



**WOODS:** We're talking Emma Goldman. Before we talk about her, let's say a little something about anarchism, the history of anarchism, because there are a lot of people who listen to this podcast who consider themselves anarchists from a private property standpoint.

**MALICE:** Wait a minute. There's a lot of people that listen to this podcast? This very failed podcast?

**WOODS:** Very failed. Extremely failed, according to somebody I've heard [laughing].

**MALICE:** It's not even in the Nielsen ratings.

**WOODS:** Yeah, see, now they listen just for the same reason you take a look at a train wreck, right? That's why they're tuning in, not for the content.

**MALICE:** [laughing] And I'm the driver.

**WOODS:** So all right, number-two guest on *The Tom Woods Show* —

**MALICE:** You treat me like number two.

**WOODS:** That's pretty good. That's not bad. Let's talk about this point that you want to make, which is namely that people who, for example, think of themselves as anarchocapitalists are often contemptuous of people, let's say, who have a left-wing take on anarchism, an anti-private property take on it. And they feel like these people are not anarchists at all, and whether they are or they aren't, the fact is they did come first. I mean, they were the ones who were using the term.

**MALICE:** Yeah, you know how sometimes you'll hear a cover of a song, and then you'll hear the original, but because chronologically in your life you heard the original second, you think the original was the cover? So many ancaps, I see this happen constantly on Twitter. And it takes a lot to get me to cringe, and I cringe every time, where they will be talking to these anarchocommunists or other kinds of anarchists, more of the socialist anarchists, and they'll be like, "Lol, you guys can't call yourselves anarchists." It's like, they were there first. You're the one who is basically stepping on their turf.

There's a reason Rothbard called it anarchocapitalism instead of simply anarchism; he was distinguishing it from his predecessors. Now, you can easily make the argument that anarchocommunism wouldn't work in practice and so on and so forth. But to kind of appropriate their word comes often from a place of ignorance, and embarrassing ignorance, because —

**WOODS:** Okay.

**MALICE:** Let me just finish. I think it's important for those who call themselves anarchists of any stripe to be familiar with all the different stripes.

**WOODS:** That's fair enough, and people should be. And 99 times out of 100, I'm sympathetic to this kind of argument, and I even am sort of sympathetic right now. But I think what irritates me and what's motivating the brighter people on our side who take this position is that when they examine what the ancoms are saying, I think they're engaged in a bait and switch. They say, oh, we're anarchists, so we're against the state. All right, are you really, though? I mean, because if it turns out, like if it turned out that, yeah, they started using the

term first, but when you peel back one layer of their onion, they actually want the state in another form, then yeah, I feel like taunting them, taking their term away because they don't deserve it. Absolutely.

And if their position is something like — and by the way, there are a lot of different ways that you could try to conceive of how their society might work, but one of them is that you would have kind of a common or democratic decision-making that would determine how production takes place at a particular firm. But given all the different decisions that would need to be made, unless we're all going to sit around at meetings for our entire lives, inevitably, this will turn into some form of representation. Inevitably, the iron law of oligarchy will take over. And inevitably, you will then have some kind of system that, yeah, I grant you they won't call the state. Oh, terrific, they're not using the word *state*. But for all intents and purposes, it will be a state, so yeah, I do question that they're really anarchists.

**MALICE:** Well, that's an argument against anarchocapitalism also, because it's saying, well, those private police forces will, for all intents and purposes, be a state.

**WOODS:** But how is a private police force for all intents and purposes a state?

**MALICE:** Because the anti-anarchocapitalist argument, which I don't necessarily hold but I'm sure you are very familiar with is, well, you'll have a natural monopoly — this is the Robert Nozick argument, right — that if you have this anarchism, it's going to basically reduce itself to a minarchist state.

