

UC Santa Barbara

Journal of Transnational American Studies

Title

Saving Civilization from the "'Green-Eyed' Monster": Emma Goldman and the Sex Reform Campaign against Jealousy, 1900-1930

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2mj2p06d>

Journal

Journal of Transnational American Studies, 4(1)

Author

Hustak, Carla C.

Publication Date

2012

DOI

10.5070/T841007119

Copyright Information

Copyright 2012 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

Saving Civilization from the “Green-Eyed’ Monster”: Emma Goldman and the Sex Reform Campaign against Jealousy, 1900–1930

CARLA HUSTAK

In 1912, sex radical and anarchist Emma Goldman warned that a “green-eyed’ monster” was overtaking homes, nations, workplaces, and even possessing the bodies of its victims. Goldman claimed that “the most prevalent evil of our mutilated love life is jealousy, often described as the ‘green-eyed’ monster who lies, cheats, betrays, and kills.”¹ By 1912, Goldman had emigrated to the United States from Russia, immersed herself in anarchist politics, defied the law on numerous occasions, earned the epithet Red Emma, and become notorious for free love sexual mores.² Although a well-known figure within Greenwich Village among the white middle-class bohemian intelligentsia, Goldman also had a number of international ties to the sex reform movement. She visited British sex reformer Edward Carpenter’s utopian commune, corresponded with Bertrand Russell, and attended one of Freud’s early lectures in 1895.³ Much like Goldman’s international reputation, her warning of the “green-eyed’ monster” highlighted embodied political alliances among liberal capitalist nations. Goldman’s attention to jealousy drew on a transnational conversation among sex reformers that located early twentieth-century burgeoning American capitalism, patriarchy, and empire in a broader narrative of kinship among white liberal capitalist nations that was affectively inscribed on white middle-class bodies. Goldman’s diatribe on jealousy highlighted the production of a particular kind of emotional economy through the global circulation of bodies, sex, and capital.

While Goldman has received considerable historical attention for her prevalent contributions to a period known for its labor militancy and radical sexual agenda advocating female sexual pleasure, less attention has been given to this period as a watershed in emotions history.⁴ Historians such as Lynn Hunt, Nicole

Eustace, and Rachel Weil have shown how behavioral codes and the performance of emotions have been integral to questions of “rights,” status, social contract theory, and the formation of political communities.⁵ I want to draw attention to both the historical specificity of an early twentieth-century discourse on jealousy and how sex reformers’ critiques of the state also mobilized a politics of emotions that forged communal ties.

Goldman’s speech on jealousy is an example of an important early twentieth-century formation of an *emotional economy*. I situate Goldman’s speech within the wider milieu of transatlantic networks of white middle-class sex reformers who were particularly influential in redefining national and international problems as problems of how social and political institutions shaped the emotional bodies of citizens. I use the term emotional economy to highlight currencies, exchanges, circulation, and specific concentrations of energies that early twentieth-century sex reformers identified with the manifestation of particular kinds of emotions. My focus on an emotional economy emphasizes the malleability and mutual shaping of bodies, political institutions, social bonds, and nations as they are materialized and ordered by emotional attachments. I argue that sex reformers’ campaigns highlighted an emotional economy where whiteness, reproductive bodies, middle-class status, and heterosexuality were experienced as *felt* relations of power, drawing together nations as genealogical and mobile entities materialized in citizen bodies. As sex reformers mounted a critique of dominant sexual and economic norms, their transatlantic campaigns for liberating sexual instincts remained tightly wedded to assumptions of similarly constituted white middle-class bodies shaped over time by their shared Anglo-Saxon histories. What is important to note about this critique is that sex reformers reconfigured international relations at the level of flows of energies, desires, and the production of emotions, which brought sex reformers in Britain and the United States into particularly close relations at the site of concerns over the affective condition of white middle-class bodies.⁶

My aim here is to explore the specific case of jealousy in leftist critiques of capitalism and patriarchy, which devoted particular attention to white middle-class emotional attachments to property, the bourgeois family, and professional work. Rather than focus on what Matthew Frye Jacobson has shown as the racial and political Anglo-Saxon subjectivity of self-governance, I focus on sex reformers’ critiques of white Anglo-Saxon political subjectivity as a jealousy-based emotional economy.⁷ I want to draw attention to sex reformers’ campaigns against jealousy as a harmful distribution of energies. For example, sex reformers contended that patriarchal control was marked by the direction of energies into the sexual possession of wives and the ownership of children. For sex reformers, this distribution of energies was closely linked to economic relations in the form of the sexual exhaustion of professional husbands who looked to fulfill their roles as breadwinners while focused on enriching their own families without concern for the welfare of other families. In the case of imperial power, sex reformers suggested

wars were effects of investing energies in the protection of territorial possessions. To this extent, sex reformers shaped an emotional narrative of fluctuating and contested national boundaries that stretched, bent, and shaded into each other in the movement of people and commodities.

My argument builds on and reframes historiographies of sexuality, colonialism, and emotions. Most importantly, I take the prevalent mention of jealousy in transatlantic sex reform networks as an opportunity for analyzing the sex reform movement as a politics of emotions. Instead of focusing on sex per se, I explore what an emotional lens like jealousy contributed to sex reformers' campaigns to exalt the importance of sexual instincts to upholding "civilization." I suggest that the lens of emotion, particularly jealousy, introduces an important complexity into the traditional picture of the history of early twentieth-century sex reform and social movements.⁸ Secondly, my work builds on Ann Laura Stoler's insights into emotions as more than the "fluff of history."⁹ My specific focus on Goldman's critique of jealousy as the emotional character of a capitalist and patriarchal social order builds on recent feminist analyses of the place of love, joy, intimacy, and feeling in Goldman's anarchist politics and philosophy.¹⁰ I suggest here that an emotional lens provides new insights into how bodies are governed in ways that exceed, complicate, and introduce tensions into discerning national boundaries. Thirdly, Peter Stearns's cultural history of jealousy has pointed to a widespread disapproval of jealousy in the early twentieth century among the middle class.¹¹ However, I want to refine this lens by specifically addressing what jealousy meant for the intermeshed personal and political struggles of sex reformers who were torn between ethical and political beliefs in relinquishing impulses toward possessiveness, ownership, and control over bodies and things in marriage and wider economic relations. My contribution here is more than simply linking together these historiographies but introducing emotions as an important analytical lens for understanding early twentieth-century Anglo-transatlantic sex reform politics. In doing so, I look to what the sex reform movement contributed to reconceptualizing international politics as an emotional economy where jealousy was a particular effect of how families, intimacy, work, and resources were organized. By exploring sex reformers' bohemian living experiments and their engagement with capitalism, I show how they tightly bound British and American citizenship in similar traditions of sexual morality and liberal capitalism that affectively inscribed the valued citizen of white middle-class professional status.

Varietism in the Village or Intimate Possessions in the Home?

Whether in New York City's Greenwich Village or in London's Bloomsbury, sex reformers engaged in marriage experiments of bohemian living. Despite being located on different sides of the Atlantic, sex reformers drew these two metropolitan communities together as sites of a shared set of ethics and struggles in battling the

“green-eyed’ monster.”¹² This monster often surfaced in the midst of efforts to establish a new marital ethic of non-possessiveness, non-monogamy, and more egalitarian sexual and economic relations. Although far from a mainstream practice, sex reformers who experimented with non-monogamous marriages are important from the perspective of the salience of an anti-jealousy ethic. As Lesley Hall has noted about the British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology, these individuals are worth studying due to their disproportionate influence as white middle-class intellectuals at the forefront of reshaping sexual norms.¹³ While not all sex reformers undertook such experiments, questioning monogamy or the viability of the institution of marriage operated as a normative value within sex reform networks. More importantly, sex reformers themselves suggested that these marital experiments marked their superiority insofar as they were far more enlightened than a mainstream population, which may need monogamous marriage until they evolved to this form of marriage.¹⁴

On both sides of the Atlantic, a cooperative intellectual network took shape as sex reformers turned monogamy into a site for critical discussion, practice, and reform. Many sex reformers attacked monogamy on the ethical ground that it produced jealous men and women. For sex reformers, jealousy was problematic because it impeded the affirmation of sexual desires by binding partners to an ethic of fidelity, which, according to H. G. Wells, turned marriage into an institution based on jealousy rather than love.¹⁵ In the United States, there was a series of debates over the institution of marriage that brought British and American sex reformers into the same spaces of intellectual discussion as part of a sex reform circuit. Judge Ben Lindsey of Denver, Colorado, was popular for his work on companionate marriage, which criticized marriage conventions for exalting jealousy.¹⁶ According to Lindsey, “at the very heart of this ‘Christian,’ but often very un-Christian like, civilization of ours, we place this ugly thing, this mother of lies and abomination on a throne beside the domestic hearth, and in so doing we exalt selfishness, exclusiveness, fear, suspicion, and raw egotism in the home to the position of cardinal domestic virtues.”¹⁷ Lindsey situated his own claims as a pivotal moment of change in that “adultery is ancient, of course; but this tendency to debate what has hitherto been debateable is new” (59).

