



PROJECT MUSE®

Labor, Memory, and the Boundaries of Print Culture: From
Haymarket to the Mexican Revolution

Shelley Streeby

American Literary History, Volume 19, Number 2, Summer 2007, pp. 406-433
(Article)

Published by Oxford University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/215829>

Labor, Memory, and the Boundaries of Print Culture: From Haymarket to the Mexican Revolution

Shelley Streeby

1. Haymarket Memories, the Civil War, and the Mexican Revolution

In this essay, the constellation of events known as “Haymarket” serves as a hinge between the Civil War and the Mexican Revolution. These events, which together comprise one of the most notorious episodes in US labor history, include huge demonstrations in Chicago on 1 May 1886 in support of an eight-hour day; 3 May 1886 attacks in which police fired on strikers at the McCormick Reaper plant in that city, killing at least two; the gathering of 3000 workers the next day at Haymarket Square; and finally, the interruption of that peaceful meeting by the police and the throwing of a bomb, which killed several policemen and workers. As is well known, the state charged eight of Chicago’s labor leaders with murder, though the identity of the bomb-thrower was never discovered. After an outrageously unfair trial, all were convicted: four were hung, one was found dead in his cell, and three others received long prison sentences.¹ Despite the Red Scare and the repression of public speech that followed the 1887 executions, however, in newspapers, pamphlets, books, plays, poems, images, speeches, commemorations, and through other modes of memory-making, radicals and working-class advocates repeatedly returned to Haymarket to understand the past and make meanings for the present.² In order to contribute to the

Despite the Red Scare and the repression of public speech that followed the 1887 executions . . . radicals and working-class advocates repeatedly returned to Haymarket to understand the past and make meanings for the present.

Shelley Streeby is Associate Professor in the Literature Department at UC San Diego. She is the author of *American Sensations: Class, Empire, and the Production of Popular Culture* and is currently completing a study of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century anti-imperialist, transnational social movements.

larger project of situating US labor history and culture within a global frame, this essay focuses on the connections some of these radicals made among the US Civil War, Haymarket, and the Mexican Revolution.

In what follows, I retrace the paper trail left by the radical periodicals and other publications of the era in order to reconstruct the responses of a range of Haymarket memory-makers who looked both backward, especially to the Civil War, and forward to the revolutionary break with the present that some hoped the Mexican revolt might inaugurate. I read texts composed by a multiply connected cohort of writers, orators, editors, and organizers, including Eugene V. Debs, Lucy Parsons, Jay Fox, Voltairine de Cleyre, William C. Owen, and Emma Goldman, who drew on antebellum languages of labor and race as they remembered Haymarket and looked south to Mexico. Partly as a result, I argue, they linked together the Civil War, Haymarket, and revolutionary struggles against the Díaz regime (1876–1911), understanding each of these conflicts as a war against slavery. Viewing Haymarket as a continuation of the Civil War and as part of an ongoing struggle to end “slavery” and return control of land, natural resources, and the means of production to workers, some even hoped that the Mexican Revolution might be the transformative event that the martyrs had called for in the famous speeches and other public statements and writings that were cited and circulated again and again in the decades after Haymarket.

Such comparisons had ambiguous implications, however. During the antebellum period, labor advocates’ comparisons of different forms of “slavery” sometimes connected those struggles, but also often pitted them against each other, so that the problems of white workers were in many cases prioritized over those of black slaves.³ In the case of early twentieth-century Mexico, characterizations of Mexicans as slaves could link up US and Mexican labor and land struggles, but they could also “blacken” Mexicans in ways that played into white supremacist beliefs about the supposed inability of nonwhites to rule themselves. Although many US anarchists, Industrial Workers of the World members, and other radicals did not share those beliefs, the long history, reinforced by the US–Mexico War, of racializing non-elite Mexicans as non-white, along with the language boundaries that often separated working-class communities, posed limits to the coalition-building possibilities of the slavery comparison after US emancipation and during the Mexican Revolutionary moment. The transnational anarchist and socialist discussion of the meanings of emancipation and revolution after the Civil War and Haymarket and during the

Mexican Revolution, moreover, also involved and opened up even more debates about whether marriage was a form of slavery, about alternatives to the institution of marriage and their effects on women, and about women's roles within revolutionary movements as well as within the economies and societies that would emerge after the demise of capitalism. In what follows, I suggest that radical newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and speeches reveal traces of the larger social movements that were connected but not reducible to the spheres of print culture and literature as I explore the possibilities and limits of the slavery comparison for publishers, writers, and activists in those movements who remembered Haymarket and the Civil War as they faced the Mexican Revolution.

2. Looking Backward, Looking Forward

It is not surprising that many of those who remembered Haymarket compared it to the Civil War, for the latter was still a relatively recent historical event for many of that generation. Many who were not immigrants came from abolitionist families, and some even viewed Haymarket as a continuation of the Civil War. Since the Civil War had resulted in the abolition of chattel slavery, they reasoned, another war might lead to the abolition of wage slavery. Certainly the militarized response to strikes and other labor actions, which became especially violent during the 1870s and 1880s, made labor conflicts feel like war to those who were engaged in them. *The Life of Albert R. Parsons* (1889), a multi-form text which was compiled by Lucy Parsons, the wife of Haymarket anarchist Albert Parsons, and published after his execution, is full of examples of the war on workers. Speaking to a group of workers in South Bend, Indiana, who had struck the previous January to protest "starvation wages," for instance, Parsons compared the conflict to the Civil War as he recalled how "The Grand Army of the Republic, which twenty-five years ago, drew its sword to liberate the black chattel slave from bondage, came to South Bend, and with gleaming bayonets and flashing swords riveted the chains of slavery upon wage-laborers and compelled them to submit to the dictation of the property beasts" (41).

After the Civil War and at least through the late nineteenth century, such comparisons of slavery, other forms of unfree labor (such as Mexican peonage and Asian contract labor), and so-called free labor or wage slavery persisted even as workers faced changing conditions.⁴ As David Roediger and others have suggested,

the language of wage slavery risked minimizing chattel slavery since it could imply that the former was even worse, and the idea that the Civil War was fought “to liberate the black slave from bondage,” as Parsons puts it, is wishful thinking. However, while older associations still cling to it, Parsons’s comparison also takes on new meanings in the post-bellum context: He underlines the limits of formal emancipation and emphasizes the state’s use of military force against laborers in order to support the widely shared view that one civil war had given way to another, that the state and capitalists were making war on workers, and that workers therefore needed to find ways to defend themselves. Such a perspective could authorize an insurgent response, one that was not defused but rather intensified by Parsons’s conviction and execution. Indeed, many Haymarket memory-makers constructed John Brown as a precursor figure who had been executed by the state but whose powerful afterlife as a martyr made him more threatening dead than alive.⁵ Just as the example of Brown’s martyrdom helped to end slavery, they argued, so might memories of the Haymarket anarchists’ “legal murder” provoke a fundamental transformation of US society, one that would radically alter existing labor, property, and social relations.