**WOODS:** So either way, we wind up with a state?

**MALICE:** No, what I'm saying is, you look at an ideology, that's level one. And level two is, let's suss out what this would look like in practice. But those are separate orders of analysis. In the same way — and people are very capable of cognitive dissonance, and the best example of this is conservatives with the Constitution, right? *I stand by the Constitution. I stand by the Constitution*. What about social security? What about wars overseas? *Well* — So we can say, if you are for the Constitution, Lysander Spooner, his great quote, "It has either authorized such a government as we have had or been unable to prevent it." But these are separate issues and separate ways of looking at things.

**WOODS:** Well, to me, the issue is, my position is I favor no initiation of coercion.

**MALICE:** Sure.

**WOODS:** And that's my position all the way through. Whereas I feel like their position is, yeah, we don't want some forms of coercion but —

**MALICE:** I'm not defending the ancoms. All I'm defending is people knowing their history and not making idiots of themselves on Twitter when someone who is informed about this history is being told you don't know what you're talking about, when they in fact do. And if you are making a fool of yourself in front of some crusty ancom, that's really embarrassing.

**WOODS:** Yeah, I hear what you're saying, but I feel like the crusty ancom is probably, like a lot of ancaps, living in a bubble and needs to have it pierced from time to time by people saying, are you really sure that the set of ideas you are association with anarchism is a stable equilibrium? Because I think that's what the intelligent people are trying to say to them.

**MALICE:** No. No, no, no. Well, I'm not talking about the intelligent people. I'm talking about the unintelligent people, or the ignorant people who are often intelligent.

**WOODS:** And interestingly, Emma Goldman has a lot to say about ignorant people. Oh, man, that was some of the best stuff that you and I read.

**MALICE:** Okay, so you have read those essays?

**WOODS:** Of course. Yeah.

**MALICE:** Okay, you did your homework.

**WOODS:** When I am set to talk to Michael Malice at one o'clock in the morning, I make sure I'm prepared.

**MALICE:** Okay. [laughing] As prepared as you can get.

**WOODS:** Well, so can you start off by just telling people — I mean, until I read these, I pretty much knew about Emma Goldman that she was an anarchist of the left-wing variety.

**MALICE:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** She spoke out against the regime in the Soviet Union, or in communist Russia. But that was pretty much all I knew.

**MALICE:** Okay.

**WOODS:** So what else can we — like, first of all, roughly, do you know her birth and death dates offhand?

**MALICE:** Yeah, they're actually wrong on her tombstone. Isn't that funny?

**WOODS:** Really?

**MALICE:** Yeah. I don't know it offhand, but they're wrong —

**WOODS:** That's a case of: you had one job.

**MALICE:** [laughing]

**WOODS:** That's what a tombstone is supposed to say. I suppose the name.

**MALICE:** So I don't know who's to blame. Is it the state or is it the market?

**WOODS:** It's 1969 to 1940.

**MALICE:** So I'm going to make another point before we get to Emma Goldman. And you and I, let's suss this out because I think this is something that bears discussing. I think it'd be really funny, Tom — you know I'm a big troll — if we just discussed these kind of meta issues and never actually get to Goldman.

**WOODS:** I could easily see that happening, and then we'll have to do a part two where we actually talk about the thing we promised to talk about.

**MALICE:** NPCs, you know, people who are not really capable of critical thought, there are a lot of them on the internet. And they come in all stripes, and some of them wave the black flag just as much as everybody else. And part of NPC psychology is binary thinking, us versus them. And you see it all the time. *Oh, this person is a racist.* You could just throw them in trash. They can't say anything of value. *Oh, that's just right-wing hyperbole.* *Oh, they're just a leftist.* And then it's just like, done, right? And it's false and foolish to me to just preemptively dismiss someone because of their school of thought, especially when it's someone who, in many ways, is fighting the good fight. And I think she's a very, very mixed character, but this kind of preemptive like, *Oh, she's a commie, let's throw her in the trash,* she was, as you just alluded to, probably the most effective anti-communist figure, certainly from the left, from the beginning.