British sex reformer, mathematician, and philosopher Bertrand Russell visited the United States a number of times to debate these questions. Writing to his wife and fellow sex reformer, Dora Russell, Bertrand claimed, “I never heard about your speech on marriages to Maude Royden’s people. I hear there was a lot about it (very laudatory) in the American papers, but I missed it. Tomorrow I speak on Companionate Marriage here in New York City, and on Dec. 8 I debate it in Boston with a Presbyterian Minister.”¹⁸ Russell’s debates and lectures on marriage also brought him into contact with Judge Lindsey. He wrote to Dora, “I shall be entertained by Judge Lindsey. From here I go South. So far as I have been able to discover, people don’t much mind my book on marriage + morals.”¹⁹ In fact, both

Bertrand Russell's *Marriage and Morals* and Dora Russell's *The Right to Be Happy* circulated within the United States and became popular works for criticizing fidelity as an ethic that turned marriage into an institution based on jealousy rather than love.²⁰

Aside from the actual physical presence of British and American sex reformers, edited collections brought the writings of white middle-class sex reformers into the same intellectual space. American "sex boys" V. F. Calverton and Samuel Schmalhausen undertook collaborative works that privileged the work of American and British sex reformers.²¹ In fact, famous British sexologist Havelock Ellis wrote the introduction to one of Schmalhausen and Calverton's collections entitled *Sex in Civilization*.²² In *Sex in Civilization*, American sex reformer J. William Lloyd's essay on "Sex Jealousy and Civilization" argued that the conventions of marriage ultimately treated women as sexual commodities "to be bred like a domestic animal, captured like booty, purchased as a chattel, bestowed as a gift, treated as a slave."²³ This, however, extended far beyond just the realm of the home as jealousy amounted to a way of navigating the world. Lloyd maintained that "a man who will selfishly take and jealously defend rights over a woman's sex, which are no rights, will selfishly take and jealously defend all the legal privileges he can get over his neighbour and his nation's right to unequal advantage over other nations" (235). In another edited collection, entitled *Divorce as I See It*, British and American intellectuals such as Bertrand Russell, H. G. Wells, and American novelist Theodore Dreiser collaborated on the question of possession, fidelity, and marriage. What Wells called "jealousy-marriage" he criticized for its "sexual monopolization," citing the specific example of New York State's divorce law where adultery served as the only ground for divorce.²⁴ For Wells, like other sex reformers, this was not simply a problem confined to a specific nation or state but amounted to "a disagreeable aspect of a larger and still more disagreeable fact, the hard, rigid, irrational exaggeration of marriage in the modern community" (30). Wells's own extramarital lover, journalist Rebecca West, also wrote in this collection on how "Divorce Is a Necessity," explaining that the institution of marriage supported man's "natural jealousy" whereby a double standard occurred that made women particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation, specifically where the wife was reliant on the economic provision of the husband.²⁵ These feminist critiques intertwined jealousy, marriage, sexual morality, and economics as manifestations of male domination over women's bodies. In other words, sex reformers suggested that jealousy was essentially the emotional product of such social and political ways of ordering and defining men and women.

In the realm of sex reformers' marriage experiments, their critiques of marriage were embodied in the tensions they experienced as the inconsistency or hypocrisy between feeling jealousy and their commitment to a feminist and socialist commitment to non-possessiveness. Emma Goldman's relationship with her tour manager, Ben Reitman, exemplifies this embodiment of the transatlantic discursive connections between sex reformers.²⁶ Goldman initially experimented with

nonexclusive sexual relations with Alexander Berkman, whom she called Sasha. Berkman and Goldman agreed that anarchist principles took the form of nonexclusivity in sexual relations whereby claims to property over the wife, household, and family were relinquished in the dual commitment to the economic and sexual rights of both men and women. This also amounted to overturning a bourgeois sexual morality that presumed an economically self-sufficient male breadwinner who turned his wife into a sexual and decorative possession.

Goldman and Reitman's relationship highlights the joint struggles over jealousy that, they believed, dammed the flow of energies by erecting barriers to sharing possessions in the forms of free love and communal ownership. Goldman's letters to Reitman mark the overwhelming physiological experience of attempts to overturn bourgeois sexual morality. At a time when feminists began to argue against the dominant trope of the passionless white middle-class woman, Goldman wrote to Reitman, "when I think of last night, our beautiful compartment all to ourselves. It seemed all aglow with love and passion and ecstasy."²⁷ In another letter, Goldman used explicitly sexual references to convey her longing for Ben, encouraging him to "rest and dream of your mamie and the lonely treasure box and your mountains of joy."²⁸ To communicate the intensity of her feelings, Goldman drew on the racialized and evolutionary figure of the "primitive," referring to "the madness of a wild, barbarian primitive love."²⁹ Goldman situated "primitive love" as a counterforce to civilization, which was aligned with the advent of private property and bourgeois forms of marriage.

Goldman and Reitman's efforts to develop a relationship fully consistent with anarchist ethics of free love and communal ownership uneasily contended with the specter of jealousy. While Goldman chastised Reitman for womanizing, she was careful to insist that "it is not jealousy, it's only a terrible savage craving to give you everything to receive everything from you, that is all."³⁰ Reitman also seemed to uncomfortably identify and then deny jealous feelings as profoundly inconsistent with the demands of ethical political beliefs within his Greenwich Village milieu. Reitman wrote to Goldman that he had "little sense of possession but I want to own all for myself."³¹ The double standard that interlocked patriarchy with capitalist investments in property also emerged when Reitman confessed that "I am satisfied of one thing when you desire to become intimate with men. I do not want to know it I cannot stand it. I see that you have every moral and physical right to it and it is only what I have done."³² Goldman and Reitman struggled to keep the "'green-eyed' monster" at bay as part of the new normative constraints being created in the radical political milieu of the sex reform movement.

Goldman and Reitman's struggles with jealousy were part of a broader phenomenon occurring among white middle-class intellectuals within Greenwich Village who had come to criticize how they had been shaped by both the Victorian sexual moral and economic codes of their parents. In Greenwich Village, a number of white middle-class intellectuals engaged in both socialist and feminist movements

also experimented with what was then called “varietism,” a term for a variety of sexual partners in pursuing love, sexual pleasure, and affirming instincts.³³ These couples included editor of *The Masses* Max Eastman and socialist Ida Rau, poet Edna St. Vincent Millay and novelist Floyd Dell, wealthy Buffalo heiress and salonnière Mabel Dodge and artist Maurice Sterne, and writers Hutchins Hapgood and Neith Boyce. Hutchins Hapgood, a journalist and friend of Goldman, described marriage experiments in Greenwich Village as a painful test of manhood whereby “the woman was in full possession of what the man used to regard as his ‘rights,’ and the men, even the most advanced of them, suffered from the woman’s full assumption of his old privileges.”³⁴ Hapgood and wife Neith Boyce, in fact, also tried what was then called “varietist” marriage. Perhaps Hapgood was thinking of his own battles with Boyce, when he wrote of the “Jealous Wife.” Hapgood situated the early twentieth-century strides of feminism in terms of how this would undermine jealousy within marriage. He argued that “women are predestined to touch life on so many points, to work with so many men, to care for so greatly enlarged a family of children, namely the children of the community, that they will cease to have so exclusive so isolated, so purely personal and possessive relation to one poor, weak, individual man.”³⁵ In doing so, Hapgood drew on what had become a socialist argument within sex reform networks for redefining the family and the home as extending to the broader care and mothering of the state or a wider community of children. In other words, Hapgood engaged in social movements that not only were defined as reordering relations between bodies but also tended to an emotional economy whereby the way the home, work, and government were organized could transform the prevalence of jealousy in the world toward love.

