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ARTICLES

LOVE AND HATE IN EUROPEAN EYES: EMMA GOLDMAN AND ALEXANDER BERKMAN ON AMERICA*

ANTHONY ASHBOLT

In the wake of September 11, a classic European disdain for American sentiment became apparent. Even American intellectuals, like Susan Sontag and Gore Vidal, issued pronouncements that reflected a profoundly European sensibility, one embedded in notions of tradition and memory. Yet within the contemporary European critiques of America there frequently lurks a distinct affection. Note the ambivalence of many commentators (not, to be sure, just Europeans) in Granta 77: What We Think of America. This paradoxical embrace and withdrawal is hardly new and, in a sense, arises from the essential unknowability of America remarked upon by both John Gray and Hans Magnus Enzensberger in Granta. Many assessments of America from de Tocqueville on are laced with a dialectic of love and hate. Yet not all Europeans are or were ambivalent. Sigmund Freud’s apparent anti-Americanism puzzled Max Eastman. Why, Eastman once asked him, do you hate America? Freud responded that he did not hate America but, rather, regretted it. The withering assessments of the American culture industry penned by Theodor Adorno were not counter-balanced by a passion for America. Adorno in exile was estranged from the culture of his adopted home. He perceived the political culture of America to be the embodiment of commodity fetishism. To a certain extent, so did the German sociologist Werner Sombart. Yet his classic and wrongly neglected Why is There no Socialism in the United States?, reverberates with a simultaneous suspicion of and admiration for the United States. The image of the anarchist Alexander Berkman kissing the American flag, having been tortured by vigilantes during an IWW struggle in San Diego, captures this ambivalence.

America, in the eyes of European socialists from the mid 19th century on, could be both the promised land and hell-hole of exploitation and excess. For some it was one or the other, for many it was both, while some flitted between these perspectives, depending upon time and place. Thus we find both Alexander Berkman and his fellow anarchist Emma Goldman, while in America, waxing lyrical about the possibilities of liberty, while at the same time recoiling from the horrors of American capitalism. And then, having been deported from America in 1919, their outlook shifts and there is at times an evident European distaste for things American. Goldman, however, shifts again. Her time in Russia is as witness to the revolution betrayed. Elsewhere in Europe, she never quite feels at home and positive assessments of America resurface. Berkman remained hostile, albeit harbouring a
grudging admiration of American get up and go, and is unable to even contemplate returning to the country which expelled him. The dialectic of love and hate reflected in early writings and in correspondence between Goldman, Berkman and others, is a fascinating instance of the European radical imagination coming to grips with a society itself full of contradictions.

Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were leaders of the American anarchist movement yet both had European backgrounds. They were born in Russia but came to America while still relatively young - she at 16 in 1885, he at 17 in 1888. Nonetheless, both spent the formative years of childhood and adolescence in Europe and this, at the very least, helped shape their perspectives. Goldman became more Americanized than Berkman but it was an Americanism frequently tempered with European disdain for a culture of culturelessness. This is reflected in much of her correspondence both within America and, after exile in 1919, from Europe. While her autobiography, published in 1931, puts great emphasis on her American identity, the faith in America at that time is undoubtedly because she was so desperate to return there. Her European origins are never forgotten and mark her out, as a remarkable instance of a European Jewish woman coming to radical prominence in America. Early on in her radical career, she often gave lectures in Yiddish but as a more cosmopolitan radicalism was forged in her mind, English became her favoured mode of address.

In Goldman’s musings about America there is often a critical European perspective but there is also, admittedly, a profound Americanism, revealed, for instance, in her thorough respect for the U.S Constitution. Indeed both Berkman and Goldman, at least early on, saw America as ‘the politically most advanced country’. The problem was not the Constitution nor even the structure of government (there is even a positive reference, seemingly not ironic, to ‘universal adult suffrage’) but rather the rulers’ violation of the spirit of the Constitution. While Goldman in 1907 conceded that America was fifty years behind Europe, she pointed out that economically, ‘especially for women’ it is fifty years ahead: When I think, that I should have to earn my living in England and France, I shudder.” In her more cynical moments, however, Goldman’s caustic wit reflected a European outlook:

American politicians are like American dramatists and American ladies. Poor, barbarian Europe! If it were not for you, the American dramatist could write no drama for lack of material, American women would stalk about naked for lack of styles, and American reform politicians would run short of campaign speakers and election batt.
A series of Goldman’s letters to her magazine *Mother Earth* in 1909 were entitled ‘Adventures in the American desert of liberty’. In them she decries the fact that the noble ideals of liberty upheld by the founding fathers lay now in tatters. Having faced police intimidation in Boston, she reflected: ‘The city of Boston, whose every stone bears the footprints of the American champions of liberty, turned into a camping ground for professional man-killers who vied with each other in stabbing liberty the quickest.’ Likewise Philadelphia: ‘There it was that American liberty was born; there, too, it has been stabbed to death; what is left of it, is but a hideous nightmare that benumbs the mind and weakens the spirit of erstwhile liberty-loving Philadelphians.’ Yet the anarchist within her pointed to the problem being government, which is inherently authoritarian and will cultivate a climate in which people succumb to the rule of law. Despite her admiration for the American tradition of liberty, even if it be under siege, she did perceive America as intellectually underdeveloped compared to Europe:

> That the word anarchist doesn’t sound so bad in Europe as here speaks very badly for the intellectual development of the Americans. Were they to be informed in the literature of their own country even, they could not possibly be so ignorant on anarchism.8

And it is certainly the case that Goldman did not forget her European origins. An experience in Madison, Wisconsin, caused her to pause and contemplate an experience in her childhood:

> A sleigh ride in that very beautiful country, with all the glory of a white winter, bore me back to the never-to-be-forgotten joys of the Russian troika, dashing along through the cold, the music of its bells re-echoing through forest and field.9

The European sensibility is reflected frequently in Goldman’s assessment of American culture. Whereas the artist in Europe was in solidarity with the people, in America the artist was a commodity just ‘like everything else that has been debased by money’.10 Indeed, there is something of the European aristocrat about her (and she does refer to her aristocratic leanings on a few occasions). Take the actual disdain for the masses – ‘the tragedy of the masses’ for her is that they have no appreciation of beauty and thus have no will to escape ‘the drabness of life’.11 When challenged about this perception, she cast doubt on the notion that the masses lack appreciation of beauty was due to their being deprived of chances:
Somehow I cannot help thinking that a sense of beauty is innate rather than acquired...you are right when you say that the masses have no incentive to cultivate an appetite for anything but the most sordid and commonplace. Yet I feel that unless we can create such an incentive, there is no hope for the masses.\(^\text{12}\)

And here she was not referring to material incentives but to spiritual incentives, to ‘the ideal’ without which revolutionary change would not exist. This is very much in the European cultural tradition and divorced from the materialism of American life. It reflects a pessimism of the intelligence which somewhat remarkably did not undercut her optimism of the will. Thus there was an ambivalence about America in Goldman. One moment she could be celebratory, the next sharply critical. Writing of California in 1910, she tempers her romanticism only slightly by acknowledging that capitalism has the power to render ordinary that which was once special:

_The California of to-day has not the primitiveness, the savage beauty, the driving recklessness of Brett Hart’s time. Like everything else in our life-and-soul destroying commercialism, California is becoming ordinary and commonplace. Yet, with all that, it is still so gloriously beautiful, so rich and fragrant, so thrilling and yet so soothing as to remain forever the enchantress of all those who first followed her lure._\(^\text{13}\)

Similarly, writing years later, she praises ‘glorious California’ but notes that ‘the mercenaries of greed are nowhere as active as in Southern California’.\(^\text{14}\) On the hand there is striking beauty, on the other an ugly and voracious capitalism; on the one hand we have workers dedicated to the class struggle, on the other we have supine masses.

As stated before, Goldman never forgot her European origins, referring in 1917, after the February revolution, to ‘all of us Russians’.\(^\text{15}\) She suggested that many were already planning to go back home and signalled the possibility that she and Berkman would join them, cheerfully noting that as a consequence they may not be let back in to America. Increasingly, Goldman was becoming disillusioned with America and losing faith in American radicalism. Writing (from Missouri state prison) to a onetime hero who had turned against the Bolsheviks, Goldman expressed horror. While understanding her friend’s discomfort with Bolshevik bureaucracy, how could she possibly contemplate coming to America? She accuses her of turning her children:
over to the American Moloch capitalism. If so, you do not know the ravages the monster is guilty of in his own land. Go to the cotton fields of the South, to the textile region of New England, and see with your own eyes what this monster has done to the children of this country. You came here to plead for the war orphans of Russia. Oh, Babushka, go and see the peace orphans of America. See how pinched, how starved, how deformed they are...You have always been deceived in American liberties...  

Her increasingly caustic approach was undoubtedly a consequence of intensified state repression but it did also reflect a cosmopolitan contempt for America’s backwardness which ultimately, of course, was a contempt for ordinary people: ‘America as a whole is very much in a provincial stage, but the mind of her sons of the soil, and even the average townsman, is so dull that it surpasses every conception’.  