**WOODS:** So she's extremely interesting, and she is worth reading and knowing about. And I agree with you that it enrages me that we have people who have something valuable to say to us and something interesting to say, of all persuasions, and yet almost everybody is so stuck in one way of thinking that it's almost heretical even to consider cracking open a book by such-and-such person. And the thing is, I know a lot of the people who, let's say don't like me, are just going to continue to live that way. But that's no reason for me to live that way. So when you said, I think you need to read this woman, I thought, all right. Well, I for some reason have come to trust Michael. I think this will be worth my time. And it was worth my time.

**MALICE:** And a lot of it is going to be stuff people disagree with, but that's okay. Let's just talk about what you just alluded to. So, long story. She in 1901 — the first terrorists in America

were like white and immigrants. So there was the Haymarket Affair. A bomb went off and people were killed, including a cop. They rounded up seven anarchists. And at the time, *anarchist* really meant *terrorist* in many ways. The song by the Sex Pistols, "Anarchy in the UK," you know, "I'm an anarchist, I'm an antichrist," the lyric means I want to blow up people. And you can imagine 1976 in Britain, hearing this from their children's radio, you know, everyone's freaking out with good reason. So they rounded up some random anarchists, and one of them Louis Lingg, who I think is — I mean, they were pro-violence. They were absolutely for violence. There's no question. And this is something that I think anyone who is a philosophical radical has to think through. I know Jason Brennan just fairly recently wrote a book — I haven't read it — which was published — have you had him on the show to discuss this book?

**WOODS:** Not this book, but I'd like to get him on for this one.

**MALICE:** Yeah, it was some academic press, and basically he was making the argument for when it's appropriate to use force against the police. But that is a question that everyone, we like to pretend that's not an issue, because America, the police are nowhere near as bad as a police state. But this is the question of liberty, like where do you draw the line?

So they rounded up these guys, put them on basically a show trial. And Louis Lingg, if you look at photos of him, he looks like an Abercrombie model from 2019. It's insane. He's like in the 1890s or 1870s, whatever it was. And he says, I couldn't have thrown that bomb. I was at home making bombs. And the speeches they gave in this trial, like, "We reject the authority this court." "If you'd come at us with guns, we'll come at you with dynamite." "Hang us." Like you know, bring it on. And they were hung. Louis Lingg blew himself up in jail. He snuck in an explosive.

And a few years later, when it was clear they had nothing to do with this bombing, there was a monument built to them, still there in the cemetery in Chicago. They were pardoned posthumously by the governor. And the slogan, one of the men, it's on the monument, says — I'm going to mess it up a little Tom, I forget the exact quote, but it's ["*The day will come when our silence will be more powerful than the voices you strangle today.*"] You know, this is what they're saying as they went up to the gallows. So Goldman was very inspired by this.

And I think we see also — you know how like we laugh at these people who wear these Che Guevara shirts, right? Because it's like, you don't know what you're wearing. This guy just a wanted murderer. And very often what happens is violence becomes romanticized. And it happens with armies. I mean, there's no better example. World War II, George Washington, these were bloody, bloody conflicts with lots of people dying. It's a lot prettier in the books than it is in real life, which is why you and I and so many others are so antiwar.

Anyway, so anarchism had this very, very understandably dark connotation in the States and especially in Europe. And in 1901, this guy, Leon Czolgosz — I don't know how you pronounce his name — shot McKinley. *McKinley*. And when he's arrested, he says, I was influenced by Emma Goldman. So now she's on the lam, because the guy said he shot her because of her work. There was this idea that somehow there's this underground anarchist network who were trying to plot to kill the president, because it can't be as simple as just one random lunatic, right? Like, that would be very embarrassing. There had to be some big conspiracy.