Sex reformers’ collaborative efforts to reform marriage were not just a matter of changing institutional arrangements or establishing new normative practices. These also entailed redefining how bodies were taught to feel by normative institutions and the values that sex reformers identified as similar impositions on white middle-class bodies in Britain and the United States. Although British sex reformers noted a distinctive manifestation of American capitalism as more rapid and uncontrollable alongside a more puritanical legal and moral code, they suggested the struggles of a declining white birthrate, the “civilized” disease of neurasthenia, and the psychological harm incurred from white middle-class sexual morality united white middle-class bodies across the Atlantic.³⁶ More importantly, these similar bourgeois values carried the implication that the “green-eyed’ monster” was far from confined to Greenwich Village. These similar institutions of marriage, sexual mores, and capitalist regimes of production and consumerism circulated jealousy inasmuch as they were produced by it. Sex reformers engaged in feminist and socialist movements that were international in scope also situated the emotional bodies produced by capitalism and patriarchy within international circuits of white middle-class mobility and experience.

British and American sex reformers allied in their battles against a “‘green-eyed’ monster” that could not be confined to national boundaries as it symbiotically engaged with bourgeois social and political institutions. Among British sex reformers, there were struggles with jealousy that simultaneously occurred and resonated with those of Goldman, the Hapgoods, and other Greenwich Villagers. British sex reformer and socialist Edward Carpenter’s works became required reading for a number of sex reformers in both the United States and Britain as he rose to the stature of a prophet of sex reform.³⁷ In fact, in 1925, Emma Goldman visited Carpenter at his bohemian commune, which had moved to Mountside (427). Carpenter’s commune was famous as his creation of a domestic space for homosexual relations, allowing him to pursue his attraction to rugged working-class men like long-term companion George Merrill at a time when homosexuality was condemned as crime and pathology. Historian Terence Kissack has devoted particular attention to Goldman’s connections to Carpenter in the context of American anarchists’ politics of homosexuality as the liberation of desires.³⁸

While Edward Carpenter became known for his attention to homosexual love, his celebrated work on *Love’s Coming-of-Age* devoted considerable attention to love in the context of the need for reforming heterosexual marriage. Despite Carpenter’s fame as an advocate for “homogenic love,” he was reticent on the subject of homosexual sex and emphasized love over physical contact in contrast to encouraging heterosexual husbands and wives to affirm their sexual desires. Although Carpenter’s homosexual relationships also abided by an anti-jealousy ethic that allowed for nonexclusive sexual relations, Carpenter framed connections between sex and emotion in very different ways when discussing heterosexual and homosexual love. Carpenter’s critique of bourgeois marriage foregrounded sex as “the allegory of Love in the physical world,” which gave it “immense power.”³⁹ By contrast, Carpenter maintained that Uranians or “the Intermediate race” were “purely emotional in their character” (123, 126). This contrast marks the tensions of Carpenter’s politics of emotions in relationship to sexual moralities. Goldman herself seems to have shared this ambivalence. While Goldman passionately defended Oscar Wilde and lectured on homosexuality, she expressed shock and dismay when she discovered that Austrian homosexual rights advocate Magnus Hirschfeld placed Paris Commune Louise Michel among his “collection of homosexuals.” Goldman claimed to be “anxious that Louise Michel should be saved the unfounded charge of Homosexuality.”⁴⁰

Carpenter’s *Love’s Coming-of-Age*, first published in 1896, denounced “bourgeois marriage,” which he also equated with “modern Monogamic Marriage” as “forcibly stiffened and contracted by private jealousy and public censorship.”⁴¹ In Carpenter’s work, he advocated “variety of love,” which would allow “for married people to have intimacies with outsiders, and yet to continue perfectly true to each other” (105). Carpenter juxtaposed this “variety of love” against the current norms of marriage whereby “the narrow physical passion of jealousy, the petty sense of

private property in another person, social opinion, and legal enactments, have all converged to choke and suffocate wedded love in egoism, lust, and meanness” (104). Carpenter described the manifestation of jealousy in terms of a blockage, barriers, or the isolation of sexual feelings that would remain concentrated between the married couple, which “suddenly cuts them off from the world, not only precluding the two from sexual, but even from any openly affectional relations with outsiders, and corroborating the selfish sense of monopoly which each has in the other” (104). In other words, Carpenter suggested that, paradoxically, prevailing marital conventions of fidelity produced jealousy as a capitalist and patriarchal expression of the male assertion of sexual property and economic security and the woman’s complicity in taking the role of an ornament. These problems of jealousy, however, were by no means specific to Britain but flourished as the “conditions of high civilisation” among the middle and upper classes where there existed “an overfed masculinity in the males and a nervous and hysterical tendency in the females” (78–79). What Carpenter attacked as the problem of jealousy bound to bourgeois sexual and economic codes circulated as an emotional economy mapped by the movement, location, and activities of white middle-class and “English-speaking” bodies shaped by their similar experiences of such institutions (28).

For a number of British sex reformers, Greenwich Villagers’ bohemian experiments bore an affinity to London’s Bloomsbury. British sex reformer and novelist Naomi Mitchison wrote to Greenwich Villager Mabel Dodge expressing the uncanny resemblance between Bloomsbury and the Village as venues of radical sexual politics.⁴² As Katie Roiphe has shown, the practice of “varietist” marriage was relatively widespread among the British Bloomsbury white middle-class intelligentsia.⁴³ British sex reformers who gravitated to London for work and social and family life invoked similar claims on the need to eradicate jealousy through a new practice of non-monogamous marriage. Harriet Ward, the daughter of Dora Russell and Greenwich Village journalist Griffin Barry, has pointed out her own personal connection in the transatlantic crossings of the sex reform movement.⁴⁴

Dora and Bertrand Russell’s marriage and their connections to American sex reformers exemplify the transatlantic efforts to reshape the emotional economy that brought sex reformers on both sides of the Atlantic into shared struggles with the “green-eyed’ monster.” Although sex reformers Dora and Bertrand Russell lived in Chelsea, they frequented Bloomsbury, associating with prominent Bloomsbury Group members such as Leonard and Virginia Woolf, John Maynard Keynes, and Ottoline Morrell. During Bertrand Russell’s trips to the United States, he often wrote to Dora of their own efforts to embrace sexual freedom within their marriage by allowing each other to freely pursue sexual desires and relations outside of the marital bond. Initially, Bertrand confidently told Dora that “altogether when people are as secure in each other’s love as you + I are, jealousy is impossible.”⁴⁵ However, this situation soon strained the marriage when, in November of 1927, Bertrand tried to explain his affection for his lover Alice. He told Dora that “I am happy with her [Alice], although I

don't love her as I love you; but jealousy + inferiority-complex keep me from being happy with you." He confessed that "I struggle hard to keep jealousy under but it isn't easy."⁴⁶ Much like Goldman and Reitman, sex reformers Dora and Bertrand Russell felt jealousy as a bodily disturbance as these feelings pointed to an unsettling tension between feeling, ethics, and political beliefs. These efforts to keep the "green-eyed' monster" at bay highlights the emergence of new normative constraints as sex reformers attempted to embrace sexual freedom to overcome existing sexual taboos.

While Dora and Bertrand Russell's relationship provides one example of simultaneous struggles with jealousy in both Greenwich Village and Bloomsbury, their ideas also had a more direct transatlantic connection in the popularity of their works in the United States. In both Dora Russell's 1927 publication *The Right to Be Happy* and Bertrand Russell's 1929 work on *Marriage and Morals*, they attacked existing sexual morality and marriage for impeding sexual fulfillment and love. Dora Russell advocated "temporary sex partnerships," which would lead to "fewer lonely, hard, and envious men and women, less anger and jealousy more generosity and love."⁴⁷ In *Marriage and Morals*, Bertrand Russell blamed both jealousy and sexual fatigue for the puritanical morality that produced a horror of sex.⁴⁸ He argued, however, that such puritanism was much more prevalent in the United States where "sex relations as a dignified, rational wholehearted activity in which the complete personality cooperates, do not often, I think, occur in America outside of marriage" (158). In another work, *The Conquest of Happiness*, Bertrand Russell praised American judge Ben Lindsey for his views on companionate marriage while going on to point to a mutual interest between Britain and the United States.⁴⁹ This mutual investment appeared in Russell's contention that "instinctive happiness" appeared to be rare in the English-speaking world.⁵⁰ According to Russell, "civilization in this respect seems to have gone astray," and "if the white races are to survive, that parenthood should again become capable of yielding happiness to parents" (93, 196). For the most part, British and American sex reformers' attacks on jealousy were grounded in the milieu of what they understood as the problems of "civilized" white middle-class sexual morality. By identifying jealousy as a problem in the ordering of the world, sex reformers essentially highlighted how white middle-class men and women, particularly in the English-speaking world, had been harmed by their conformity to Victorian sexual and capitalist values.