Even as Haymarket memorialists looked backward to the Civil War, however, they also faced the future by remembering Haymarket. Although World War I and the Russian Revolution have been cited more frequently as touchstones for scholars interested in the international dimensions of US radicalisms in the 1910s, the series of wars and other conflicts that took place in Mexico and the US/Mexico borderlands during these years also had an important impact on debates about labor, land, and fundamental social change within the US. The US bombing and occupation of Veracruz in 1914, the deployment of US soldiers against Pancho Villa in New Mexico in 1916, the recurring possibility of further US military intervention in Mexico, and the harassment and imprisonment of émigré revolutionaries were especially controversial.⁶ As we shall see, the responses, at different moments, of US radicals and working-class advocates to the writings, activities, and legal persecution of Ricardo Flores Magón and other members of the Partido Liberal Mexicano (PLM) during their years of exile in the US were a particularly important bellwether of the possibilities for a US/Mexico labor internationalism during this period. Flores Magón and his followers were dedicated not only to the overthrow of the Díaz regime but also to anarcho-communist ideals, especially the expropriation of land and the means of production, and US radicals and working class advocates were divided in their response to this revolutionary agenda.⁷

In some cases, representatives of US organized labor such as AFL president Samuel Gompers distanced themselves from the more radical aims of the revolutionaries and refused to condemn US military interventions in Mexico,⁸ and some US socialists, notably Eugene V. Debs in an article called “The Crisis in Mexico,” published in the *International Socialist Review* in July of 1911, criticized the PLM for its anarchist tendencies. While Debs hoped that the ouster of Díaz would ultimately inspire the Mexican people to “overthrow not merely their political dictators but their economic exploiters” (22) in order to achieve true “emancipation” (22), he worried that the “direct action” (22) tactics of the Mexican Liberal Party would end “in a series of Haymarket sacrifices and the useless shedding of their noblest blood” (22–23). Instead of inspiring rebellion, in this case the Haymarket analogy serves a cautionary function, and despite his sympathy for the revolt against Díaz, a certain condescension comes through when Debs argues that “the masses of Mexican workers and producers, like those in other countries, are ignorant, superstitious, unorganized, and all but helpless in their slavish subjugation,” so much so that “in their present demoralized state economic emancipation is simply out of the question” (22). It is important to recognize that Debs spoke out, more often than many of his peers, on behalf of racial justice,⁹ and the differences between socialists and anarchists should not be overstated, since there were many political and institutional connections between these movements. However, Debs’s statement reveals the implicit narrative of progress and development, with its emphasis on stages of revolutionary transformation, which limited most socialist discussions of the possibilities for “economic emancipation” after the Civil War.¹⁰

Most anarchists had problems with such gradualist visions of social transformation, however, and they were therefore much more likely to endorse what Debs called the “direct action” tactics of the Mexican revolutionists. Indeed, several prominent anarchists took issue with Debs in print, using radical newspapers and magazines as vehicles for their criticisms of Debs’s cautious assessment of the possibilities for revolutionary social change in Mexico. William C. Owen was one of the most eloquent and persistent defenders of the PLM and their revolutionary program. Owen was an English anarchist who came to the US, became editor of the English-language section of the Los Angeles-based PLM newspaper *Regeneración* in 1911, wrote a pamphlet on the Mexican Revolution that was published in Los Angeles in 1912, briefly edited an English-language paper called *Land and Liberty*, and escaped back to England in 1916 just in time to avoid being

arrested with Flores Magón. One of Owen's responses appeared in the *Agitator*, edited by Jay Fox, a Haymarket veteran who filled the short-lived, initially pro-IWW paper with drawings, articles, and poems about Haymarket as well as news of the Mexican Revolution. In the 1 August 1911 issue, Fox reprinted an article by Owen called "Debs Sides with the Reactionists," in which Owen criticized Debs for arguing "as slave-owners have argued since slavery began." Owen asked Debs: "What will you do after you have organized [Mexicans] according to your superior wisdom? What COULD you do with them except urge them to get back their land—the very thing they have been doing most effectively NOW, and without your aid!" (2). In a 15 November 1911 editorial called "Greatest Figure in History," Fox also echoed Owen's criticisms of the socialists as he sarcastically noted that "The 'ignorant' peons will not trade their guns for socialist tracts." Arguing that "the Mexican" is "the most important figure in history, not excepting the French Revolutionists," Fox predicted that "the 'illiterate' Mexican across the line is engaged in the first battles of the world-wide revolution which will sweep capitalism from its base and enable industrial and political freedom." Fox concluded, "All hail to you, my gallant Mexican fellow workers! I bow before your superiority. You know, you do, I merely talk" (4). Here, Fox identifies the Mexican revolutionists as models for workers in other countries precisely because of their direct action tactics rather than declaring them as yet unready for "economic emancipation."

Looking backward, Fox remembers being present at the May 1886 McCormick riot in Chicago, as part of his finger was shot off by a bullet that proceeded to kill someone next to him. Looking forward, he sees the Mexican Revolution as the beginning of a "world wide revolution" for "industrial and political freedom." Both Fox and Owen viewed the Mexican Revolution and worldwide labor struggles as rebellions against "slavery," and both thereby connected the US Civil War, wars on workers, and the Mexican Revolution in their editorials and pamphlets. Both also criticized socialists for not supporting the direct action tactics of the Mexican revolutionists, which they saw as the rightful efforts of the proletariat, in Owen's words, "to get back by force what has been taken from it by force, or fraud backed by force" ("What" 239). As we shall see, such connections were also made by prominent anarchist women, including Lucy Parsons and Voltairine de Cleyre, who remembered Haymarket, responded to events in Mexico, and also addressed the issue of women's place in these struggles as well as questions about whether marriage was a form of slavery. While the periodicals and pamphlets of the era

can tell us much about Haymarket memory-makers' responses to Mexico and their debates over what they viewed as different forms of slavery, however, during the long period of public sphere repression that extended from Haymarket at least through the Palmer raids, much lies beyond the boundaries of print culture. The details of Industrial Workers of the World members' involvement in the Mexican Revolution; the differences between local and regional labor organizations and official spokesmen with respect to Mexico; and Lucy Parsons's lectures on Mexico, to name just a few examples, are not amply documented in the print culture remains of the era. Yet, within anarchist print communities especially, ideas about Mexico and the Mexican Revolution figured prominently in Haymarket memory-makers' backwards-looking visions of "near future" revolutionary transformations.

3. Boundaries of Print Culture: Lucy Parsons, Haymarket Memory-Making, and Mexico

In the same issue of the *Agitator* that contained Fox's defense of the Mexican revolutionists, he devoted a good deal of space to remembering Haymarket. He reprinted, for instance, an extract from the 19 November 1887 issue of the Parsons's paper *Alarm*, which contained an account of the execution and of the anarchists' last words as well as a piece by Lucy Parsons, entitled "The Trial a Farce," in which she provided numerous details about the unfairness of the Haymarket trial and concluded by connecting the past to the present: "Our comrades sleep the sleep which knows no awakening, but the grand cause for which they died is not asleep nor dead!" Using language much like that Fox used in the same issue, Parsons claimed that it was useless for "the ruling class" to try to suppress the "swelling tide" of revolutionary transformation, for "though they should erect gallows all along the highways and byways, build prisons, and increase armies, the tide will continue to rise until it overwhelms them in a worldwide revolution" (2). At the bottom of the page, the *Agitator* advertised an edition of *The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches*, which was being offered for 30 cents. In the very first issue of the paper, Fox had suggested that the speeches are "masterpieces of their kind, and have traveled around the world and given hope and courage to hundreds and thousands of toilers, in a dozen languages" ("Chicago" 1).

Lucy Parsons was perhaps the person most responsible for the wide dissemination of the speeches of the Haymarket anarchists. Parsons, who has today become something of a radical icon herself, was not only an activist, writer, editor, and spellbinding

speaker, but also a publisher and book promoter. In the wake of Albert's arrest and execution, she compiled and contributed to *The Life of Albert R. Parsons*, which was published in 1889 and then re-issued in a somewhat different form in 1903. The book included writings by Albert, Lucy, and others about the history of the Chicago and US labor movements; a brief biography; excerpts of letters and articles about Albert's travels throughout the Midwest to organize workers; editorials and other writings for the *Alarm*; speeches; an account of the trial and the events surrounding the execution and the funeral; and reminiscences of Albert Parsons and others in the Haymarket movement. Lucy Parsons also edited and published *The Famous Speeches of the Eight Chicago Anarchists* (1886), an even more popular book that went through many editions. Indeed, *Famous Speeches* served as a kind of source-book for the radicals who remembered Haymarket. Again and again, they quoted the martyrs' words in poems, essays, newspaper articles, and speeches of their own. From the 1890s through the early decades of the twentieth century, Lucy Parsons sold both of these books and others on the street, by mail through notices in radical periodicals, and at labor events, including Haymarket memorials, where she usually lectured, not only in Chicago but also in many different parts of the US, including New York City, Seattle, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, as well as Canada (Ahrens 11).