And when she was arrested, she says she sympathized with this shooter, that McKinley is not as clever as he thinks he is, that he's basically an idiot and a puppet of the corporations. And the quote — she was arrested for being associated with the president being killed — she says, "The police are making more anarchists than the most prominent people connected with the anarchist cause could make in ten years. If they will only continue, I shall be very grateful. They will save me lots of work." So I mean, the cojones on this woman, five feet tall, who's arrested for the murder of the President, and her line is basically, you know, *Screw the police*. It's just mind boggling. And they had to let her go because she had nothing to do with it. What were you going to say? I'm sorry.

**WOODS:** Oh, no, nothing. You carry on, because once you're done, I've got some things to amplify what you're saying.

**MALICE:** Sure. But the most important thing I think why people on our side should like her is after all this, during Wilson's presidency and Teddy Roosevelt that started it, they passed the law making it a crime to kind of preach these ideas. And they deported a ton of radicals, including her, and they sent her to Russia. And she went there and she thought, okay, this is going to be great. The revolution, we finally have kind of the new way. We're overthrowing capitalism. And she gets there, and all the anarchists are being rounded up and murdered. She sits with Lenin. She's like, we're about free speech. We're about the individual. And Lenin's like, well, you can't really have that in a transition period.

So she gets out of the Soviet Union. And she writes a book called *My Disillusionment With Russia*. And she went to Britain, and the quote was, when she was there, before she started talking, it was a standing ovation. And when she was done, dead silence. Because she came, she goes, this is worse than the Tsar. This is the most brutal dictatorship the world has ever seen. This is not what I'm for. And she just completely denounced this kind of noble experiment. And the West did not want to hear it. She was the big voice from the left who had the credentials, and she spoke out and spoke truth to power far more than most people today.

So I think she needs to get a lot of credit for that, because one of the questions — I forget, there's that essay, who wrote it, which is one of the most important essays I think ever written by a former communist. And he goes, "What did you know and when did you know it? At what point were you aware of the communist atrocities, and when did you pretend it was okay?" And she's back in the '20s, and she's saying this is what's going on. So they didn't even have the option of playing dumb, and that's in large part thanks to her.

**WOODS:** I read a couple of the essays in her — what is the collection called? — *Anarchism and Other Essays*, right?

**MALICE:** Correct.

**WOODS:** Okay, I'm going to link to that on the show notes page, [TomWoods.com/1550](http://TomWoods.com/1550). You can just read it for nothing. The second essay in there about majorities and minorities has a lot of interesting insights. It's not really the one I wanted to talk about first, but just to back up something you were saying, it's interesting that she does not have a romantic view of the masses.

**MALICE:** No.

**WOODS:** To say the least. She has a view of the masses that actually I thought seemed kind of like your view of the masses. And so she is not under the impression that it's just a small elite who are wickedly forcing the existing system on the masses. She's saying, look, if the masses would wake up and not be soldiers, policeman, jailers, and hangmen, we wouldn't be living under this system. It's precisely because they're going along with it. And that, in a way, echoes some of the libertarian analysis that I've heard. Like Rothbard used to always say that the political class is always a minority, and yet somehow, it's able to get the majority to carry out its will. But then occasionally, you get these cases like in the former Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc countries, where the masses from do just say, we're not going to obey this minority anymore. Once they say we're not going to obey this minority, the thing falls apart. The trouble is they almost never say that. And so she does not romanticize them.

**MALICE:** Yeah, and that's the other thing I think people who are anarchist, like anarchocapitalist, would kind of get wrong. They assume she's kind of this anarchocommunist, so therefore, she's going to venerate the working man and the mass man as opposed to the elites. And that essay, Carl Hess, who's an important historical figure — he was Barry Goldwater's speechwriter, who allegedly wrote Barry Goldwater's famous quote from the 1964 convention speech, "Extremism in defense of liberty is no vice. Moderation in pursuit of

justice is no virtue" — he later became an anarchist. And he said, all the great things that are in Ayn Rand, you can find in Emma Goldman. And that essay, I mean, if I had crossed it out and wrote that it was Ayn Rand, I think a lot of people would believe it. It passes the sniff test because she's talking about how societies work. She's even worse than Rand in many ways, or more — she says explicitly, "The masses cannot reason." Even Rand doesn't say that.