In their critiques of a world governed by an emotional economy where jealousy rather than love predominated, sex reformers identified a kinship among white middle-class Anglo bodies along the lines of their affective constitution. In particular, both American and British sex reformers identified a specific way that sexual energies circulated in white middle-class bodies that had conformed to sexual and capitalist social values. In other words, white middle-class bodies, which were complicit in conforming to the circulation and investment in jealousy, were defined by a particular energetic makeup. Dora Russell lamented the "age-long neglect of the

roots of primitive feeling.”⁵¹ However, in doing so, she situated her advocacy for sexual freedom within the context of dominant white middle-class educated morality whereby “the struggle for reform was left to economics, to rationalism, and to a thin and watery humanitarianism. All this is part of the price we have paid for the leadership of ascetics and puritans” (80). Bertrand Russell also pointed to the damaging effects on white middle-class bodies that affectively internalized hegemonic sexual and economic codes. According to Bertrand Russell, “vigorous men of later periods have had to do their best to live up to an outlook on life belonging to diseased, weary, and disillusioned men who had lost all sense of biological values.”⁵² Although Bertrand Russell used the specific example of the American businessman who renounced such biological values by abandoning instinctive pleasure for moneymaking, he more broadly defined this as a problem of “the most civilized races” and “the pattern for the white man everywhere.”⁵³ Across the Atlantic in Greenwich Village, Hutchins Hapgood voiced similar concerns about the failure of white middle-class husbands to cultivate the art of love due to the pressures, fatigue, and loss of sexual energies incurred in white middle-class professional life. In an article on “Husbands and Wives,” Hapgood maintained that “breadwinners are not enough for highly developed women, who need real attention. Many women are bored with their husbands simply because their husbands stick too closely to their jobs, and don’t work enough over marriage, don’t try to make marriage extend itself into social and esthetic enjoyment, thereby becoming richer, and more deeply pleasurable.”⁵⁴ Like Bertrand Russell, Hapgood identified this problem of emotional and instinctive expression with a particular racial character that united Anglo-Saxons at the site of a common energetic constitution of sexual fatigue aligned with an emotional economy that was fueled by and produced jealousy. At a time of high levels of Southern and Eastern European immigration, Hapgood contrasted the Italian character with the Anglo-Saxon, maintaining that “they are emotional about ideas as such, warm about abstractions, a feeling relatively rare with Anglo-Saxons.”⁵⁵ Reporting on an interview with Felix Adler of the Ethical Culture Society, Hapgood also emphasized Adler’s view that Anglo-Saxons, unlike Gallic/Latin/French feeling, failed to “indulge their personal tendencies.”⁵⁶

The rise of the genre of sex manuals in the early twentieth century addressed this popular concern of the lack of sexual fulfillment among white middle-class couples as American birth controller Margaret Sanger and British birth controller Marie Stopes wrote works pitched at the white middle class to teach them to cultivate what was being called “the art of love.” Both Sanger’s and Stopes’s works circulated in the United States and Britain, propagating love as a different kind of emotional economy that could allow for the free flow of sexual energies. As such, these works also implicitly attacked jealousy at the level of white middle-class men’s investment in asserting sexual ownership over women by proclaiming such ownership through their own sexual gratification and holding wives to an unrealistic standard of chastity. Both Sanger and Stopes were also implicated in the “varietist”

trend of reshaping marriage. Margaret Sanger lived in a “varietist” marriage with William Sanger in Greenwich Village.⁵⁷ Marie Stopes later came to an agreement with Humphrey Verdon-Roe to pursue extramarital affairs.⁵⁸ Like Russell and Hapgood, Stopes situated her advocacy of sexual fulfillment as a project for “civilized countries” where “the profound primitive knowledge of the needs of both sexes have been lost.”⁵⁹ Her detailed instructions on how husbands and wives could cultivate sexual pleasure were specifically aimed at “the great majority of people in the English speaking countries [who] have no glimmering of knowledge of the supreme human art, the ‘Art of Love’” (18).

From the circulation of sex manuals to the practice of “varietist” marriage experiments, sex reformers contributed to shaping an emotional traffic among white middle-class bodies joined in similar ethical, political, and familial projects. This emotional traffic, however, not only bound white middle-class bodies across national boundaries in their specific uses of energies and instincts but also joined these bodies in a reproductive alliance for white racial survival. Dorothy Roberts’s *Killing the Black Body* and Matthew Connelly’s *Fatal Misconception* emphasize the racial politics of the birth control movement, its connections to eugenics, and worldwide population control movements.⁶⁰ What I want to stress here are the hitherto neglected emotional dimensions of the racial logic of sexual politics. When sex reformers denounced jealousy for contributing to damming the flow of sexual energies, whether by stifling such energies in one partner or by draining such energies through the pursuit of property, they located jealousy as a force contributing to what they regarded as a worrisome declining white birthrate, the suppression of sexual energies, and the fecundity of so-called “unfit” populations.⁶¹

Although many historians have pointed out the eugenic legacy of American birth control leader Margaret Sanger, less attention has been paid to how Emma Goldman’s sexual politics were implicated in early twentieth-century feminist arguments for birth control as scientific motherhood.⁶² In an interview on what anarchy promised for women, Goldman claimed that “very few mothers know how to take proper care of their children, anyway. It is a science only a very few have learned.” This interview, which appeared in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, depicted Goldman herself as an Anglo-Saxon racial type by describing her “Teutonic type” nose, blue eyes, “complexion clear and white,” and “her whole type . . . more German than Russian.”⁶³ On the one hand, early twentieth-century birth controllers encouraged white middle-class women to indulge in sexual pleasure while, on the other hand, they suggested that for the lower and so-called “unfit” classes the problem was not one of desire but of too many births. Goldman and Sanger had much in common as trained nurses who grounded their early calls for birth control in eyewitness claims to the poverty, misery, and indiscriminate breeding of poor, immigrant, and typically nonwhite families.⁶⁴ Goldman’s correspondence with Sanger reveals her support for Sanger’s views on birth control, particularly in Goldman’s distribution of Sanger’s *Woman Rebel* on her lecture tours across the United States.⁶⁵

Goldman's views on birth control also had much in common with Sanger. Writing to Sanger in 1914, Goldman expressed support for neo-Malthusian leagues, which became prominent in England and France among intellectuals concerned over the racial distribution of population levels.⁶⁶ In 1913, Goldman's article on "Victims of Morality" appeared in an issue of her periodical *Mother Earth*, which called for a transformation toward a "race-conscious" mother as a "race-builder."⁶⁷ This free motherhood, however, had a specific socioeconomic and racial grounding of love. Goldman joined specific emotional and sexual dilemmas of morality to particular kinds of women. According to Goldman, morality condemned "women to the position of celibate, a prostitute, or a reckless breeder of hapless children."⁶⁸ Goldman's concern with affirming sexual instincts largely turned on the figure of the celibate as the middle-class girl who needed a "more normal expression of their physical instincts." According to Goldman, these girls suffered from "a gray-grown Morality," which "applies even with greater force to the masses of professional middle-class girls."⁶⁹ While Goldman highlighted "the modern woman" as "race-conscious," this held different meanings for professional middle-class and working-class mothers.

Perhaps surprising on the part of an anarchist and labor militant, Goldman, like many eugenicists and birth controllers, emphasized the drain of births on state resources, highlighting how "they fill the factories, the reformatories, the homes for feeble-minded, the prisons, the insane asylums."⁷⁰ Appearing before a court on April 20, 1916, Goldman framed her defense for birth control in the classic eugenicist claims of quality over quantity. She told the judge, her aims are to inform women "by what means to bring children who are of quality to the race, instead of quantity into the world."⁷¹ Emma Goldman, in fact, aligned eugenic motherhood with love, which characterized the future healthy mother in white middle-class terms. According to Goldman, "Woman no longer wants to be a party to the production of a race of sickly, feeble, decrepit, wretched human beings who have neither the strength nor moral courage to throw off the yoke of poverty and slavery. Instead she desires fewer and better children, begotten and reared in love and through free choice; not by compulsion, as marriage imposes."⁷² This eugenic dimension of Goldman's views of a race-conscious motherhood adds a level of complexity to what Lori Jo Marso and Heather Ostman have shown as the feminist tension in Goldman's work of affirming a feminine sexual instinct while seeking to free women from normative constraints of gender.⁷³ The place of eugenics in Goldman's politics highlights tensions in both her economic and sexual analyses of power, which sought justice for lower classes and women.