While in America, Goldman may have been ambivalent. Expelled from America, unable to adapt to Europe and totally disillusioned with the Russian Revolution, this ambivalence actually intensified. Yet she could not divorce herself from America and gradually fell under its spell once more. Her disillusionment with Russia is reflected clearly in the following correspondence from 1924:

...I came to Russia in the firm belief that the Bolsheviki were earnest revolutionists, sincerely trying to bring to Russia a Communist life. What I have found and what I have studied for two years is something entirely different. The Bolsheviki have merely established a formidable state and thereby crushed the Revolution.  

While the old bourgeoisie had been destroyed, Goldman argued a new one had been created, one actually ‘worse than the old...it is mercenary, material to the extreme and bent on one thing only - to get rich’. The supposed betrayal of the Revolution became an obsession for her, particularly after she left Russia: ‘...since I have come to Germany, Russia has got into my very being’ and also ‘that woe-begotten country has gotten into my blood to an extent as to make every minute seem torture’. Her estrangement from Russia actually deepened her attachment to America or, at the very least, to her remaining American friends. Her articles condemning Russia which had been published in the New York World actually alienated many former comrades. Perhaps they detected in her an exaggerated view of the Russian situation and a concomitant softening of her perspectives on America: ‘In all my 33 years in America I did not have to compromise so much with the State and submit to so many rules as I have
in the two years in Russia’. Nonetheless she did acknowledge that she would only go back to America if involved in politics and that the Government would not allow that. Europe allowed her, she conceded, to withdraw from politics and live a quiet, peaceful and inexpensive life. Yet she did not feel at home in Europe, pined early on for American books and revealed an inability to identify with politics outside of America or Russia. Her rootlessness contributed to a sense of despair: ‘I have come to realize that there is no greater punishment for an active spirit than to be torn out of one’s sphere.’ Moreover, the relative material poverty of Europe alerted her to blockages on the road to revolution in America:

*I am no longer so impatient with the American people. In fact, I rather understand how it is that people in America should still fail to grasp their bondage. Material comforts are not conducive to the awakening of the mind.*

While ‘hunger of the spirit’ was more important than ‘hunger of the body’, it would just take a long time for Americans to wake up to their spiritual deprivation.

By the early 1930s, Goldman had begun a campaign to re-enter America. Political developments since the onset of the Depression intrigued her and she wanted desperately to be part of the action again. Indeed, she thought it a ‘tragedy’ that she and Berkman, having prepared the way, would not partake in any upsurges across America. She did, however, express caution about the American situation, noting that ‘Russia has cured me from the belief in the magic power of revolutions that are not prepared thoroughly in advance’. And in correspondence with H.L.Mencken she referred caustically to the lack of culture in American Government compared to that of Europe: ‘It seems to me that there has not been a single president since Lincoln who could boast of penetration, understanding or ability as a representative of the country, and heaven only knows Lincoln has been overrated’. Similarly, she was shocked by the Sacco and Vanzetti, along with the Mooney, cases, seeing them as an indictment of both American society and the labour movement: ‘I do not think such lack of integrity and humanity would have been possible anywhere else.’

Goldman’s fellow exile Alexander Berkman did not share her dark despair or her sense of not belonging. More at home in Europe, he nonetheless remained fascinated by America. In 1932, Goldman was negotiating with the Columbia Broadcasting System over the possibility of a radio talk and Berkman was advising her of possible titles. ‘Why I love and hate America’ or ‘An Anarchist’s Hate and Love for America’ were early favourites. He noted that his love for America was kindled in Russia at the age of 15 or 16
and it was love for the Promised Land. 33 This was a love for the ideals of America. The hatred, of course, was generated by the realities of capitalism, which betrayed those ideals.34 His ‘first terrible disillusionment’ with America was generated by ‘the contrast of rich and poor; the sweatshop; political corruption; the police club mightier than the Constitution; legal injustice and social inequality and discrimination’.35 For Berkman, ‘the tragedy of America’ became his own ‘great tragedy ’ and thus ‘the turning point of my life’.36 In one letter to Goldman, Berkman included an enclosure entitled The Two Americas (Or: How an Anarchist Would Save America).37 One America was that of ‘capitalist imperialism’ which constituted ‘the greatest crime in the history of man’.38 The other was ‘the UN-OFFICIAL America of those who still believe in liberty and integrity, who love freedom and have the courage to think and act’. This was ‘the America of the people’.39 He expressed hope in the future of America, a desire that America be ‘the pioneer architect of the new social structure, the really new world whose radiant beauty shall spring from liberty for each, peace and well-being for all’.40 Apparently this was Berkman’s proposed script for Goldman but it remains unclear whether she would have retained the populist tendencies. CBS was initially keen to proceed with Goldman’s talk but she was warned against any reference to hating America in the title as this would turn potential listeners off.41 While she was happy to accommodate a different title, CBS pulled the plug due to concerns voiced by some executives.42

