

the anarchist scare of 1908

a sign of tensions
in the progressive era

robert j. goldstein

On February 23, 1908, one of the most bizarre murders in American history occurred. Father Leo Heinrichs was administering the rite of holy communion at early mass at St. Elizabeth's Roman Catholic Church in Denver, when suddenly one of the communicants spat out the wafer which Father Heinrichs had just placed on his tongue, drew a pistol, placed it against the priest's robes and fired a shot. As women in the church fainted, Father Heinrichs fell dead, shot through the heart, exclaiming, "My God! My God! To Thee I commend my soul!"¹

The assassin subsequently proclaimed that he had committed the murder because he was an anarchist and hated all priests. The Heinrichs murder was followed by two other "outrages" attributed to anarchists which occurred within the next five weeks: the alleged attempt to assassinate Chicago's police chief and an abortive attempt to throw a bomb into a group of police in New York City. These "outrages" set off an anarchist scare that convulsed the country for about seven weeks. Before it had run its course, many Americans were expressing concern about the possibility of a "class war," five men were dead, scores of innocent people had been clubbed or arrested by the police, thousands were deprived of the right of free speech and free assembly, the federal government had suppressed two anarchist newspapers and announced a major campaign to deport alien anarchists, a soldier had been sentenced to jail for three years for shaking hands with an anarchist leader while in uniform, and Congress, in an attempt to ban anarchist literature from the mails, for the first time had established political criteria for excluding material from the postal service.

It is difficult to understand how the anarchist scare of 1908 could

have developed if the standard historical interpretation of the early years of the Progressive Era is accepted. Most American historians have painted the first decade of this century as a time of buoyant optimism during which Americans joined together to begin a crusade to cleanse society of its ills. Thus, John Higham writes that the defeat of Bryan in 1896, the return of prosperity in 1897 and the "splendid little war" with Spain led to "confidence" and "relief from class conflict." Higham further asserts that "the antiradical tradition was dormant through the whole decade of the 1900's."² Harold Faulkner writes that at the turn of the century, "Success, progress and prosperity were the dominant notes; the future was bright, and to many the new century held dreams of greatness and glory beyond any yet achieved."³ According to George Mowry:

The bloody strikes of the nineties, the march of desperate men to Washington, the rise of socialism and the farmer's startling political protest in 1896 were all episodes which most Americans wished to forget at the beginning of the new century. . . . A relative sense of well-being possessed the nation and the average man assumed a feeling of optimism about the future that he had not had since the eighties.⁴

The general tone of these and many similar accounts⁵ suggests that suddenly in about 1900 Americans forgot all their differences and fears in a wave of good cheer and exuberance. Of course, there is some degree of truth to this picture, especially if one contrasts the prevailing mood of the country from 1900 to 1910 with the widespread fears of revolution or social chaos during the 1890's. But such interpretations tend to gloss over the strong conflicts, tensions and fears that churned away just beneath and often on the surface of American society during this period. How can it be maintained that these years were a period of "unity" and "confidence" when 1901-03 saw a severe anarchist scare, 1903-07 saw a period of vicious repression directed against the radical Western Federation of Miners, and 1908 saw the anarchist scare discussed here?⁶

Aside from the specific "outrages" that led to the scare, the anarchist hysteria of 1908 had three more basic roots which reflected the continuing fears and conflicts in American society: 1) a deeply ingrained fear of radicals which had become embedded in American government and business circles since the Paris Commune of 1871 and which had focused particularly on anarchists since the Haymarket affair of 1886; 2) the rapid spread of radicalism during the years immediately preceding 1908; and 3) increasing fears about American social stability aroused by labor unrest resulting from the economic depression which had begun in October, 1907.