Goldman's advocacy for birth control drew on eugenics as a tool for working-class resistance to capitalism through limiting the number of bodies as fodder for capitalist and war machines. However, as Goldman tied the control of births to particular constructions of unhappy, feeble, vulnerable, and unloving working-class homes, her politics of emotions also reaffirmed an emotional superiority to white

middle-class homes and maternal bodies. In Goldman's article on "The Social Aspects of Birth Control," which appeared in the April 1916 issue of *Mother Earth*, she addressed an audience of middle-class intellectuals. This article is perhaps one of the clearest statements on Goldman's engagement with eugenics and population control. Beginning her article with a concept of a "genius nature" as "the heritage of the race," Goldman's arguments must be situated in the context of intellectuals' familiarity with the father of eugenics Francis Galton's ideas on hereditary genius.⁷⁴ In this same article, Goldman referred to Thomas Malthus and the importance of curbing fecundity as a pivotal moment in the legacy of birth control. She specifically referred to "the merits of Malthus' contention, to wit, that the earth is not fertile or rich enough to supply the needs of an excessive race" (468). Goldman's discussion of birth control was very much wedded to her understanding of an embodied form of capitalism at the level of energies, desires, and impulses. According to Goldman, capitalism had "an insatiable appetite" and since Malthus's time had "grown into a huge insatiable monster" (468). Goldman suggested that birth control could be a means of working-class resistance to curb a "superfluous human mass" that serves the needs of "political economists, together with all the sponsors of the capitalistic regime, [who] are in favour of a large and excessive race" (469). However, these claims also ran the risk of re-entrenching class and racial hierarchies on the grounds of which bodies were fit to breed. In Goldman's article, lower-class bodies take on a frightening display of degradation and devaluation, particularly as the "overworked and underfed vitality [that] cannot reproduce healthy progeny" (469). To mount claims for limiting working-class births, Goldman also cast working-class motherhood in the unfavorable light of "an indiscriminate and incessant breeding on the part of the overworked and underfed masses [that] has resulted in an increase of defective, crippled and unfortunate children" (469). To Goldman, this motherhood was biologically complicit in upholding capitalism through "blindly and stupidly dedicating its offspring to Moloch" (471). Goldman also emphasized that this project amounted to a "worldwide movement" that promised to "usher into the world a new kind of motherhood" (474). Goldman's views on "the social aspects of birth control" highlight the complexities of her politics of emotions in terms of whether pleasure and the joys of sex were primarily directed to middle-class women and the curbing of fertility directed to working-class women.

Goldman's attention to this birth control as a worldwide movement can be seen as evidence of the particularly close ties between American and British sex radicals who situated their arguments within what historians have defined as eugenic morality. One of Goldman's British mentors, Edward Carpenter, hopefully looked to a future healthy mother who would overturn the existing condition of "false sexual selection" whereby men selected females on the basis of beauty, turning women into what Carpenter deemed to be "an emblem of possession – a mere doll, an empty idol."⁷⁵ Carpenter here was largely concerned with the white middle-class family where "the greed of Private Property" most clearly manifested itself in sexual

relations and emotional expression (35). Other British sex reformers such as H. G. Wells, Havelock Ellis, and Bertrand Russell supported eugenics, regarding their own efforts to reform sex as intrinsic to shaping and securing the future of white middle-class civilization. Ellis's eugenic views were certainly no secret. Yet Goldman expressed admiration for Ellis, telling him that she had "carried your ideas and your pleas for human rights all over the United States."⁷⁶ These transatlantic affinities between sex radicals situated white middle-class women's reproductive bodies as sites where national boundaries collapsed in a racial mission of Anglo-Saxon reproduction and survival.

Havelock Ellis specifically addressed these biological alliances in an article that appeared in Margaret Sanger's American periodical, *The Birth Control Review*. Ellis here framed the problem of population in terms of "the world's racial problem," wherein a "colored military peril" presented itself as the unequal distribution of "colored" versus "white" population levels.⁷⁷ Ellis blamed this situation on the "white race" insofar as "its civilization has been too materialistic" (14). To illustrate the urgency of such a problem, Ellis cited the numbers that one-third of white human beings held nine-tenths of the globe under their political control (14). Rather than condemn colonialism or this unequal distribution of power, Ellis instead highlighted the peril of such a situation for white imperial power. In this context, the appearance of Ellis's article in Sanger's *Birth Control Review* highlighted the politics of women's bodies, the transatlantic bonds, and the biological battles that crossed national borders. While historians have shown that many prominent sex reformers were also eugenicists, I argue here that their involvement in eugenics situated sexual reproduction as a materialization of the circulation of an emotional economy.⁷⁸ In other words, the births of eugenic babies came to represent the affirmation of love as opposed to jealousy.

At the end of *Love's Coming-of-Age*, Carpenter's notes "On Jealousy" highlighted a force that moved throughout the universe, shaping bodies, relationships, and institutions in ways that drew connections between people beyond national borders. According to Carpenter, jealousy existed on a cosmic plane as "a great disturber of the celestial order of Love is Jealousy – that brand of physical passion which carried over into the emotional regions of the mind will sometimes rage there like a burning fire."⁷⁹ While this "'green-eyed' monster" seemed all the more insidious for its invisible and pervasive momentum, it left material tracks in the struggles of bohemian marriage experiments, the pursuit of material wealth, the dissipated energies of white middle-class husbands without the time to cultivate the "art of love," and the ornamentation of wives expected to fulfill the roles of chaste dolls. On both sides of the Atlantic, British and American sex reformers waged a war on the "'green-eyed' monster" as they identified with similar institutions of capitalism, patriarchy, and sexual morality. In forging alliances, British and American sex reformers highlighted the biological values binding English-speaking countries and "white races" joined in their affective condition of devitalized energies, little

“instinctive happiness,” and loss of sexual vitality. While many historians have noted these concerns over energies in this period, particularly in the diagnosis of neurasthenia, these concerns were also tied to a particular emotional economy, which, sex reformers claimed, circulated and produced jealousy as integral to the possessive investments in the bodies of women and the accumulation of material wealth.

Conclusion

By the time Goldman issued her warning of the “‘green-eyed’ monster” in 1912, she had already established connections among white middle-class bohemians in Greenwich Village. As she broadened her anarchism beyond the circles of the immigrant and working poor, Goldman drew attention to what happened to white middle-class bodies under dominant sexual and economic norms. Goldman’s “‘green-eyed’ monster” blurred the lines between white middle-class bodies and white middle-class social and political institutions that upheld Victorian sexual and capitalist morality. In Goldman’s talk, bodies were constituted by values and institutions that highlighted the “‘green-eyed’ monster” as the offspring of the white middle class. As Goldman and her fellow Greenwich Villagers experimented with marriage and attacked capitalism, they suggested that the white middle class was harmed by the “‘green-eyed’ monster” yet continued to feed it insofar as they continued to perpetuate investments in sexual and economic property.

On both sides of the Atlantic, sex reformers’ struggles to keep the monster at bay exemplified their ambivalent position of being shaped by dominant capitalist and sexual norms while trying to invent new ethical codes. In other words, they were in the difficult position of trying to attack the monster while still being in its clutches. Goldman maintained that this monster was produced by “legal, religious, and moral interference [which] are the parents of our present unnatural love and sex life and out of it jealousy grown.”⁸⁰ According to Goldman, jealousy had been taught through the ages, passed down by generations as “the legitimate weapon of defense, for the protection of property right” (4). Those who were, therefore, most responsible for jealousy were property holders with families reflecting the sexual and economic gender roles of the middle and upper classes. In Goldman’s view, jealousy had both a gendered and capitalist manifestation in the “conceit of the male” as the breadwinner and the “envy of the female” as the ornament of the household (4). These households, men, women, and commodities were the outward material signs of jealousy made visible across national borders, connecting white middle-class bodies in biological and economic kinship.