Despite her public sphere persistence, however, it was not always easy for Parsons. On many occasions, she was prevented from speaking or from selling literature. In April of 1913, for instance, Parsons and a friend were arrested in Los Angeles for selling literature without a license, and in January of the next year she was arrested in San Francisco and charged with "inciting to riot" when around a thousand angry demonstrators followed her and the police to the station after she was arrested while speaking from a curbstone, having been turned away from a lecture hall where she was scheduled to speak (Ashbaugh 232–35). Although the charges did not stick, these events are only two of many cases in which Parsons was hassled by police and public officials who wanted to prevent her from speaking or circulating literature. While over the course of her lifetime she contributed to and/or edited many different radical periodicals, including the *Socialist*, a few different incarnations of the *Alarm*, *Freedom*, the *Rebel*, *Free Society*, the *Liberator*, *Industrial Worker*, the *Agitator*, the *Syndicalist*, and others, these periodicals were generally short-lived, often short of funds, and were sometimes suppressed. The *Alarm* was shut down for a while after the Haymarket bombing, for example, and in Chicago police destroyed the *Free Society* press after President McKinley was assassinated in 1901 (Ashbaugh 212).

Indeed, Lucy Parsons's struggles to participate in various public spheres and to produce and circulate literature suggest some of the limits of print culture as an archive of radical memory. Although pamphlets and periodicals were intimately connected to movement actions and events, and although Parsons and others were fiercely committed to "propagandizing" in print, there is no printed record of the vast majority of Parsons's public lectures or speeches. In Parsons's case, any printed version would inevitably fall short, since she was said to be an unusually gifted speaker. For many reasons, then, there is a great deal that we do not know about Lucy Parsons and the radical movements to which she contributed. To make matters worse, Parsons's papers were confiscated after her death and they have never been recovered.¹¹

These gaps and absences are particularly frustrating for those who would like to learn more about Parsons's interest in the Mexican Revolution. In Carolyn Ashbaugh's 1976 biography of Parsons, many intriguing details appear, but a more complete paper trail is elusive. We know that Parsons was a vocal opponent of US imperialism, that she criticized the imperialist wars of the turn of the twentieth century, led antirecruitment protests in 1899, and made a speech appealing to potential recruits to "refuse to enlist and go to those far-off islands for the purpose of riveting the chains of a new slavery on the limbs of the Filipinos" (Ashbaugh 207). Many of those in her circle (or circles, I should say, since she maintained affiliations with a changing array of radical and other labor groups—including local, regional, and national anarchist, socialist, communist, IWW, and AFL organizations—that were often at odds with each other) understood the relationship of the US to Mexico to be an imperialist one, citing US capitalists' large-scale acquisition of Mexican land and other resources, such as oil, pressures on the state to protect their interests, and President Taft's and President Wilson's interventions in Mexico as part of a continuum of recent US imperialist activity. It is likely that Parsons also connected US efforts to contain and reshape the Mexican Revolution to an ongoing US "dream of empire," one that notably included the wars of 1898 and the long war in the Philippines.

Parsons also participated in efforts to free Mexican and US citizens imprisoned for violating US neutrality laws when they tried to cross the US–Mexico border to join the revolution. Ashbaugh reports that, when Parsons lectured in Tacoma, Washington on 11 November 1913, she "took up a collection for four Mexicans who were in jail in Texas for attempting to return to Mexico and participate in the revolution" (234). This probably refers to a case involving some PLM and IWW members who

were arrested after becoming involved in a deadly gunfight with US cavalry and Texas police as they entered Mexico; two of the leaders were sentenced to life imprisonment and PLM followers were given long terms (Sandos 57). Their case was often mentioned in the US anarchist and IWW press, and several other US activists came to their defense, including Emma Goldman, who, in her autobiography *Living My Life* (1931–34), remembered the “campaign” on behalf of the men and her own efforts to provide “publicity” to “arouse the workers of the east to the perils of the situation” (519). Like other prominent US anarchists, especially Goldman and Berkman, moreover, Parsons, according to historian Paul Avrich, helped to raise money for the legal defense of Flores Magón and his followers, who were arrested and imprisoned on several different occasions (*American* 226). On each occasion, the arrests were partly prompted by Mexican officials and in each case the trials were full of legal irregularities. In 1913, for instance, many of the witnesses from the 1912 trial signed “affidavits reversing their prosecution testimonies and admitting perjury” (Poole 139). The editors of *Regeneración* published these affidavits in their paper and appealed to Wilson to pardon the men, but he refused.¹² The legal persecution, trials, convictions, and appeals of the Flores Magón brothers, as well as the cases of the many other radicals who were arrested and imprisoned or executed during these years, must have reminded Parsons, Goldman, and other Haymarket memory-makers of how the Haymarket anarchists were persecuted by the state, as Parsons put it, because “they had been active in organizing the wage slaves of America” (*Famous* 11) and of how they were quickly convicted after, in Parsons’s words again, a “farce” of a trial.

To some extent, questions about Parsons’s relationship to Mexican radicals and to the Mexican revolution have come up when scholars debate the more widely discussed issue of her race. In an 1888 address before the Socialist League in London as part of a Haymarket commemoration event, Parsons described herself as “one whose ancestors are indigenous to the soil of America. When Columbus first came in sight of the Western continent, my ancestors were there to give them a native greeting. When the conquering hosts of Cortez moved upon Mexico, my mother’s ancestors were there to repel the invader; so that I represent the genuine American. I don’t say this from any national feeling of boundary-lines; I simply say this to show the tenor of the times and the different peoples who are here tonight” (*Address* 1). While Parsons’s emphasis on her indigenous American-ness may respond to characterizations of the Haymarket anarchists as foreigners, her allusion to the “invasion” of Mexico reminds her listeners of the

long history of empire-building in Mexico and the Americas. As Anne Martínez suggests in her short biographical sketch of Parsons, however, it “is widely speculated, largely based on her appearance, that she was born a slave and fabricated her Mexican and Indian ancestry as a survival mechanism in Reconstruction-era Texas.” If so, as Martínez writes, claiming “Mexican or Indian ancestry” might “protect Parsons from slavery,” but “it likely provided little protection from physical or economic violence” (331). Indeed, claiming Indian ancestry would not necessarily have protected Parsons from slavery either, since many Indian women were enslaved. What is more, the idea that the categories black, Mexican, and Indian are discrete and mutually exclusive underestimates the extent to which historically they have overlapped and converged. Native American studies scholar Jack Forbes suggests in *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples* (1993) that throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, native people, especially those who intermarried with blacks, often “disappeared” as Indians by being reclassified as black or as people of color. So while it is true that, as far as we know, Parsons never claims an African identity or calls herself a former slave or the child of slaves, this does not necessarily mean that she is “fabricating” her “ancestry” when she claims to be Indian and Mexican.¹³

Born Lucy Ella Waller in 1853 in Waco, Texas, Parsons also sometimes used the names Gonzales and Diaz (Ahrens 3–4). At an early age she was orphaned and raised in obscure circumstances. Ashbaugh speculates that Parsons might have been a slave of the people who owned the man, Oliver Gaithings, with whom she was living in Waco before she met Albert, while in an 1886 Chicago newspaper article about Parsons, a family named Rosser from Houston claimed that she was their former slave who had left them after the Civil War and that she was the child of a Mexican father and a black mother.¹⁴ Lucy’s compilation *The Life of Albert R. Parsons* contains a biographical sketch of Albert written by William Parsons, his older brother, which includes the claim that Albert’s “marriage to a Mexican lady of youth, beauty, and genius occurred in Austin, TX in 1871, and is a matter of record in that city, where miscegenation is a crime. Her Spanish and Aztec blood were then never questioned.” Parsons also claimed that Lucy spoke Spanish and that she was raised by an uncle who was a Mexican ranchero in Johnson County, Texas (3). Similarly, in a section by Albert Parsons called “The Story of his Life,” he calls his future wife a “charming young Spanish-Indian maiden” (15).