While fears of radicalism, and especially foreign radicalism, had been endemic in the United States at least since the Alien and Sedition hysteria of 1798, the modern version of the "red scare" can be traced to the fears resulting from the Paris Commune. The growth of the American labor

movement after the civil war, coupled with widespread labor unrest during the 1873-78 depression, the Molly Maguire episode and the 1877 railroad strikes, convinced conservative forces in America that the threat posed by the Commune could easily cross the Atlantic in the form of foreign agitators who might inflame the minds of American workers.⁷

These fears had been revived with the growth of the Knights of Labor during the 1880's, and the rash of strikes and unrest which developed during and immediately after the 1883-85 depression. The growth of a largely alien-based and violence-advocating anarchist movement during this period was a particular cause for concern, especially in Chicago, where anarchist forces achieved considerable strength in the local labor movement. These fears burst out in full panic as a result of the Haymarket bombing, which fixed forever in the American mind the image of the anarchist as a "ragged, unwashed, long-haired, wild-eyed fiend, armed with smoking revolver and bomb—to say nothing of the dagger he sometimes carried between his teeth." The fact that there was never any real evidence that a member of the Chicago anarchist movement was responsible for the bombing was disregarded in the hysteria which swept the country, and four leaders of the movement were hanged for the deed.⁸



ANARCHIST LEADER Alexander Berkman, who was convicted of the attempted assassination of industrialist Henry Frick in 1892, was arrested but later freed in connection with the Union Square bombing of March 28, 1908. (Source: *Current Literature*, May 1908.)

The Haymarket affair marked the end of anarchism as a potentially strong political force in America,⁹ but fear of anarchism remained. The image of the anarchist as murderous fiend was reinforced by a series of anarchist outrages and assassinations: those in Europe during the 1890's, including the assassination of King Umberto of Italy in 1900, planned by a group of Italian anarchists in Paterson, New Jersey; and in the U.S., the attempted assassination of Carnegie steel magnate Henry Frick by the anarchist Alexander Berkman during the 1892 Homestead strike, and the assassination of President McKinley by Leon Czolgosz, who claimed to be an anarchist, but was most likely simply insane.¹⁰

The Berkman and Czolgosz affairs both set off brief anarchist panics. The panic following the McKinley assassination culminated in the 1903 Anarchist Exclusion Act, by which Congress banned from entry to the U.S. “anarchists or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force and violence of the government of the U.S., or of all government, or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials” as well as anyone who “disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching” such doctrines. Further, aliens already in the country who fell within these categories within three years of their date of entry, even if they developed such beliefs after coming to the U.S., could be deported.¹¹

While fear of anarchism declined after 1903, persecution of anarchists did not end. On at least eight occasions in 1906 and 1907, for example, police in Philadelphia and New York barred anarchist meetings or meetings called to discuss anarchism, sometimes arresting speakers and clubbing protesters in the process.¹²

Anarchist agitation appears to have increased after about 1905, although the total number of anarchists in the country who preached violence—as opposed to philosophical anarchists who merely taught the abstract desirability of eliminating coercive governments—probably did not exceed one thousand. A survey of anarchism in America in 1908 indicated there were only half a dozen anarchist newspapers, of which only one advocated violence. It concluded that “violence and terrorism” were not generally found in written or oral anarchist propaganda.¹³ The total number of anarchists in San Francisco, one of the major anarchist strongholds, was estimated at 500 in 1908. Chicago had another several hundred anarchists, while the “physical force” anarchists in New York were viewed as “very small” and not constituting a “difficult problem” by a New York police official.¹⁴

The upsurge in anarchist agitation, which was apparent by 1908, was only part of a general increase in radical strength and activity that was making government and business circles edgy. The Socialist Party, organized in 1898 with about 10,000 members, had over 40,000 members by 1908. The socialist vote had increased from less than 100,000 in 1900 to over 400,000 in 1904. By 1905, President Roosevelt was referring, in his private correspondence, to the socialist threat as “far more ominous than any populist or similar movement in the past.”¹⁵

Yet another threat to propertied interests was posed by the Industrial Workers of the World. The I.W.W., organized in 1905, was a militant and openly anti-capitalist industrial union that preached the need for workers to “organize as a class, take possession of the earth and machinery of production and abolish the wage system.” Although the I.W.W. was weakened by internal struggles from 1905 to 1908, one of its leading figures, William D. Haywood, received heavy treatment in the press as a prime public enemy. The allegedly violent propensities of the I.W.W.

and its predecessor, the Western Federation of Miners, was kept constantly in the public mind from 1905 to 1908 as a result of the 1905 murder of former Idaho Governor Frank Steunenberg; Steunenberg had brutally suppressed the 1899 W.F.M. strike at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. Haywood, W.F.M. President Charles Moyer and former W.F.M. official George Pettibone were arrested for the murder; Haywood spent a year and a half in jail before his acquittal in July, 1907, while Moyer and Pettibone were not freed until January, 1908. Before the trial began, President Roosevelt publicly termed Moyer and Haywood "undesirable citizens."¹⁶