As American and British sex reformers circulated common works, exchanged information, attended similar gatherings, and engaged in similar experiments with marriage, they situated their radical politics within an imagined emotional economy of the world. At a time of rapid American economic and imperial expansion, both

British and American sex reformers identified the United States as an extreme case of materialism, the rapid pace of modernity, the exhaustion of white middle-class energies, and the puritanism of bourgeois sexual norms that exalted chasteness and passionlessness in the wife and self-control in the husband. Yet, despite this seeming American exceptionalism, American and British sex reformers acknowledged a particularly close kinship in similar social, political, and economic institutions that reflected their entangled national and imperial histories. In this period, sex reformers' campaigns against jealousy highlighted the emotional bonds and shared investments of white middle-class bodies in Britain and the United States as jointly suffering under capitalism and patriarchy. What sex reformers highlighted as a problem of jealousy remapped communities across national boundaries by identifying a particular emotional constitution of white middle-class bodies, similarly engaged in upholding dominant Western liberal capitalist institutions of work and family. While sex reformers' campaigns were undoubtedly important in this period for their affirmation of sexual instincts as integral to "civilization," their attention to jealousy as a particular emotional ordering of the world intensified the intimacies between Britain and the United States. These Anglo-transatlantic intimacies were shaped at the level of imagined biological ties between white middle-class citizens who *felt* the effects of similar institutions in the form of their irresistible possessive impulses toward acquiring, protecting, and controlling property in the form of both people and things. What Goldman identified as the "'green-eyed' monster" gave a mythic form to an enemy that sex reformers on both sides of the Atlantic looked to purge from their familial, economic, and political practices. This war against jealousy exemplifies sex reformers' historical significance as part of a vanguard that not only radically contested existing sexual morality but also contributed to new ways of understanding nations and world politics as circuits, distributions, and flows of energies that underpinned the global movements of bodies and commodities.

Notes

I acknowledge Sarah Amato, Stephen Brooke, Elspeth Brown, Todd Craver, Corina Hustak, Michelle Murphy, and Barbara Todd for their insightful suggestions on improving this manuscript at various stages toward its completion.

¹ Emma Goldman, "Cause and Possible Cure of Jealousy [1912]," in *The Emma Goldman Papers* (Alexandria, VA: Chadwyck-Healey, 1990–1991), reel 54.

² A number of biographies on Goldman have discussed her engagement in anarchist socialist and sexual politics. See Richard Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961); Alice Wexler, *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life* (New York: Pantheon, 1984); Candace Falk, *Love, Anarchy, and Emma*

Goldman (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1984); Marian J. Morton, *Emma Goldman and the American Left: "Nowhere at Home"* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992); Bonnie Haaland, *Emma Goldman: Sexuality and the Impurity of the State* (Montreal: Black Rose, 1993); and C. Brid Nicholson, "Emma Goldman: 'Woven of Many Skeins'" (PhD diss., Drew University, 2007). Also, see Margaret Marsh's discussion of Goldman in her case studies of anarchist women, *Anarchist Women, 1870–1920* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981).

³ For Goldman's reactions to Carpenter's utopian commune, which had been initially at Millthorpe and then moved to Mountside, see Sheila Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter: A Life of Liberty and Love* (London: Verso, 2008), 427–28. For Bertrand Russell's communication with Goldman, see Bertrand Russell, *The Selected Letters of Bertrand Russell: The Public Years, 1914–1970*, vol. 2, ed. Nicholas Griffin, assisted by Alison Miculan (New York: Routledge, 2001), 251.

⁴ While Peter Stearns has written extensively on the early twentieth century as a period that exalted self-control or "cool" among the white middle class as dominant cultural codes of emotional expression, within the space of sex reform politics there was an intensification of emotional experience profoundly connected to radical political and social movements. On emotions history, see Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards," *American Historical Review* 90, no. 4 (1985): 813–36; Peter N. Stearns, *American Cool: Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style* (New York: New York University Press, 1994); and Peter N. Stearns, *Battleground of Desire: The Struggle for Self-Control in Modern America* (New York: New York University Press, 1999). For the most part, Stearns looks to the nineteenth century as the period most defined by intense emotional experience.

⁵ See Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2007); Nicole Eustace, *Passion Is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008); and Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the Family, and Political Argument in England, 1680–1714* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1999).

⁶ Recently scholars have turned their attention to affect as a productive category of analysis that builds on poststructuralist, feminist, postcolonial, and queer theories. Scholars have looked to affect as a new avenue for rethinking the politics of embodiment and dismantling the totalizing hegemonic white male heterosexual subject. See for example Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983); Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987); Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002); Patricia Ticineto

Clough, introduction to *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*, ed. Patricia Ticineto Clough with Jean Halley (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), 1–33; and Nigel Thrift, *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect* (New York: Routledge, 2008). What I call the “affective condition” situates sex reformers’ attention to energies and instincts as a historically specific expression of what scholars today are theorizing as affect.

⁷ See Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876–1917* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2000).

⁸ Historians have generally focused on birth control, sexual pleasure, and women’s bodies as the important sites of early twentieth-century developments in the history of sexuality that have situated sex rather than emotions at the cornerstone of sex reformers’ radical politics. In the British historiography, see for example Lesley A. Hall, *Hidden Anxieties: Male Sexuality, 1900–1950* (Cambridge: Polity, 1991); and Marcus Collins, *Modern Love: An Intimate History of Men and Women in Twentieth-Century Britain* (London: Atlantic, 2003). In the American historiography, see for example Nancy F. Cott, *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987); and Christina Simmons, “Women’s Power in Sex Radical Challenges to Marriage in the Early-Twentieth-Century United States,” *Feminist Studies* 29, no. 1 (2003): 168–98. For the most part, bohemians of Greenwich Village and Bloomsbury have been treated as hedonistic rebels proclaiming sexual pleasure, which has generally missed the ethical and emotional contexts that surrounded their politics. See for example Christine Stansell, *American Moderns: Bohemian New York and the Creation of a New Century* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2000); Kevin White, *Sexual Liberation or Sexual License? The American Revolt against Victorianism* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000); and Ross Wetzsteon, *Republic of Dreams: Greenwich Village, the American Bohemia, 1910–1960* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002). On Bloomsbury, see for example Pamela Todd, *Bloomsbury at Home* (London: Pavilion, 1999); and Christopher Reed, *Bloomsbury Rooms: Modernism, Subculture, and Domesticity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).

⁹ Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 12.

¹⁰ See Penny A. Weiss and Loretta Kensinger, eds., *Feminist Interpretations of Emma Goldman* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).

¹¹ See Peter N. Stearns, *Jealousy: The Evolution of an Emotion in American History* (New York: New York University Press, 1989).

¹² See Leela Gandhi, *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siècle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

¹³ Lesley A. Hall, “‘Disinterested Enthusiasm for Sexual Misconduct’: The British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology, 1913–47,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, no. 4 (1995): 666.

¹⁴ See, for example, American physician William J. Robinson’s introduction to British birth control leader Marie Stopes’s popular work on *Married Love*. William J. Robinson, introduction to *Married Love, or Love in Marriage*, by Marie Stopes (New York: Eugenics Publishing Co., 1927).

¹⁵ H. G. Wells, “Divorce Is Inhuman,” in *Divorce as I See It*, ed. Bertrand Russell et al. (London: Noel Douglas, 1930), 33.

¹⁶ For a discussion on Judge Ben Lindsey, see Rebecca L. Davis, “‘Not Marriage at All, but Simple Harlotry’: The Companionate Marriage Controversy,” *Journal of American History* 94, no. 4 (2008): 1137–63.

¹⁷ Ben Lindsey, *Companionate Marriage* (Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Co., 1927), 72.

¹⁸ Bertrand Russell to Dora Russell, 1 December 1927, Bertrand Russell Fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University.

¹⁹ Bertrand Russell to Dora Russell, 3 November 1929, Bertrand Russell Fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University.

²⁰ Bertrand Russell wrote to Dora Russell about the popularity of these two books in the United States. See for example Bertrand Russell to Dora Russell, 23 October 1929; and Bertrand Russell to Dora Russell, 26 October 1927, Bertrand Russell Fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University.

²¹ For a discussion on V. F. Calverton and Samuel Schmalhausen’s efforts to facilitate a collaboration between American and British authorities on sexology, see Leonard Wilcox, “Sex Boys in a Balloon: V. F. Calverton and the Abortive Sexual Revolution,” *Journal of American Studies* 23, no. 1 (1989): 7–26.

²² Havelock Ellis, introduction to *Sex in Civilization*, ed. V. F. Calverton and Samuel Schmalhausen (Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Co., 1929).

²³ J. William Lloyd, “Sex Jealousy and Civilization,” in Calverton and Schmalhausen, *Sex in Civilization*, 234.

²⁴ Wells, “Divorce Is Inhuman,” 32.

²⁵ Rebecca West, “Divorce Is a Necessity,” in Russell et al., *Divorce as I See It*, 67.

²⁶ Candace Falk extensively discusses the importance of emotions and politics in the context of Emma Goldman and Ben Reitman’s relationship. See Falk, *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman*.