It is important, however, to attend to the layers of meaning in *The Life of Albert R. Parsons*, which is a mediated narrative,

authored by several very different writers, one that must be understood in the context of Lucy Parsons's and others' efforts, in the immediate wake of the deaths of Albert and the other Haymarket anarchists, to exonerate them and to perpetuate their memory. William Parsons was a white supremacist who had advocated secession and wanted to reopen the slave trade. After the Civil War he joined the Virginia Knights of Labor and, after not having seen his brother for 25 years, showed up to support him at his trial. His contribution to the *Life* emphasizes that the Parsons' ancestors came over on "the second voyage of the Mayflower" (1) and that just as his ancestors in "the two preceding centuries" had shown their devotion to that great American principle, so had Albert served "as a devotee to the cause of industrial freedom in the nineteenth century" (2). William Parsons's concerns about "miscegenation" help to explain his interest in the "question" of Lucy's "blood," and his emphasis on Albert's American-ness is clearly meant to counter the characterization of the Haymarket anarchists as an alien element in republican America. The question of whether William was right that Lucy spoke Spanish has still not been answered, though the Los Angeles Public Library holds a Spanish-language text on dress-making that is attributed to Lucy Gonzalez Parsons.

Albert's own "Story" of his life, which may have been ghost-written by Lucy, also contains an opening mention of his Puritan origins and Revolutionary war hero forebears as well as a similar account of Lucy's "Spanish" and "Indian" ancestry, which suggests that Albert and probably Lucy, the editor, also in some way authorized this narrative of ancestry and race, partly as a way of appealing to readers' sympathies and prejudices. However, Albert's trajectory had been very different from his brother's: Albert fought for the South in the Civil War but then returned to Texas, became a Radical Republican, held a series of government jobs, and encountered violent resistance among whites when he tried to register black voters in the late 1860s and 1870s, a time of intense white supremacist terror in Waco. Finally in 1872, he left Texas with Lucy and ultimately settled in Chicago, where he "discovered a great similarity between the abuse heaped upon these poor people by the organs of the rich and the actions of the late southern slaveholders in Texas toward the newly enfranchised slaves, whom they accused of wanting to make their former masters 'divide' by giving them 'forty acres and a mule' and it satisfied me there was a fundamental wrong at work in society and in existing social and industrial arrangements" (16). From registering black voters Albert turned to organizing mostly German immigrant and native-born white workers in Chicago and throughout the

Midwest, although the 1883 Pittsburgh manifesto of the International Working People's Association to which he and Lucy belonged and which was also, interestingly, attended by representatives from Mexico called for "Equal rights for all without distinction to sex or race" (106). In his writings, he generally maintained that "the difference between chattel slavery and wage slavery" was "one of form" (101), and that unless the laborer owned, "in common with all other laborers," the means of production, he was practically enslaved (101). While Albert had supported black voting rights and while immigrant anarchists were often racialized by more privileged US whites, however, the Chicago labor movement that Parsons joined after the Civil War only "hesitantly and inadequately," as Roediger suggests, addressed "the issue of Black freedom" (94).

Lucy Parsons shared many of Albert's views of the parallels between rich capitalists and southern slaveholders, the continuities between slavery and so-called freedom after the Civil War, and the need to make fundamental changes in "existing social and industrial arrangements." During the decades that followed Albert's death, she continued to use the wage slavery metaphor and to envision workers' struggles as a new front in an ongoing Civil War. Only occasionally, although then with outrage and sympathy, did she refer specifically to the struggles of black people in the wake of the failure of Reconstruction. Thus she did not specifically address the grim situation of black people in the post-emancipation period when, almost 20 years after the Haymarket executions, she contributed a front-page article to the *Liberator*, entitled "Americans Arouse Yourselves."¹⁵ Reminding her readers of the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the Civil War, she claimed that "40 Years Ago You Drew Your Sword to Save the Black Slave" and posed the question "What will you do now?" By using the wage slavery metaphor Parsons emphasized the continuities between the position of workers after the Civil War, who she called "slaves to the money power," and that of "Southern slaveholders" "black slaves" before the Civil War (1). By naming her short-lived weekly newspaper the *Liberator* (1905–1906), moreover, she implicitly compared Garrison's abolitionism to the post-Civil War project of emancipating the "wage slave." In all of these ways, she continued to draw on antebellum languages of labor and race as she critically addressed the incomplete project of emancipation in the decades after the Civil War and Haymarket.

As Robin D.G. Kelley suggests in *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (2002), Parsons, who he calls "the most prominent black woman radical of the late nineteenth century" (41), subordinated race and gender within the economic framework that she privileged, although it is too much to say that

she “ignored race” (42)¹⁶ because on a few occasions she did emphasize race as a factor in her analysis of the new but uncannily familiar forms of violence and inequality that followed the Civil War. In an 1892 newspaper article on “Southern Lynchings,” for instance, she denounced the “brutality” of the “war” being “perpetrated upon the Negro in the south,” which she described as a “scene of horrors” in which “bloodthirsty mobs” were “lashing and lynching” citizens. What is more, she hoped that “another John Brown” would rise up from among the “colored” race and suggested that “peaceful citizens” were being lynched “simply because they are Negroes” (70). One issue of the *Liberator* also devoted several columns of one issue to the first meeting of the Georgia Equal Rights Association, which was attended by “two hundred colored delegates,” including W.E.B. Du Bois, who attacked the idea that labor contracts were free and cited debt peonage and vagrancy laws as examples of the near reduction of farm labor “to slavery in many parts of the State.” Although Parsons herself put little faith in political solutions, her paper reprinted the group’s statement that “Voiceless workingmen are slaves” as well as their angry request that the nation “enforce the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments” (“Address” 2). She undoubtedly shared the group’s position on the inequalities enforced by labor contracts, for in an editorial published in the *Liberator* on 29 October 1905, she argued that “Contracts are only good between equals; but as the laborer is never on equal footing with capital, the contract is a fraud and will react to his detriment” (“Anthracite” 2).

Since Lucy Parsons also shared the belief that, as Albert put it, “access to the means of production” was a natural right and that all people had an “equal right to the use of the soil and other natural opportunities” (*Famous* 104), it is likely that she also supported Flores Magón’s view that the Partido Liberal Mexicano and the Mexican people were involved in a fight against “slavery,” the same slavery that US workers were fighting, and that through direct action the Mexican people should take back the land and other resources that had been taken over by US, European, and Mexican capitalists. Certainly it would help to know more about the lectures on “Mexico and Mexicans” which Parsons, who was described in a newspaper ad for the event as a “native,” delivered in the 1920s before the Chicago Society of Anthropology Forum, a group that was formed by people who supported Ida B. Wells’s protest of “the exclusion of African Americans from the World’s Congress of Religions” at the Chicago World’s Fair (Ahrens 18–19). However, unfortunately none of her lectures on this topic have been discovered, and because of this and other gaps in the record,

accounts of Parsons's relationship to and interest in Mexico, the PLM, and the Mexican Revolution remain incomplete. Since Parsons worked on the margins of print culture, publishing and selling literature, lecturing, editing, and contributing to short-lived and obscure anarchist, IWW, and other periodicals linked to the radical movements of the era, more detailed answers to questions about Parsons and Mexico may lie beyond print culture's boundaries.