Like Goldman, Berkman had a degree of admiration for America, some of which was only expressed in somewhat bizarre private correspondence. In a letter extolling the virtues of the air mail envelope developed in America, Berkman waxed lyrical:

That’s American enterprise. I’ve been wondering why no one tries it in other countries. I am sure that sooner or later they imitate in this regard the U.S., as they do in everything...Incidentally, it is this spirit of grabbing and exploiting every new idea (except social ideas) that has helped make the U.S. the foremost country industrially and commercially.43

He then proposed setting up a business scheme to get air mail envelopes off the ground (as it were) in Europe. Just as Marx had great admiration for capitalism’s power, so too Berkman harboured enormous respect for American business acumen. And, like Goldman, he also admired the spirit of American individualism and self-reliance (where it was not being crushed actively by the state). Thus it was that he wrote to Charles Lindbergh, congratulating him on a ‘wonderful feat of pluck and self-reliance’.44 He
concluded the letter by requesting that Lindbergh come out in defence of Sacco and Vanzetti, noting that ‘the cause of justice is even more important than aerial navigation’. It appears the plea made no impact on Lindbergh whose pluck and self-reliance drifted towards fascism.

At one time, Berkman was invited to write a piece for Collier’s magazine dealing with the good things about America ‘from the ‘vantage point of Europe’’. He replied, indicating a willingness as long as he ‘could also write of the evil and reactionary things’. He still referred to America as ‘his own home’ but acknowledged that in exile he had become ‘a European ‘identity’’. In a sense that does not apply to Goldman, if only because she could not embrace Europe fully. Both of the exiles remained vitally interested in the anarchist movement in America, although both were sharply critical of it. Goldman, for instance, deplored the fact that none of the anarchist leaders was genuinely home-grown and argued that ‘our foreign comrades simply don’t know how to reach the natives’. Yet she also believed that ‘only an American who has had sufficient European background’ could become ‘a cultural force’ in the States. The tension between these propositions reflects the overall dialectic of love and hate in her European eyes. Berkman referred to ‘the deplorable condition of our movement in the States’ causing him and Goldman ‘great grief’. He suggested that the movement was not just suffering because of state repression of dissent but was itself mired by petty factionalism and growing intolerance of departures from dogmatism. Yet Goldman’s former lover, Ben Reitman, wrote a scathing letter to Goldman in 1932, upbraiding her for hostility to Communism and suggesting that ‘The Revolutionary Movement in America, in spite of all your misgivings and misinformation, is progressing very nicely’. He described her attitude to Russia and Communism generally as ‘unholy, disloyal, unreasonable’ and ‘positively vicious’. While faults in Russian Communism were obvious, including the lack of free speech, it did prefigure genuine socialism:

...but you didn’t want a new society. You didn’t want capitalism destroyed. You wanted some sort of visionary scheme in your mind to come to pass, and anything that wasn’t Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman you wouldn’t have, no matter how many people were rescued from ignorance and starvation. A few of your comrades suffering and in jail meant more to you than a hundred million peasants living in freedom and in beauty.

While history may have proven Goldman’s analysis more accurate than Reitman’s, there is more than a grain of truth in the notion that her anarchism lacked the praxis which paved the way for thorough social
transformation. Another erstwhile comrade pointed to the fact that Berkman ‘did more effective work among the masses’, whereas Goldman spoke essentially to the intellectuals. And her contempt for the masses even lead her once to suggest that ‘the stupidity of the American people and their lack of rebellious passion are more to be deplored than the corruption and villainy of their rulers’.

Goldman herself was horrified by Reitman’s correspondence:

But what have ten years with me given you that you dare to impugne (sic) my integrity (sic) and sincerity? Nothing it seems. That hwoever (sic) is your loss not mine old man.  

Given her desire to return to America, Reitman’s letter would have been a severe blow. Her sense of estrangement and alienation was increasing rapidly in the early 1930s: ‘Try as I might, I can not take root in Europe. I feel an alien everywhere’, Reitman eventually did apologize for sending that ‘terrible letter’ and they resumed reasonably personable correspondence, although Goldman undoubtedly found Reitman’s faith in the ‘rebel spirit’ of the American masses somewhat puzzling.  