²⁷ Emma Goldman to Ben Reitman, 29 June 1908, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 2. On the early twentieth-century feminist attention to the importance of orgasm, see Jessamyn Neuhaus, “The Importance of Being Orgasmic: Sexuality, Gender, and Marital Sex Manuals in the United States, 1920–1963,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 9, no. 4 (2000): 447–73.

²⁸ Emma Goldman to Ben Reitman, 29 June 1908, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 2.

²⁹ Emma Goldman to Ben Reitman, 3 July 1908, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 2.

³⁰ Emma Goldman to Ben Reitman, 2 July 1910, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 4.

³¹ Ben Reitman to Emma Goldman, 24 July 1912, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 6.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Joanne Passet briefly discusses “varietism” in relation to the other strands of the free love movement. See Joanne E. Passet, *Sex Radicals and the Quest for Women’s Equality* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 163.

³⁴ Hutchins Hapgood, *A Victorian in the Modern World* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1939), 320.

³⁵ Hutchins Hapgood, “The Jealous Wife,” Hapgood Family Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

³⁶ Richard Soloway has written on early twentieth-century concerns over a declining white birthrate in Britain and the United States. See Richard A. Soloway, “The ‘Perfect Contraceptive’: Eugenics and Birth Control Research in Britain and America in the Interwar Years,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, no. 4 (1995): 637–64. On the problem of neurasthenia in terms of the vulnerability of white middle-class bodies to the pressures of “modernity,” see Tom Lutz, *American Nervousness, 1903: An Anecdotal History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991); and Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra and Roy Porter, eds., *Cultures of Neurasthenia from Beard to the First World War* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001). A number of historians have also written on the paradox of early twentieth-century models of masculinity that turned to primal energies as necessary to upholding “civilization.” See Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880–1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*; Athena Devlin, *Between Profits and Primitivism: Shaping White Middle-Class Masculinity in the United States, 1880–1917* (New York: Routledge, 2005); and John Pettegrew, *Brutes in Suits: Male Sensibility in America, 1890–1920* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).

³⁷ Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*, 354.

- ³⁸ See Terence Kissack, *Free Comrades: Anarchism and Homosexuality in the United States, 1895–1917* (Edinburgh, UK: AK, 2008).
- ³⁹ Edward Carpenter, *Love's Coming-of-Age: A Series of Papers on the Relations of the Sexes* (1896; repr., London: Allen & Unwin, 1930), 20.
- ⁴⁰ Emma Goldman to Havelock Ellis, 27 December 1924, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 14.
- ⁴¹ Carpenter, *Love's Coming-of-Age*, 87–89, 96.
- ⁴² Naomi Mitchison to Mabel Dodge Luhan, 21 November 1935, Mabel Dodge Luhan Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- ⁴³ See Katie Roiphe, *Uncommon Arrangements: Seven Portraits of Married Life in London Literary Circles, 1910–1939* (New York: Dial Press, 2007).
- ⁴⁴ See Harriet Ward, *A Man of Small Importance: My Father Griffin Barry* (Debenham, UK: Dormouse Books, 2003).
- ⁴⁵ Bertrand Russell to Dora Russell, 9 May 1924, Bertrand Russell Fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University.
- ⁴⁶ Bertrand Russell to Dora Russell, 6 November 1927, Bertrand Russell Fonds, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University.
- ⁴⁷ Dora Russell, *The Right to Be Happy* (New York and London: Harper & Bros., 1927), 154.
- ⁴⁸ Bertrand Russell, *Marriage and Morals* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1929), 39.
- ⁴⁹ Bertrand Russell, *The Conquest of Happiness* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1930), 80–81. Bertrand Russell also mentions Lindsey's ideas on companionate marriage in Russell, *Marriage and Morals*, 163–65.
- ⁵⁰ Russell, *Conquest of Happiness*, 93.
- ⁵¹ Russell, *Right to Be Happy*, 82.
- ⁵² Russell, *Marriage and Morals*, 43.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, 249; Russell, *Conquest of Happiness*, 55.
- ⁵⁴ Hutchins Hapgood, "Husbands and Wives," Hapgood Family Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- ⁵⁵ Hutchins Hapgood, "The Drama of the Italians," Hapgood Family Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. Historian Matthew Frye Jacobson has discussed how high levels of Southern and Eastern European immigration were part of a historical transformation in the category of whiteness. See Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge,

MA: Harvard University Press, 1998). On the shifting membership of Italian immigrants within whiteness as a national category of citizenship and belonging, see Jennifer Guglielmo and Salvatore Salerno, eds., *Are Italians White? How Race Is Made in America* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

⁵⁶ Hutchins Hapgood, "Sex and Society," Hapgood Family Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

⁵⁷ On Margaret Sanger's marriage to William Sanger and their Greenwich Village connections, see Patricia Walsh Coates, *Margaret Sanger and the Origin of the Birth Control Movement, 1910–1930: The Concept of Women's Sexual Autonomy* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2008).

⁵⁸ June Rose, *Marie Stopes and the Sexual Revolution* (1992; repr., Stroud, UK: Tempus, 2007), 265.

⁵⁹ Stopes, *Married Love*, 18.

⁶⁰ Dorothy Roberts, *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty* (New York: Vintage, 1999); and Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008).

⁶¹ Historians have shown how white middle-class intellectuals in the early twentieth century situated eugenics as part of a new morality linked to love, scientific marriage, and legitimate intimacies to further white civilization. In the British context, see Angelique Richardson, *Love and Eugenics in the Late Nineteenth Century: Rational Reproduction and the New Woman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); and George Robb, "The Way of All Flesh: Degeneration, Eugenics, and the Gospel of Free Love," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 6, no. 4 (1996): 589–603. In the American context, see Wendy Kline, *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); and Julian Carter, *The Heart of Whiteness: Normal Sexuality and Race in America, 1880–1940* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).

⁶² Linda Gordon discusses Margaret Sanger's debt to Goldman, Sanger and Goldman's use of eugenic logic, and their involvement in the bohemian milieu of Greenwich Village. Gordon also makes the point that "there was a remarkable unity between sex radicals and sex conservatives," particularly in the use of eugenic arguments. I build on Gordon's insights by considering how these connections contributed to the emotion politics of sex reform. See Linda Gordon, *Woman's Body, Woman's Right: Birth Control in America*, rev. ed. (New York: Penguin, 1990), 114–15, 215–17, 269–86.

⁶³ Emma Goldman, interview, "What Is There in Anarchy for Woman?" *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, October 24, 1897, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 47.

⁶⁴ On Goldman as a nurse, see Cynthia Anne Connolly, “‘I Am a Trained Nurse’: The Nursing Identity of Anarchist and Radical Emma Goldman,” *Nursing History Review* 18 (2010): 84–99.

⁶⁵ See, for example, Emma Goldman to Margaret Sanger, 22 June 1914, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 8.

⁶⁶ Emma Goldman to Margaret Sanger, 26 May 1914, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 8.

⁶⁷ Emma Goldman, “Victims of Morality,” *Mother Earth* 8 (1913): 19–24, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 48.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Emma Goldman, “Emma Goldman before the Bar,” *Mother Earth* 11, no. 3 (1916): 496–503, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 48.

⁷² Emma Goldman, “Marriage and Love [1916],” in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 48.

⁷³ See Lori Jo Marso, “A Feminist Search for Love: Emma Goldman on the Politics of Marriage, Love, Sexuality, and the Feminine,” in Weiss and Kensinger, *Feminist Interpretations*, 71–89; and Heather Ostman, “‘The Most Dangerous Woman in America’: Emma Goldman and the Rhetoric of Motherhood in *Living My Life*,” *Prose Studies* 31, no. 1 (2009): 55–73.

⁷⁴ Emma Goldman, “The Social Aspects of Birth Control,” *Mother Earth* 11, no. 2 (1916): 468, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 48.

⁷⁵ Carpenter, *Love’s Coming-of-Age*, 43.

⁷⁶ Emma Goldman to Havelock Ellis, 1 December 1924, in Goldman, *Emma Goldman Papers*, reel 14.

⁷⁷ Havelock Ellis, “The World’s Racial Problem,” *Birth Control Review* 4, no. 10 (1920): 14–15.

⁷⁸ See for example Robb, “Way of All Flesh”; Diane Paul, “Eugenics and the Left,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 45, no. 4 (1984): 567–68; Richard Soloway, “The Galton Lecture: Marie Stopes, Eugenics, and the English Birth Control Movement,” in *Marie Stopes, Eugenics and the English Birth Control Movement: Proceedings of a Conference Organised by the Galton Institute, London, 1996*, ed. Robert A. Peel (London: Galton Institute, 1997), 49–76; Angela Franks, *Margaret Sanger’s Eugenic Legacy: The Control of Female Fertility*

(Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2005); and Ivan Crozier, "Havelock Ellis, Eugenicist," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 39, no. 2 (2008): 187–94.