4. Voltairine de Cleyre, the PLM, and the "Slaves of the World"

We can begin to imagine the significance the Mexican Revolution had for some radicals in the wake of Haymarket when we consider the response of anarchist poet, essayist, and orator Voltairine de Cleyre, who was known, among other things, for her powerful 11 November speeches commemorating the Haymarket executions.¹⁷ De Cleyre was born in poverty in 1866, a year after the Civil War ended, in a small town in Michigan. Her mother was from a family of New England abolitionists and her French father was an itinerant tailor and free thinker who named her after Voltaire and who gained US citizenship by fighting for the North during the Civil War. The execution of the Haymarket anarchists in 1887 was a transformative event for her, one that she later credited with converting her to anarchism. After that, she moved to Philadelphia, where she began teaching English to Jewish immigrants and learning Yiddish, in which she became so fluent that she could read Jewish anarchist newspapers and translate Yiddish for *Mother Earth*.¹⁸ Between 1890 and her death in 1912, she contributed to a variety of radical and anarchist journals, including some that Lucy Parsons was involved with, such as *Freedom*, the *Rebel*, *Solidarity*, the *Firebrand*, and the *Agitator*. She also gave many speeches, including at least one alongside Parsons at a Haymarket memorial in Chicago in 1906. From 1906 to 1912, she also contributed to *Mother Earth* on a regular basis.

For de Cleyre, the Mexican Revolution was, like the Haymarket executions, a transformative event, one which, she suggested in *Mother Earth*, might hold "as important a place in the present disruption and reconstruction of economic institutions as the great revolution of France held in the eighteenth-century movement" ("Mexican" 255).¹⁹ Shortly before her death in 1912, she organized the Chicago Mexican Defense League with a group of comrades to answer what she called "the appeal of the Junta of the Mexican Liberal Party" ("Report" 60). In an article on "The

Mexican Revolt" which had been published in *Mother Earth* a year earlier, she had welcomed the revolution as "a genuine awakening of a people" who have "struck for Land and Liberty" (167). Now she urged readers to support the revolution and prevent another US invasion of Mexico by circulating "a newspaper, a pamphlet, or a leaflet" ("Report" 61–62) or by giving "a dollar to maintain the Word of Revolt" (62). To that end, she became a correspondent for the PLM's bilingual newspaper, *Regeneración*, and she sold the paper and distributed PLM pamphlets at "picnics, private gatherings, and mass meetings" (de Cleyre, "Report" 60). Indeed, her last poem was published in *Regeneración* on 16 December 1911, just a few months before she died. In that poem, "Written-in-Red," which is dedicated to "our Living Dead in Mexico's Struggle," de Cleyre suggests that the dead who have perished fighting for Mexico have written a "red" protest, so that their "living words" flame out to illuminate a message to the "Slaves of the World": "Seize the lands! Open the prisons and make men free!" (75).

The Haymarket speeches that de Cleyre delivered between 1895 and 1910 help explain the intensity of her response to events in Mexico. Some of these speeches were published in movement periodicals, usually shortly after the event but sometimes many years later, as part of an ongoing cycle of commemoration that shows how committed radical publishers and cultural producers were to responding to the present by remembering Haymarket. Like Parsons and other radical memory-makers, moreover, de Cleyre looked both backward to the past and forward to the future when she remembered Haymarket. For de Cleyre, Haymarket was an "unhealing wound whence blood still issues" (*First* 1), one which was productive rather than an "uncompensated loss" (2), since there were "so many things to gather" from the "grave" (1). In all of her speeches, she frequently cites the anarchists' words, especially those from Parsons's *Famous Speeches*.²⁰ In a Haymarket oration delivered in Philadelphia in November of 1900, in language that foreshadows the words of her final poem, "Written-in-Red," she insisted that the Haymarket anarchists had a message to deliver, "a burning message, red at the heart, and leaping in flame" (*First* 18). Looking backwards to the Civil War, she claimed that the Haymarket martyrs "believed that Lincoln and Grant were right, when they predicted further uprisings of the people, wild convulsions, in the effort to reestablish some equilibrium in possessions" (18). In this way, she situated the Haymarket tragedy as a continuation of the Civil War and as part of an ongoing history of "slavery" that opened up onto a future of "further uprisings." The message that she attributed to the

Haymarket martyrs, moreover, was one that was at the heart of PLM efforts in Mexico: to tell the people to “learn what their rights upon this earth were—freedom to use the land and all within it and all the tools of production—and then to stand together and take them, themselves, and not to appeal to the jugglers of the law” (*First* 27). It is not surprising, then, that in 1911 de Cleyre concluded her address on “The Mexican Revolution” (which also appeared in *Mother Earth*) by bowing “to these heroic strugglers, no matter how ignorant they are, who have raised the cry Land and Liberty, and planted the blood-red banner on the burning soil of Mexico” (275).

The word “ignorant” in this sentence is used ironically, since much of the address is devoted to chastising US radicals for imagining that Mexican peasants had to be ignorant if their actions were not guided by the “jargon of [US] land reformers or of Socialists” (267). Her opening premise, moreover, is that people in the US are the ones who are ignorant. She begins by trying to understand why so many in the US are “ignorant of the present revolution in Mexico,” which is taking place “in their backyard” (253). In “The Mexican Revolt,” she reserved her most pointed criticisms for radical papers that “refused to print the Manifestoes and Appeals of the Mexican Liberal Party, to afford the publicity of their columns to the real demands of the revolutionists, that their readers might give their sympathy and support, and the influence of their understanding” (169). As de Cleyre tried to persuade her audience of the significance of the PLM’s struggle to radicalize the revolution, she drew on antebellum languages of labor and land, comparing Mexico’s “great estates” to plantations and recasting the revolution as a war in which the “Slaves of Our Times . . . have smitten the Beast of Property in Land” (168). On the other hand, even as she looked backwards to the antebellum era, in her lecture on the Mexican Revolution she anticipated some of the issues of our own times as she questioned an emergent discourse of development which promised that “developing” mineral resources and “modern industries” and granting land concessions would “civilize” Mexico. Instead of viewing development as the key to progress, de Cleyre emphasized its destructiveness: how “Indian life has been broken up, violated with as ruthless a hand as ever tore up a people by the roots and cast them out as weeds to wither in the sun” (258). Ultimately, she hoped that “freedom in land” would “become an actual fact” in Mexico, which would mean “the death-knell of great landholding in this country also,” she argued, since “what people is going to see its neighbor enjoy so great a triumph, and sit on tamely itself under landlordism?” (274). However, she was also concerned that US citizens might

fail to learn what they needed to know about Mexico because they were too busy reading about baseball and wrestling, too “egotistic” about “their own big country,” and especially because “they do not read Spanish” and have always been taught “that whatever happened in Mexico was a joke.” Finally, she complained, “the majority of our people do not know that a revolution means a fundamental change in social life, and not a spectacular display of armies” (274). For all of these reasons, she worried that US observers might not understand that some Mexican revolutionists were trying to bring about the sort of “fundamental change in social life” that the Haymarket martyrs had called for.