Her own pessimism, initially fuelled in Russia, was reflected constantly:

Witness how the American people have fallen for the Roosevelt bate (sic). How they always grab at every soothseer (sic). What hope is there in such a people or such a country that so completely lacks its own mind, its ability to think out any proposition to its logical conclusion?...The American Intelligentsia is among the worst lick spittles. They have fallen for Russia as the promised land...there is no hope.

When asked to write for an edited collection entitled The American Mind in Miniature, she observed that ‘the title expresses the American mind better than anything I had ever heard of.’ Both the mind of the intelligentsia and that of the masses were small. The mass mind, in particular, was submissive and in times of prosperity celebrated ‘the tawdry, vulgar and cheap’, while in times of economic decline stood back and failed ‘to protest against starvation and destitution widespread in the land.’ Her arrogant contempt for ordinary people blinded her to any of the radical activism of the Depression years.

While not as critical of the American people, Berkman shared Goldman’s antagonism towards the intelligentsia. Their achievements amounted to precisely nothing. In culture there were only ‘some pale reflexions of European things’. Outside of architecture and industry, he argued,
everything in America had ‘been done in Europe and done better’. Goldman, interestingly, did not agree with Berkman about this. She pointed to great achievements in psychology, science, surgery, education, architecture, drama and literature. Where Berkman had referred to H.L. Mencken as ‘a superficial clown’, Goldman defended his libertarian spirit. Berkman replied that Mencken was, indeed, a clown, ‘a smart aleck of American literature’. He acknowledged the achievements in surgery but attributed this to ‘the American ability for things mechanical’. These differences between them probably partly reflect the fact that Goldman wanted desperately to return to America but Berkman was adamant in his refusal ever to return:

...I do not want to return under any conditions...as long as capitalism and government exist in the U.S. (and they will exist a long time yet, much longer than I will live) I would not return, nor want to return...I would not return even if I could.

For Goldman, however, ‘trying to get back to America’ was ‘really a question of life and death...’. And she did return for a lecture tour in 1934 and this re-ignited the sort of faith she had in America which had diminished while in exile. She chided Berkman for his prejudices about America, singling out for praise the American writers whose work was better than that of their European counterparts:

I am sure dearest it is your long absence from the states that does not let you see what is going on there. I leaned in this direction until I returned and could see with my own eyes... True America remains naïve, childish...[compared to] the sophistication of Europe. But I prefer its naïvity (sic), there is youth in it, there is still the spirit of adventure, there is something refreshing and stimulating in the air. Europe is hoary with age, it sticks on its centuris (sic) of traditions. It dares nothing.

She even saw the New Deal as having resuscitated the workers’ movement. Roosevelt, albeit unconsciously, had ‘awakened the whole country to a deeper social awareness and freedom of expression.’ She noted the innovative spirit in America, the spirit also of adventure and experimentation: ‘it is this surcharged electric and dynamic atmosphere which permeates its writers, poets, dramatists’. She urged Berkman to return and take hold of the leadership of the Anarchist and syndicalist movement, bemoaning yet again the fact that these movements have no home-grown leadership.
Emma Goldman now had another reason to be positive about America - a new and younger American lover. Her love had turned to hate, only to resurface as love. With Berkman, the love had all but disappeared and a coldly European assessment of America prevailed. Distanced from America, Goldman in a sense wanted to turn against it but found herself constantly pulled back. Her pessimistic perspectives on America and its people could not survive the powerful desire to return. Berkman, on the other hand, had no such desire. The tension between Goldman’s love and Berkman’s hate resonated with the simultaneous disdain and attraction which had characterized much of their entire relationship with America.

Goldman and Berkman’s writings and correspondence about America reveal a quintessentially European stance. Hostile to tradition but advanced in its modernity, America embodied, depending upon time and place, both hope and despair. The relevance of their observations today could not be more acute. Imagine Goldman and Berkman in a world saturated by consumerism, where culture is manipulated by megacorporations, where poverty and degradation are increasing, where belligerence on the international stage is becoming insufferable. Yet there is another America. As the expatriate Chilean writer Ariel Dorfman put it at the time of the 2002 anniversary of September 11:

> Where is that America of mine? Where is that other America? Where is the America of as I would not be a slave so I would not be a master, the America of this land is our land this land was meant for you and me, the America of all men, every one of us on this ravaged, glorious earth of ours, all of us, created equal? Created equal: one baby in Afghanistan or Iraq as sacred as one baby in Minneapolis. Where is my America? 

So, too, Goldman and Berkman paid homage to but at times recoiled from an America which offered so much yet betrayed its promises, an America founded on ideals consistently broken, an America whose own contradictions propelled a dialectic of love and hate.
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