**WOODS:** Here's something I just want to share with you, just a quotation that struck me because it sounds Rothbardian to me. She says — and I don't know that — well, I mean, maybe — no, maybe a Randian would speak this way, now that I think about it. But she says, "The most absurd apology for authority and law is that they serve to diminish crime. Aside from the fact that the state is itself the greatest criminal, breaking every written and natural law, stealing in the form of taxes, killing in the form of war and capital punishment, it has come to an absolute standstill in coping with crime." Well, how about that?

**MALICE:** Yeah, so her paramour, Alexander Berkman, tried to kill Frick who was Carnegie's righthand man, and he went to jail for many years for this. And it's kind of funny also, the story of them, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, because they were young, they were radicals, and they thought, all right — and Marx had the same idea. One of the things that's funny about Marx, in his lifetime, like he would try to get the workers to have a revolution, and they'd be like, we just don't want to have like, 20-hour days, dude. Like, we don't want to overthrow the government. Just give us some family leave. And like it drove him to distraction, because he had this idea of the working man which did not relate to reality at all.

And they kind of had the same thing. So Frick — I didn't realize this. Those Pittsburgh steel mill strikes, where it was very famous, you have the unions, you had Carnegie and the steel mills, they brought in the Pinkerton guards, and people lost their lives? The unions weren't even asking for raises. Frick was insisting they get a pay cut, and the union said, we just want to get paid the same. And he brought in that private police force.

So Berkman goes to Frick's office and tries to murder him, because he thought, all right, I'm going to do this, and the workers are going to get their consciousness and everything's going to be great. And they all denounced it. Every single one. They're like, what are you doing? We want to kill this guy. You're making him a martyr. The closest anyone came to supporting him was saying like, oh, you would have made a martyr out of him. Everyone else was like, this is not what we're about. We denounce it completely. And Berkman and Goldman were like, what? What is going on? So they were very naive in that sense.

But as a consequence, he served many years in jail. And she was one of the first voices condemning what happens in the prison system. And one thing she condemns, which everyone listening to this I think would agree, is at the time, all these prisoners were forced to work all day, and all that they produced was basically sold by the state. So this was a de facto slave labor situation. And she's like, this is insane. And thankfully that's been largely abolished.

**WOODS:** This whole matter of the homestead strike, it's actually a hopelessly complicated thing. I actually have an episode where I talk about it. I'll link to it on the show notes page, where I talk about this and some other episodes in labor history.

But the gist of it is, the workers had a contract with the plant that said that if the price of steel goes up, their wages go up. If the price of steel goes down, their wages go down. It was a sliding scale. And you can understand why you would favor that, because you would think, well, the price of steel going up means the plant is getting more profits; we should share the profits. Well, okay, but the flip side of that is that if the price of steel goes down, so do your wages. So what they had was, at \$25 a ton, if Steel went lower than that, wages stopped declining. So that was the floor for wages. So the thing they were arguing about was should the floor be at \$25 a ton for steel or \$22. And they went back and forth, and eventually they settled on something like 23, and then that was about the end of it.

But there were 3,800 people working at the plant. The Amalgamated Iron and Steel Association represented 800 of these, and they were the ones who were the most vocal about this. And only 330 skilled workers were actually affected by this whole matter anyway, it turns out. But every single one of them went on strike, so naturally, there's suspicion: why would they all go on strike when almost none of them are really going to see any real difference with this? And so the suspicion, was that intimidation, there's a slight chance intimidation might have been used here. So the Pinkerton guards were brought on to try to get to the bottom of that, and also to protect the plant.