If many socialist periodicals criticized or ignored the PLM and the Mexican Revolution, however, *Mother Earth*, the *Blast*, and other anarchist publications were much more supportive, and at times they also made connections between Haymarket and Mexico. In the November 1916 issue of *Mother Earth* that contained many reflections on the significance of Haymarket, for instance, Enrique Flores Magón remembered that, when he heard his parents talk about the execution of the Haymarket anarchists, he wondered “how the bodies of the hanged men must have looked, dangling to and fro from the ends of ropes fastened to the branches of a tall, leafy oak, as men are hanged in Mexico” (“First” 674–75), and on the back page of the 1 November 1916 issue of the *Blast*, Enrique’s name appears in a full-page advertisement for an “International Mass Meeting” in San Francisco on the anniversary of the execution of the Haymarket martyrs. Inside the paper it was promised that Magón, “who is even now under a Federal prison sentence for his unyielding devotion to the cause of Liberty” (5) would speak in English and Spanish at the meeting. Goldman and Berkman also published other writings by Enrique, as well as PLM literature, including an appeal to the “the workers of the United States,” which appeared in *Mother Earth* in April 1915 and was endorsed by Goldman, in which they argued that “To deny solidarity to the Mexican workingmen who are struggling to conquer their economic freedom is to stand against the Labor cause in general, because the cause of the wage-slave against his master has no frontiers; it is not a national problem, but a universal conflict” (“Organizing” 86). *Mother Earth* also included essays by William C. Owen in support of the PLM and the revolution, as well as appeals from the Los Angeles-based Rangel-Cline Defense Fund, a group to which Owen belonged, along with articles about that legal struggle. What is more, in the group’s appeal to the “friends of justice,” they connected US–Mexico border struggles to the Civil War and to Haymarket when they argued that “To hang Rangel is to hang another John

Brown, and well might prove another Harper's Ferry. To hang, or imprison for life, our other comrades, whose real crime is devotion to the poor and disinherited, is to repeat the legal butchery that followed the Haymarket tragedy in Chicago" ("Appeal" 306). In a February 1914 article called "Tyranny in Texas," the author characterized the case as one in which "Mexican working-men" and an "American member of the IWW" crossed the border to help the "oppressed workers" fight the "slavers" in Mexico. Explaining the persecution of the men as a nervous response to the "growing solidarity of the working class" (Ashleigh 377), the author concluded by hoping that "the day is not far distant when there will be sufficient solidarity" to "demand and secure" the release of the most "militant members" of the "working class," who continued to be targeted by the "masters" (Ashleigh 379).

So why was there not even more solidarity? Despite the support of many US anarchists, IWW members, and other radicals, it is clear that those making appeals on behalf of the PLM and the more radical aims of the Mexican Revolution believed that it was an uphill battle and that they were struggling against "a mountain of indifference," as de Cleyre put it. Part of the problem might have been the "slavery" matrix that was used to explain the Mexican Revolution, together with ideas, which can be traced at least as far back as the US–Mexico War, about Mexico as a racially heterogeneous space that threatened a fictive Anglo-Saxon purity.²¹ Indeed, although different struggles could be linked together on the basis of the slavery comparison, such a framework also threatened to bring with it some of the racial baggage of its antebellum uses. As I have suggested elsewhere, during the US–Mexico War a third term was introduced into discussions of different forms of labor and spaces of labor exploitation: chattel slaves and wage slaves were often compared to Mexican peons, and the plantation and the factory were frequently compared to the hacienda.²² In the era of the Mexican Revolution, these comparisons continued to be made in the US, but at times, as in the earlier period, they had disturbing implications. When all forms of labor by those who do not control the means of production were seen as being like each other, there was more room for interracial and international solidarity, despite the special pathos some whites tried to claim on the basis of the so-called degradation involved in being treated as badly as nonwhites were treated. However, when Mexicans were compared to chattel slaves and when haciendas were viewed as no different from antebellum plantations, it was easier for some US workers to distance themselves from Mexicans, despite the abolitionist sentiments that such

comparisons could provoke. Republican beliefs about the threat that dependence posed to virtue, moreover, could also support the idea that those who had been “enslaved” might not deserve freedom and were unfit to rule themselves without tutelage, or perhaps at all.²³

An ad in the June 1914 *International Socialist Review* for John Kenneth Turner’s sensational expose *Barbarous Mexico* helps to clarify this point. Calling Díaz a slave-driver, the ad screams “Mexican laborers are slaves! Not merely wage-slaves like the rest of us—they are CHATTEL slaves. Unless they get out and fight they have just about as much liberty, just about as much pay for their labor, as did the black people in Louisiana in 1860.” On the one hand, the ad makes the slavery comparison in order to shock the *Review*’s readers into sympathizing with the revolutionary cause; those who have been enslaved, it is implied, have to “get out and fight” so as not to be like the “black people in Louisiana in 1860.” On the other hand, the ad’s suggestion that Mexican laborers are not “like the rest of us” but instead are structurally in the same position as the black people of an earlier era could also, especially in the context of ongoing US imperialist activity, play into white supremacist beliefs about the dependency and degraded nature of nonwhites. Although many US anarchists and other labor radicals articulated more egalitarian positions and strongly criticized US empire-building, the persistence of the slavery comparison, along with US–Mexico war era ideas about race and government which were revived during the imperialist conflicts of the early twentieth century, may have worked against the emergence of a more broad-based international solidarity that would have mobilized a larger sector of the US labor movement.

At least by the end of the nineteenth century, moreover, discussions of lingering forms of slavery could also provoke challenging questions about married women’s legal status and women’s work in the home, in the labor market, and within radical movements. At times anarchists and other radicals criticized marriage as a form of “Sex Slavery,” as the title of one of de Cleyre’s pamphlets put it. Calling the “married woman” a “bonded slave” who “takes her master’s name, her master’s bread, her master’s commands, and serves her master’s passion—not at her desire” (“Sex” 223), de Cleyre protested that “only through the marriage law is such tyranny possible” (224). In viewing marriage as a form of slavery, de Cleyre contributed to what Amy Dru Stanley has shown was a vigorous post-Civil War conversation about whether principles of contract freedom should apply to marriage, whether marriage was an equal contract, and whether the wife lost

sovereignty in her “self” when she married and was thereby effectively enslaved. After emancipation, in other words, as Stanley suggests, feminists and others reconsidered “the meaning of freedom after slavery’s downfall” and exposed “the ambiguities and contradictions of contract freedom” (xi, 2), specifically with respect to marriage contracts, women’s work inside and outside the home, and women’s legal status in the nation and in their communities.

Within the radical movements of the era there were significant differences of opinion on these questions, but the intensity of the debates suggests that slavery’s demise and the ascendancy of contract as “a dominant metaphor for social relations and the very symbol of freedom” (Stanley, x) provoked even more questions about whether wives were “enslaved” and about what alternatives to the institution of marriage might look like. Instead of calling marriage a form of slavery, however, Lucy Parsons took a different position, idealizing, in one issue of the *Liberator*, the “home” even as she argued that the domestic ideal was “rarely achieved under the present system of capitalism” (“Home” 2). However, in the very next issue, she wrote an editorial about women who are “happier while unmarried” in which she defended divorce and blamed churches “for meddling with the marriage relation,” since, she argued, “the people are generally trying to find the best way to save their bodies while in this world, and obtain any happiness they can” (“Every” 1). According to Ashbaugh, Parsons tried to separate out the question of “variety in sex relations” from the question of “economic freedom,” arguing that venereal disease and the mother’s responsibility in case of pregnancy were perils of “free love” (204). However, while Parsons’s complex and sometimes contradictory views of marriage may have been shaped by her specific concern for the problems of poor and working-class women and the historical failure of the state to respect and uphold the marriages of many people of color, the distinction she tried to establish between questions of “sex” and questions of “economic freedom” was one that many other anarchists, including de Cleyre, would not have accepted.

Indeed, not only in the wake of emancipation but also during the long era of rebellion against Díaz and his successors, revolutionary imaginings of fundamental social transformation involved questions about whether and how women’s lives would change as a result. As Emma Pérez has suggested, in *Regeneración* PLM writers repeatedly addressed such questions, and in doing so they responded to ongoing debates within the larger transnational anarchist movement. In the US, de Cleyre took the position that, in the wake of industrial capitalism, different economies would arise and

that, “with free contract, that form of sexual association will survive which is best adapted to time and place. . . . Whether that shall be monogamy, variety, or promiscuity matters naught to us; it is the business of the future, to which we dare not dictate” (“Sex” 232). Her theory of such an open-ended future, one which would engender diverse forms of economy and sexual association, moreover, was informed by her interest in “anarchism without adjectives,” a more tolerant, inclusive conception of anarchism endorsed by Spanish anarchists Ricardo Mella and Fernando Tarrida del Mármol.²⁴ Interestingly, in 1910 when Flores Magón revived *Regeneración* and added the new English-language section he included an illustration of Tarrida del Mármol, among others, on a poster in the first issue. According to PLM historian James A. Sandos, Flores Magón’s writings for *Regeneración* “embrace” Tarrida del Mármol’s views, and Sandos imagines that the paper’s “emphasis upon sex equality, Modern Schools, opposition to every form of tyranny, and direct action” (41) must have particularly “resonated” with de Cleyre.