Aside from the deep-rooted fear of anarchism and the recent growth of radicalism, a third factor that set conservative forces on edge by early 1908 was increasing worker unrest resulting from the depression which had begun in October, 1907. The depression was an extremely severe one; iron production during the first half of 1908 was 50 percent below 1907, prices on the stock market dropped by one third, and overall unemployment, which had been 1.8 percent in 1907, rose to 8.5 in 1908. Unemployment in manufacturing, transportation, building trades and mining rose from an estimated 6.9 percent in 1907 to 16.4 percent in 1908. By March, 1908, total unemployment in the country was estimated at 1.2 million.¹⁷

A clear sign of the increasing fear of radicalism and labor unrest was President Roosevelt's precipitous sending of federal troops during a peaceful I.W.W. strike at the mining town of Goldfield, Nevada. Immediately after the arrival of the troops on December 5, 1907, mine-owners began a campaign to break the I.W.W.; the troops remained there for three months despite the fact that Roosevelt's own investigators reported to him as early as December 20 that there had been no need for troops and that local officials could maintain order.¹⁸

The federal courts were also showing signs of unease at manifestations of labor strength; from December 1907 to March 1908 the courts dealt labor four severe blows. The Supreme Court dealt two of these: it declared unconstitutional the portion of the 1898 Erdman Act which barred yellow dog contracts on interstate railroads, and it ruled that a nationwide boycott of a Connecticut firm by an American Federation of Labor union constituted a violation of the Sherman Anti-trust Act, for which individual union members could be held responsible. Meanwhile, lower federal courts barred the United Mine Workers from trying to organize the West Virginia coal industry and prohibited the AFL from placing a struck company on its "We Don't Patronize List" and from even discussing the labor dispute. Taken together, the 1907-08 court decisions raised the grave threat that virtually all union activities would be regarded as illegal conspiracies.¹⁹

By the beginning of 1908 severe hardships created by the depression were causing increasing unrest and militancy among workers and increasing fears among the more well-off that a "catastrophe" comparable

to the labor strife of the 1890's would come again.²⁰ During January 1908 unemployed workers demonstrated for relief in St. Louis, Boston, Seattle and Detroit. In Muncie, Indiana, state troops established martial law after riots broke out during a streetcar strike. The troops were sent after the local sheriff was unable to find any members of the community willing to serve as deputies.²¹ In New York, a widespread rent-strike movement erupted into violence on January 5. Police clubs "were used freely and many heads were broken" when tenants resisted police demands to disperse meetings and to take down red flags and protest signs which they had hung on the front of their buildings. More heads were broken on January 23, when a peaceful unemployment demonstration in Chicago, led by Ben Reitman, known as "king of the hoboes," was dispersed by club-swinging police.

On February 1, the king of Portugal and the crown prince were assassinated; after Chicago anarchists met to celebrate the assassination, Chicago Police Chief George Shippy publicly proclaimed that "never in the history of Chicago have anarchists and other enemies of law and order been more dangerous than they are at present." Shippy also criticized a municipal judge who had released two men who had been arrested for illegally placing posters advertising an anarchist meeting on telephone poles; the judge explained his actions by stating "they did not look like wild-eyed anarchists."

On February 20, an unemployment demonstration in Philadelphia ended in a riot during which three policemen were shot and slightly wounded, and 14 protesters were arrested after being clubbed so severely they had to be hospitalized. According to some press accounts, the riot developed after the marchers had attacked some wagon drivers who interfered with their line of march; other accounts suggest the police attacked the marchers without provocation.

It was in this atmosphere of mounting tension that Father Heinrichs was assassinated in Denver on February 23. Heinrich's assassin, an Italian immigrant named Guiseppe Alia, was captured by a policeman who had been attending the service. Alia, who had been in the U.S. for about three months, eventually gave several different versions of his actions, but it was his first statement that captured public attention. He stated, "I just went over there because I have a grudge against all priests in general. They are all against the working man . . . I am an anarchist and I am proud of it. I shot him and my only regret is that I couldn't have shot the whole bunch of priests in the church." He later added, "He looked to me the same as any other priest, whose hypocritical influences take the bread out of the mouths of the poor, while they themselves live in luxury."