And the Pinkerton guards did not — I mean, they are demonized in all labor history, but they did not open fire on people. They were fired upon. There was dynamite used against them. And finally, yeah, who wouldn't? I'm pretty sure at least one of them was killed right off the bat. So I think that the ancoms tend to have a much too simple angels-and-demons description of complicated episodes like this, but just FYI.

**MALICE:** Well, they did. I mean, and Goldman and Berkman were the most guilty of what you just said, having angels and demons, because in their mind, Frick's a demon. We kill him, and then we become heroes. And even the labor union didn't agree with that.

**WOODS:** And interestingly, Frank Taussig, who wrote a *Tariff History of the United States* in the 19th century, he was like a late 19th-century economist, he said at the time in 1893, he said, "Judged by the scale of the market rate of wages for work of similar difficulty elsewhere, some of the men were largely overpaid." So that's the testimony of a contemporary economist, so this was not a matter of the iron fist of the capitalist is trying to take the bread from the mouth of labor. Not quite.

**MALICE:** Oh, absolutely.

**WOODS:** All right, but anyway, I don't want to dwell entirely on this one episode, because there are other things I want to extract from the stuff you and I read.

**MALICE:** But I think what you're doing is very important, because I think it is important for anyone who calls themselves an anarchist to understand the history and understand both perspectives — or if not both, there's many perspectives. And I think this — like Rand had this kind of mistaken claim, that her ideas are basically *sui generis*, right, and she just deduced them herself, and she gave very little credit for people who paved the way for her, other than in her mind, Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas.

And the other thing that I find very useful in reading her, is because a lot of it is — first of all, she's got a lot of great quotes. And you read it, and you're like, oh, this is amazing. And a lot of it, she's out of her mind. But for me, I think it's very useful as an anarchist to familiarize myself with anarchists with whom I don't agree with much of the time, to understand their perspective, and to ask myself, okay, why are they wrong? If it's someone who's like a conservative or some progressive talking about, oh, we need the government to solve this, I know why they're wrong. But this person —and Tom, I know you were talking earlier about the ancoms and you scratch them and they want the state. Having read her, she hates the state. She really, really, really hates the state. So if I have that Venn diagram with her, as many of the listeners do, at the very least, I'm like, all right, we have something in common. Why has she gotten the rest wrong?

**WOODS:** Well, it's interesting. There's a passage here that gives us a little ray of hope about how she would want to arrange society, at least at least for me. She's obviously unhappy with an extremely developed division of labor, where people instead of being a craftsman who make the whole shoe or the whole desk from scratch, are just engaged in mindless assembly line work, from her perspective.

**MALICE:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** She says, "A perfect personality is only possible in a state of society where man is free to choose the mode of work, the conditions of work, and the freedom to work. One to whom the making of a table, the building of a house, or the tilling of the soil is what the painting is to the artist and the discovery to the scientist, the result of inspiration, of intense longing, and deep interest in work as a creative force." And so she says, "That being the ideal of anarchism, its economic arrangements must consist of voluntary, productive, and distributive associations gradually developing into free communism as the best means of producing with the least waste of human energy."

Now, I'm stopping there. The next sentence is the one that I like. So it sounds to me, at least, like she's saying that for the full flourishing of human life, for the full development of the human person, we need to have people's work be on the order of what the painting is to the artist and the discovery is to the scientist. It can't just be sheer drudgery, ten hours a day or something. So first of all, my concern there is, I mean, of course we all understand that. But on the other hand, maybe there is the point that, in order to be able to support industrial-sized populations, maybe we can't have everything we want. And I don't know that she really records with that.

But then she says — here's the sentence I like. She says, "Anarchism, however, also recognizes the right of the individual or numbers of individuals to arrange at all times for other forms of work in harmony with their tastes and desires." So maybe she's saying, this is my vision for how it would be best for people to live, but I'm not going to tell absolutely everybody that they have to abide by my model.