⁷⁹ Carpenter, *Love's Coming-of-Age*, 165.

⁸⁰ Goldman, "Cause and Possible Cure of Jealousy," 6.

Selected Bibliography

Bederman, Gail. *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880–1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Bertrand Russell Fonds. William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections. McMaster University.

Calverton, V. F., and Samuel Schmalhausen, eds. *Sex in Civilization*. Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Co., 1929.

Carpenter, Edward. *Love's Coming-of-Age: A Series of Papers on the Relations of the Sexes*. 1896; repr., London: Allen & Unwin, 1930.

Carter, Julian. *The Heart of Whiteness: Normal Sexuality and Race in America, 1880–1940*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.

Clough, Patricia Ticineto, with Jean Halley, eds. *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.

Coates, Patricia Walsh. *Margaret Sanger and the Origin of the Birth Control Movement, 1910–1930: The Concept of Women's Sexual Autonomy*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2008.

Collins, Marcus. *Modern Love: An Intimate History of Men and Women in Twentieth-Century Britain*. London: Atlantic, 2003.

Connelly, Matthew. *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.

Connolly, Cynthia Anne. "‘I Am a Trained Nurse’: The Nursing Identity of Anarchist and Radical Emma Goldman." *Nursing History Review* 18 (2010): 84–99.

Cott, Nancy F. *The Grounding of Modern Feminism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Crozier, Ivan. "Havelock Ellis, Eugenicist." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 39, no. 2 (2008): 187–94.

Davis, Rebecca L. "‘Not Marriage at All, but Simple Harlotry’: The Companionate Marriage Controversy." *Journal of American History* 94, no. 4 (2008): 1137–63.

- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- . *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Devlin, Athena. *Between Profits and Primitivism: Shaping White Middle-Class Masculinity in the United States, 1880–1917*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Drinnon, Richard. *Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Ellis, Havelock. “The World’s Racial Problem.” *Birth Control Review* 4, no. 10 (1920): 14–16.
- Eustace, Nicole. *Passion Is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Falk, Candace. *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1984.
- Franks, Angela. *Margaret Sanger’s Eugenic Legacy: The Control of Female Fertility*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2005.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siècle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Gijswijt-Hofstra, Marijke, and Roy Porter, eds. *Cultures of Neurasthenia from Beard to the First World War*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001.
- Goldman, Emma. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. Alexandria, VA: Chadwyck-Healey, 1990–1991.
- Gordon, Linda. *Woman’s Body, Woman’s Right: Birth Control in America*. Rev. ed. New York: Penguin, 1990.
- Guglielmo, Jennifer, and Salvatore Salerno, eds. *Are Italians White? How Race Is Made in America*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Haaland, Bonnie. *Emma Goldman: Sexuality and the Impurity of the State*. Montreal: Black Rose, 1993.
- Hall, Lesley A. “‘Disinterested Enthusiasm for Sexual Misconduct’: The British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology, 1913–47.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, no. 4 (1995): 665–86.
- . *Hidden Anxieties: Male Sexuality, 1900–1950*. Cambridge: Polity, 1991.
- Hapgood Family Papers. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Yale University.
- Hapgood, Hutchins. *A Victorian in the Modern World*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1939.

- Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2007.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876–1917*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.
- . *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kissack, Terence. *Free Comrades: Anarchism and Homosexuality in the United States, 1895–1917*. Edinburgh, UK: AK, 2008.
- Kline, Wendy. *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Lindsey, Ben. *Companionate Marriage*. Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Co., 1927.
- Lutz, Tom. *American Nervousness, 1903: An Anecdotal History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Mabel Dodge Luhan Papers. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Yale University.
- Marsh, Margaret. *Anarchist Women, 1870–1920*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.
- Massumi, Brian. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Morton, Marian J. *Emma Goldman and the American Left: “Nowhere at Home.”* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992.
- Neuhaus, Jessamyn. “The Importance of Being Orgasmic: Sexuality, Gender, and Marital Sex Manuals in the United States, 1920–1963.” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 9, no. 4 (2000): 447–73.
- Nicholson, C. Brid. “Emma Goldman: ‘Woven of Many Skeins.’” PhD diss., Drew University, 2007.
- Ostman, Heather. “‘The Most Dangerous Woman in America’: Emma Goldman and the Rhetoric of Motherhood in *Living My Life*.” *Prose Studies* 31, no. 1 (2009): 55–73.
- Passet, Joanne E. *Sex Radicals and the Quest for Women’s Equality*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003.
- Paul, Diane. “Eugenics and the Left.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 45, no. 4 (1984): 567–90.
- Pettegrew, John. *Brutes in Suits: Male Sensibility in America, 1890–1920*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Reed, Christopher. *Bloomsbury Rooms: Modernism, Subculture, and Domesticity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

- Richardson, Angelique. *Love and Eugenics in the Late Nineteenth Century: Rational Reproduction and the New Woman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Robb, George. "The Way of All Flesh: Degeneration, Eugenics, and the Gospel of Free Love." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 6, no. 4 (1996): 589–603.
- Roberts, Dorothy. *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*. New York: Vintage, 1999.
- Roiphe, Katie. *Uncommon Arrangements: Seven Portraits of Married Life in London Literary Circles, 1910–1939*. New York: Dial Press, 2007.
- Rose, June. *Marie Stopes and the Sexual Revolution*. 1992; repr., Stroud, UK: Tempus, 2007.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. *Edward Carpenter: A Life of Liberty and Love*. London: Verso, 2008.
- Russell, Bertrand, et al., eds. *Divorce as I See It*. London: Noel Douglas, 1930.
- Russell, Bertrand. *The Conquest of Happiness*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1930.
- . *Marriage and Morals*. New York: Horace Liveright, 1929.
- . *The Selected Letters of Bertrand Russell: The Public Years, 1914–1970*. Vol. 2. Ed. Nicholas Griffin, assisted by Alison Miculan. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Russell, Dora. *The Right to Be Happy*. New York and London: Harper & Bros., 1927.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Simmons, Christina. "Women's Power in Sex Radical Challenges to Marriage in the Early-Twentieth-Century United States." *Feminist Studies* 29, no. 1 (2003): 168–98.
- Soloway, Richard A. "The Galton Lecture: Marie Stopes, Eugenics, and the English Birth Control Movement." In *Marie Stopes, Eugenics and the English Birth Control Movement: Proceedings of a Conference Organised by the Galton Institute, London, 1996*, ed. Robert A. Peel, 49–76. London: Galton Institute, 1997.
- . "The 'Perfect Contraceptive': Eugenics and Birth Control Research in Britain and America in the Interwar Years." *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, no. 4 (1995): 637–64.
- Stansell, Christine. *American Moderns: Bohemian New York and the Creation of a New Century*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2000.
- Stearns, Peter N. *American Cool: Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style*. New York: New York University Press, 1994.
- . *Battleground of Desire: The Struggle for Self-Control in Modern America*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

- . *Jealousy: The Evolution of an Emotion in American History*. New York: New York University Press, 1989.
- Stearns, Peter N., and Carol Z. Stearns. "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards." *American Historical Review* 90, no. 4 (1985): 813–36.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Stopes, Marie. *Married Love, or Love in Marriage*. New York: Eugenics Publishing Co., 1927.
- Thrift, Nigel. *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Todd, Pamela. *Bloomsbury at Home*. London: Pavilion, 1999.
- Ward, Harriet. *A Man of Small Importance: My Father Griffin Barry*. Debenham, UK: Dormouse Books, 2003.
- Weil, Rachel. *Political Passions: Gender, the Family, and Political Argument in England, 1680–1714*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Weiss, Penny A., and Loretta Kensinger, eds. *Feminist Interpretations of Emma Goldman*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007.
- Wetzsteon, Ross. *Republic of Dreams: Greenwich Village, the American Bohemia, 1910–1960*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002.
- Wexler, Alice. *Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life*. New York: Pantheon, 1984.
- White, Kevin. *Sexual Liberation or Sexual License? The American Revolt against Victorianism*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000.
- Wilcox, Leonard. "Sex Boys in a Balloon: V. F. Calverton and the Abortive Sexual Revolution." *Journal of American Studies* 23, no. 1 (1989): 7–26.