 436.
- ¹¹⁵ Jeremy Jennings, *Syndicalism in France. A study of ideas*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990, pp. 32-3.
- ¹¹⁶ Jennings, *Syndicalism in France*, pp. 31-2.
- ¹¹⁷ Jennings, *Syndicalism in France*, pp. 94-5.
- ¹¹⁸ Earl C. Ford and William Z. Foster, *Syndicalism* (1912), Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1990 edn, ed. James R. Barrett, pp. 43-4.
- ¹¹⁹ George Woodcock, *Anarchism. A history of libertarian ideas and movements*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975 edn.
- ¹²⁰ See Rosenthal, *Nietzsche in Russia*, esp. Glaser, 'Introduction', pp. 3-48, and part III, 'Nietzsche's influence on Russian marxism'; Rosenthal, ed., *Nietzsche and Soviet Culture: ally and adversary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- ¹²¹ Roger Griffin, *Modernism and Fascism: the sense of a beginning under Mussolini and Hitler*, Palgrave 2007.
- ¹²² Allan Antliff, *Anarchist Modernism. Art, politics and the first American avant-garde*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2001, p. 2.
- ¹²³ Moore, 'Attentat art', p. 127.
- ¹²⁴ Goldman, *Living My Life*, p. 743.
- ¹²⁵ Maxim Gorky, trans. Herman Ermolaev, *Untimely Thoughts. Essays on revolution, culture and the Bolsheviks 1917-1918*, London: Garnstone Press, 1968.