**MALICE:** Yeah, and when she's attacking capitalism, what she in many cases is attacking is what you and I would call corporatism, which is government in the pocket of corporations and using rent seeking and lobbying to basically exploit and use all those tactics that they use, which you and I and everyone listening to this have nothing but complete disagreement with.

**WOODS:** So, let's see here. Yeah, see, then she says — actually, you know what? I want to move on to this one.

**MALICE:** Okay.

**WOODS:** And when I say this one, I mean I've got a whole bunch of these. I printed them out. This is her on Teddy Roosevelt.

**MALICE:** Oh.

**WOODS:** I was struck by this.

**MALICE:** Hell, yeah.

**WOODS:** Because Teddy Roosevelt is loved by all the respectable people, then and now. She will have none of it. She says:

"The majority represents a mass of cowards, willing to accept him who mirrors its own soul and mind poverty. That accounts for the unprecedented rise of a man like Roosevelt. He embodies the very worst element of mob psychology. A politician, he knows that the majority cares little for ideals or integrity. What it craves is display. It matters not whether that be a dog show, a prize fight, the lynching of a [N-word], the rounding up of some petty offender, the marriage exposition of an heiress, or the acrobatic stunts of an ex-president. The more hideous the mental contortions, the greater the delight and bravos of the mass. Thus poor in ideals and vulgar of soul, Roosevelt continues to be the man of the hour." [laughing] Oh, yikes.

**MALICE:** Yeah. And again, this is not long after she was nationally accused of causing Roosevelt's predecessor to be murdered.

**WOODS:** And so in other words, she still speaks with that level of intensity.

**MALICE:** Yes. And accuracy.



**WOODS:** Yeah, because that's pretty much how I feel about the guy.

**MALICE:** Of course. He was the first like — well, maybe not the first, but he was a big step down from McKinley.

**WOODS:** I know what I wanted to do. She's got this one about politicians. And you know, it's hard for us I think sometimes to imagine somebody who has her views really, really being against the state, because you think who's going to carry out your plans?

**MALICE:** Look, can I say one more thing?

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**MALICE:** Because you know how, like, all these lefties will look at us and be like, *Oh, you guys are just crypto fascist*, and it's like, wait, what? And it's the same thing. We'll look at people like Emma Goldman, not people who follow her today, but let's say about her specifically, and be like, *Oh, when push comes to shove, she's basically Bernie Sanders*. She is not.

**WOODS:** No. In fact, listen to how she describes politicians and why she won't rest her hopes for the future in them. She says:

"Even where the workers are able to have their own representatives, for which our good socialist politicians are clamoring, what chances are there for their honesty and good faith? One has but to bear in mind the process of politics to realize that its path of good intentions is full of pitfalls, wire pulling, intriguing, flattering, lying, cheating, in fact chicanery of every description whereby the political aspirants can achieve success. Added to that is a complete demoralization of character and conviction until nothing is left that would make one hope for anything from such a human derelict. Time and time again, the people were foolish enough to trust, believe, and support with their last farthing aspiring politicians, only to find themselves betrayed and cheated."

**MALICE:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** Not very flattering.

**MALICE:** There's a quote that's ascribed to her, which I don't know that she actually ever said, which is, if voting changed anything, they would make it illegal.

**WOODS:** Is that attributed to her?

**MALICE:** Oh, yeah.

**WOODS:** Oh, well, how about that? I did not know that was her thing.

**MALICE:** Yeah, and there's another quote, which she did not say it's a paraphrase, which is, if I can't dance to it, it's not my revolution. And this is her talking about how the progressives would ban dancing in different halls. And she's like, I'm not for this at all. So she's a very interesting figure. You know, David Friedman, I met him at Porc Fest. And Rand obviously did not think very highly of Milton Friedman and denounced him in the worst terms. And I asked him, you know, what he thought of Rand. And he said Ayn Rand was brilliant, courageous, and wrong. And I think if anyone is brilliant and courageous and wrong, that says a lot about them. That really puts them at kind of the top of the heap. And I think Goldman in many ways, you can really call her that as well, but that also means if you're reading someone who's brilliant and wrong, it's going to be extremely thought provoking.