Yet Pérez argues that, while *Regeneración* “printed at least one essay on women, their rights, or their subjugation in almost every issue of the newspaper from its initial publication” (63), the anarchists “generally denounced marriage at the same time that they held certain ideas about women’s ‘natural’ duties and desires” (62). Thus when some members of the PLM moved to a “communal farm” in Los Angeles, she points out, women and men “shared fieldwork but not housework” (67). Nonetheless, Pérez also foregrounds the contributions made to the movement by women writers and activists such as Blanca de Moncaleano, Paula Carmona de Flores Magón, and María Talavera. While anarchists and others took different positions on questions of marriage as slavery and on the place of women within revolutionary struggles, transnational anarchist movements undoubtedly brought such questions to the forefront and often articulated questions of sex and gender with questions of labor, nation, and race when the former might have otherwise remained peripheral to such discussions.

Another challenge faced by radical communities of laborers was bridging language differences. To be sure, this had been a challenge for the US labor movement at other moments as well, notably in Chicago in the years leading up to Haymarket. In his “History of the Chicago Labor Movement,” published in *The Life of Albert R. Parsons*, George Schilling observed that “A. R. Parsons for a long time was practically the only public English speaker we had,” and he recalled that “we had no English literature on socio-economic subjects” (xxii). The radical labor paper with the highest circulation in Chicago before Haymarket was, after all, the

German-language *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, not Parsons's English-language *Alarm*, and several of the other important movement papers were in German and Bohemian. Indeed, because many involved in the movement were immigrants and fluent in languages other than English, the Haymarket anarchists were often represented in mass culture as an unwelcome, alien presence in republican America. Parsons and his comrades, notably August Spies, the editor of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, worked to bridge such differences and to build solidarity between German- and English-speaking labor activists by holding rallies where speeches were made in both German and English and by publishing some important texts, such as the famous circular announcing the 4 May Haymarket meeting, in both languages.

In Los Angeles in the era of the Mexican Revolution, the efforts of the editors of the PLM paper *Regeneración* to reach readers of both Spanish and English represent perhaps the most notable US print culture attempt to construct an international US–Mexican radical coalition at this time. Although other Spanish-language papers linked to the PLM were published in the Southwest, and although, as I have suggested, some English-language periodicals reprinted translations of PLM manifestoes and appeals, *Regeneración* was, as far as I know, one of only a few radical US-based publications during this era that tried to cover events in Mexico in both languages.²⁵ In September 1910, the paper began to include an English-language page, which was briefly edited by Ethel Duffy Turner, wife of the socialist author of *Barbarous Mexico* (1910–11). In 1911, William C. Owen took over the job, and he was also responsible for adding to the roster of contributors Voltairine de Cleyre, who as I have noted was a translator of Yiddish and who was learning Spanish at the end of her life. Enrique Flores Magón also tried to appeal to both Spanish-language and English-language communities, as is evidenced by his contributions to *Mother Earth* and his Haymarket speech delivered in both English and Spanish. Although these efforts did not produce the successful revolutionary coalition that they hoped for, their interventions in print, in spite of legal repression, racism, disagreements about marriage and sex, and language differences, reveal some of the possibilities and limits of labor internationalism for radical social movements on the margins of print culture and beyond its boundaries from Haymarket to the Mexican Revolution.

Notes

1. Haymarket is a pivotal event in many narratives of US labor history. For the best general history of Haymarket, see Paul Avrich, *The Haymarket Tragedy*

(1984). For a useful account of the Chicago socialist, anarchist, and labor movements of the era, see Bruce Nelson, *Beyond the Martyrs: A Social History of Chicago's Anarchists, 1870–1900* (1988).

2. David Roediger's and Franklin Rosemont's *Haymarket Scrapbook* (1986) provides a great introduction to some of this material. One of the best recent studies of memory in US culture is Marita Sturken's *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering* (1997). Her insight that memory "both defines a culture and is the means by which its divisions and conflicting agendas are revealed" (1) is useful for an understanding of the memory wars around Haymarket. For other compelling discussions of violence and memory, see David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (2001); T. Fujitani, Geoffrey White, and Lisa Yoneyama, *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)* (2001); Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (1996), 1–31; and Lisa Yoneyama, *Hiroshima Traces: Time, Space, and the Dialectics of Memory* (1999), 26–82. For an excellent analysis of elegies for the Haymarket martyrs published in the radical press, see Kristin Boudreau, "Elegies for the Haymarket Anarchists." Her discussion of the poetry connected to what she, following Clark D. Halker, calls working-class "movement culture" converges at many points with my own account.

3. On the implications of the wage slavery metaphor and comparisons between free and unfree labor during this era, see Eric Foner, "The Idea of Free Labor in Nineteenth-Century America," *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (1995), ix–xxviii; David Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (1991), 43–92; Shelley Streeby, *American Sensations: Class, Empire, and the Production of Popular Culture* (2002), 180–83, 203–13.

4. See Tomás Almaguer, *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California* (1994); Alexander Saxton, *The Indispensable Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California* (1995); Streeby, 189–213.

5. See Avrich, *Haymarket*, 319–21, 410–11.

6. See John Mason Hart, *Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War* (2002), 305–42; Curtis Marez, *Drug Wars: The Political Economy of Narcotics* (2004), 105–12.

7. There is a huge literature on the Flores Magóns and the PLM in the US. Some of the important studies include Juan Gómez-Quiñonez, *Sembradores, Ricardo Flores Magón y el Partido Liberal Mexicano: A Eulogy and Critique* (1973); Thomas Langham, *Border Trials: Ricardo Flores Magón and the Mexican Liberals* (1982); Colin M. MacLachlan, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution: The Political Trials of Ricardo Flores Magón in the United States* (1991); Emma Pérez, *The Decolonial Imaginary: Writing Chicanas into History* (1999); and James A. Sandos, *Rebellion in the Borderlands: Anarchism and the Plan of San Diego, 1904–1923* (1992). Sandos also discusses the significance of Haymarket for the Flores Magón brothers (3–4).

8. See Gregg Andrews, *Shoulder to Shoulder?: The American Federation of Labor, the United States, and the Mexican Revolution, 1910–1924* (1991), 3–13.

9. See Nick Salvatore, *Eugene V. Debs: Citizen and Socialist* (1982), 227.

10. According to Colin MacLachlan, Flores Magón found annoying “the condescending nature of much of the assistance from” (30) the US Left, particularly the AFL and the socialists. He claims that the support of anarchists was “much more acceptable” (31). As labor historian Kathryn Oberdeck suggests in her response to this article, however, despite disagreements over key issues, there were also many connections between socialist and anarchist movements during this era. Many anarchists, particularly Lucy Parsons, also had a lot of respect and sympathy for Debs, particularly after he was imprisoned for making a speech opposing World War I. See Lucy Parsons, “Letter to Eugene V. Debs” in Gale Ahrens, “Lucy Parsons: Mystery Revolutionist, More Dangerous than a Thousand Rioters,” 152–53.

11. According to Anne Martínez, “At the time of her death, government officials confiscated her books, writings, and personal records. This material has never resurfaced” (333).

12. See David Poole, “A Magonist Chronology,” *Land and Liberty: Anarchist Influences in the Mexican Revolution—Ricardo Flores Magón* (1977), 136, 139; Colin M. MacLachlan, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution: The Political Trials of Ricardo Flores Magón in the United States* (1991), 46–47.