**WOODS:** Yeah, no kidding. Now, I think we need to, before we depart here, at least just spend a minute trying to figure out, all right, we get what she was against. She didn't like Teddy Roosevelt. She didn't like the state. She didn't trust the masses, the majority. She gave a lot of examples, by the way, of ways in which the majority oppresses the minority. She also talked about aesthetics. It's interesting material.

So what was her positive program? What is it that she wanted? If she views the state as being the upholder of private property, then obviously doing away with the state means doing away

with private property to some degree. Now, obviously, she doesn't mean everybody shares the same toothbrush. I'm sure, like most people of her persuasion, she believes in personal property for things like that. But what exactly is she agitating for, then? What is her vision of society? How would you describe it?

**MALICE:** I think in the early — so she only really has like one book. I mean, there's her memoirs, *Living My Life*, and the two-volume memoir, *My Disillusionment With Russia*. This is *Anarchism and Other Essays*. She was the editor for a long time until it was shut down by World War I of something called *Mother Earth*, which was an anarchist I believe monthly. And then there's a collection of essays from that called *Anarchy*, which has a lot of her work. She never really put forward what this would look like.

And this is why the criticism, which is often fair, is there's a certain naivete about this kind of anarchism, where it's like, all right, if you abolish prisons, sure, it's fair, let's suppose for the sake of argument, that there will be a far fewer crimes. But what do you do about those actual murderers? What do you do about those people who prey on children? And they kind of dodge this issue? And in the beginning of that *Anarchism and Other Essays*, she basically is like, well, it's not really on us to say what it would look like, because we can't imagine how a flourishing society would look like. Sure. But you know, you really have to kind of — that's not going to cut ice with most people. So I think this is kind of — Berkman, which I haven't read, wrote a book called, like the *ABCs of Anarchism*, and I think he spells it out far more. But anytime I see these types try to explain what it would look like, it really seems to me like a bit of a fairy tale.

**WOODS:** That was the impression I had, and we don't get a lot of detail. It's interesting, it seems like it swings from one extreme to the other. Either with the utopian socialists, so-called, we get extreme levels of detail, like there are going to be 1420 people in each community, kind of thing.

**MALICE:** Right.

**WOODS:** Or we get nothing at all, and we're being unreasonable to ask for it.

**MALICE:** Right.

**WOODS:** So I don't know what to make of that, but I find her interesting. And I like reading somebody I can't predict.

**MALICE:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** I can predict what Lenin's going to say. Even though I find him fascinating, I know where he's going with things. I can predict what John McCain would have said. I can predict what most people writing in *National Review* or *The New Republic*, I know what they're going to say. I know what Elizabeth Warren's take on the world is. I know what Bill Weld's take on the world is. None of this interests me at all. But because she's not one of these cookie-cutter people, she was interesting to read.

**MALICE:** Yeah, and there's lots of things she did that are really indefensible, and I'm not going to sit here and say oh, she's this angel. Not at all. I'm just saying she's someone who I find very, very thought provoking and not at all what you would expect, given who champions her today.

**WOODS:** All right, we're going to call it quits there. [TomWoods.com/1550](http://TomWoods.com/1550) will have a link where you can download this book if you'd like to take a look at it. Of course, you're going to be listening to *Your Welcome*, the Michael Malice program over on GaS Digital Network. I'll link to all Michael's stuff. I always do that. I've got his website, books, all this stuff, programs that he does. All this stuff will be linked at [TomWoods.com/1550](http://TomWoods.com/1550). And Michael, thanks a lot. Now time to go to bed.