13. In the recent (2004) Charles H. Kerr edition of Lucy Parsons’s selected works, editor Gale Ahrens concludes that “the records seem to indicate that she was indeed of ‘mixed’ descent—African American, Mexican American, Native American” (4).

14. See Carolyn Ashbaugh, *Lucy Parsons: American Revolutionary* (1976), 267–68; Avrich, *Haymarket*, 11–12.

15. *Liberator*, 24 September 1905.

16. See also Angela Davis, *Women, Race, and Class* (1983), 152–55. In an often cited passage from the 3 April 1886 issue of *Alarm*, Parsons suggests that “outrages were heaped upon the negro” because he was “poor” rather than because he was “black.”

17. After her death in 1912, the Mother Earth Publishing Company issued a 1914 collection, edited by Alexander Berkman, which included one of these speeches, along with some of de Cleyre’s poems, essays, sketches, and stories. Paul Avrich included several, along with others that he found in manuscript collections, in *The First May Day: The Haymarket Speeches 1895–1910* (1980). There has been something of a Voltairine de Cleyre revival lately; three different critical anthologies of her work have appeared in the last few years. See A. J. Brigati, ed., *The Voltairine de Cleyre Reader* (2004); Eugenia C. Delamotte, *Gates of Freedom: Voltairine de Cleyre and the Revolution of the Mind* (2004); and Sharon Presley and Crispin Sartwell, eds. *Exquisite Rebel: The Essays of Voltairine Cleyre—Anarchist, Feminist, Genius* (2005). Brigati’s AK Press edition is the only one of the three to include de Cleyre’s important speech, essay, and pamphlet “The Mexican Revolt,” but Delamotte’s book includes the short *Mother Earth* article “Report of the Work of the Chicago Mexican Defense League.” Presley’s and Sartwell’s collection contains many interesting essays by de Cleyre, especially on direct action and on her

"anarchist feminist philosophy," but none of her writings on Mexico. Berkman's 1914 edition includes the poem "Written in Red (To Our Living Dead in Mexico's Struggle)" and "The Mexican Revolution."

18. See Avrich, *An American Anarchist: The Life of Voltairine de Cleyre* (1978), 18–37, 47–51, 74–82.

19. Ibid., 225–31; Sandos, 40–42.

20. See Kristin Boudreau's analysis of the elegies of the Haymarket poets, which "lingered on this 'old-time wound' of November 11 without offering cheering sentiments" (327). She emphasizes the poets' "refusal of consolation": "they refused to be easily comforted because they wished to put their grief to political use rather than transcend it" (327).

21. See Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (1981), 208–48.

22. See Streeby, 189–213.

23. See Roediger, *Wages*, 84–87.

24. See Avrich, *American*, 149–54; Delamotte, 26–27.

25. See Richard Griswold del Castillo, "The Mexican Revolution and the Spanish-Language Press in the Borderlands," *Journalism History* (Summer 1977): 42–47.

Works Cited

- "Address of the First Annual Meeting of the Georgia Equal-Right Association." *Liberator* (1 April 1906): 2.
- Ahrens, Gale. "Lucy Parsons: Mystery Revolutionist, More Dangerous than a Thousand Rioters." *Lucy Parsons: Freedom, Equality, and Solidarity, Writings and Speeches, 1878–1937*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 2004. 1–26.
- "Appeal of the Rangel-Cline Defense Fund." *Mother Earth* 8.10 (1913).
- Ashbaugh, Carolyn. *Lucy Parsons: American Revolutionary*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1976.
- Ashleigh, Charles. "Tyranny in Texas." *Mother Earth* 8.12 (1914).
- Avrich, Paul. *An American Anarchist: The Life of Voltairine de Cleyre*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.
- Boudreau, Kristin. "Elegies for the Haymarket Anarchists." *American Literature* 77.2 (2005): 319–47.
- Debs, Eugene V. "The Crisis in Mexico." *International Socialist Review* (July 1911): 22–23.
- De Cleyre, Voltairine. *The First Mayday: The Haymarket Speeches 1895–1910*. Ed. Paul Avrich.

- Orkney, UK, New York, and Minneapolis: Cienfuegos Press, Libertarian Book Club, and Soil of Liberty, 1980.
- . “The Mexican Revolt.” *Mother Earth*: (August 1911): 167–71.
- . “The Mexican Revolution.” *Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre*. Ed. Alexander Berkman. New York: Mother Earth, 1914. 253–75.
- . “Report of the Work of the Chicago Mexican Liberal Defense League.” *Mother Earth* (April 1912): 60–62.
- . “Sex Slavery.” *Gates of Freedom: Voltairine de Cleyre and the Revolution of the Mind*. Ed. Eugenia C. Delamotte. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2004: 222–234.
- . “Written-in-Red.” 1911. Rpt. *Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre*. Ed. Alexander Berkman. New York: Mother Earth, 1914. 75.
- Flores Magón, Enrique. “My First Impressions.” *Mother Earth* (November 1916).
- Flores Magón, Ricardo. *Land and Liberty: Anarchist Influences in the Mexican Revolution—Ricardo Flores Magón*. Ed. David Poole. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1977.
- Fox, Jay. “The Chicago Martyrs.” *Agitator* (15 November 1910): 1.
- . “Greatest Figure in History.” *Agitator* (15 November 1911): 4.
- . “The Passing Show.” *Agitator* (1 April 1911): 1.
- Goldman, Emma. *Living My Life*, Vol. 2. 1931. Rpt. New York: Dover, 1970.
- Kelley, Robin D. G. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon P, 2002.
- MacLachlan, Colin M. *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution: The Political Trials of Ricardo Flores Magón in the United States*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.
- Martínez, Anne. “Lucy G. Parsons.” *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Latinos and Latinas in the United States*. Ed. Deena Gonzales and Suzanne Oboler. New York: Oxford UP, 2005. 331–33.
- Owen, William C. “Debs Sides with the Reactionists.” *Agitator* (1 August 1911): 2.
- . “What Mexico’s Struggle Means.” *International Socialist Review* (May 1912): 739–43.
- “The Organizing Junta of the Mexican Liberal Party.” *Mother Earth* 10.2 (1915).
- Parsons, Lucy. “Every Day Reflections.” *The Liberator* (17 September 1905).
- . *Famous Speeches of the Chicago Martyrs: Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Eleventh of November Memorial Edition*. Chicago: Lucy E. Parsons, 1912.
- . “The Home.” *The Liberator* (10 September 1905).
- . “In the Anthracite Coal Regions.” *Liberator* (29 October 1905): 2.

———. *Life of Albert R. Parsons with Brief History of the Labor Movement in America*, 2nd edn. Chicago: Mrs. Lucy E. Parsons, Publisher and Proprietor, 1903.

———. "Mrs. Lucy E. Parsons. Her First Address in London at a Welcome Extended Her on Arrival. Burning and Eloquent Words which Stirred the Audience to Intense Enthusiasm." *Alarm* (8 December 1888): 1.

———. "Southern Lynchings." 1892. Rpt. *Lucy Parsons: Freedom, Equality, and Solidarity, Writings and Speeches, 1878–1937*. Ed. Gale Ahrens. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 2004. 70.

———. "The Trial a Farce." *Agitator* (15 November 1911): 2.

Pérez, Emma. *The Decolonial Imaginary: Writing Chicanas into History*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1999.

Poole, David. "A Magonist Chronology." *Land and Liberty: Anarchist Influences in the Mexican Revolution—Ricardo Flores Magón*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1977, 124–44.

Roediger, David and Franklin Rosemont, eds. *Haymarket Scrapbook*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1986.

Sandos, James A. *Rebellion in the Borderlands: Anarchism and the Plan of San Diego, 1904–1923*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1992.

Stanley, Amy Dru. *From Bondage to Contract: Wage Labor, Marriage, and the Market in the Age of Slave Emancipation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Sturken, Marita. *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.