Although at first Alia said he did not know Heinrichs and that he had acted alone, later he said he had been picked to commit the assassination by a group of anarchists who held a grudge against an Italian

priest who had come to America, but that he had made a mistake and shot the wrong priest.²²

No evidence was ever disclosed indicating that Alia was in fact involved in any sort of a conspiracy, and at his trial two weeks later no evidence was given to indicate that he was even an anarchist. However, the Denver police soon were proclaiming that Alia was part of a band of 40 anarchists who had come to the U.S. and that men in six other cities were connected with him in the killing.

The Heinrichs murder threw a shiver of fear into a society which was already in a mood to accept reports of radical conspiracies and to demand measures of repression. A number of newspapers and journals immediately began to demand harsh measures to deal with the "anarchist problem." The *Washington Post* (February 25, 1908) took perhaps the strongest stand, demanding that all anarchists be executed, whether or not they had actually committed any crime. Terming anarchists the "degenerate offscouring of centuries of repression, ignorance and vice in other lands," the *Post* maintained that "since an avowal of anarchy has been found to be equivalent to an intention to commit murder . . . an anarchist is, in fact, a murderer, even before he has done the deed, and he should be executed accordingly."

The *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 27, 1908) termed anarchists "worthless as rats and far more dangerous." It suggested that all anarchists, whether native or foreign born, be deprived of their citizenship, that anarchist literature be barred from the mails and interstate commerce, and that avowal of the "damnable doctrine" be made "conclusive proof of incurable insanity," leading to life-long confinement in an asylum.

Aside from posturings in the press, the immediate effect of the Heinrichs murder was to throw Chicago's Roman Catholic clerical community into a state of terror. Aroused by the recent formation of the anti-clerical Giordano Bruno Club, named for the Italian heretic who had been burned at the stake in 1600, the Catholic hierarchy in Chicago opened up a ferocious attack upon the club, suggesting that Alia had been inspired to his deed by their preachings when he had been in Chicago. Catholic spokesmen, led by Chancellor Edward M. Dunne of the Chicago archdiocese, demanded that anti-clerical publications be suppressed, claimed that priests in Chicago had been threatened with death, and predicted that Heinrich's murder would be repeated in Chicago.

"I am positive that anarchists, anti-clericals, or whatever they call themselves, have prepared lists of priests and clergy to be killed and am certain that some Chicago man has been marked," Dunne claimed. Chicago police promised that if they found any evidence that the Heinrichs murder had been plotted in Chicago, "We will make wholesale arrests in the Italian colony in hopes of getting some of these conspirators."

Although “anarchist queen” Emma Goldman spoke in St. Louis at the end of February without inspiring any riots, Chicago Police Chief Shippy said she would not be allowed to speak in Chicago during her scheduled visit in March.²³

The federal government also began to get into the anti-anarchist act. In the days immediately following the Heinrichs murder, the press reported the Federal officials in Chicago were giving special attention to alien troublemakers, and that a general campaign of surveillance had begun against anarchist publications and against the “rabid type of anarchist, of whom Emma Goldman is one.” Widely published reports that Goldman was to be arrested and deported were denied, however, by the federal immigration commissioner.²⁴

On February 29, a group of foreigners who entered a church in Cincinnati whose pastor had received a threat were taken into custody, but released when no weapons were found on them. On Sunday, March 1, police were stationed at many churches in Chicago and at the Cincinnati church, to protect priests against possible assassination attempts, but no incidents occurred. On the same day, in Paterson, New Jersey, 10,000 persons waited through snow, rain and sleet to look upon the body of the slain Father Heinrichs. In Rochester, New York, a meeting of 50 Italians who were seeking to commemorate the death of Bruno was broken up by police who claimed the Italians were suspected of “having anarchistic tendencies and of fomenting disorder.” In Los Angeles, two socialists were arrested while attempting to address a street meeting, and another was arrested while leading a protest against the earlier arrests.

On March 2, while funeral services were being held for Father Heinrichs in Paterson, what became known as the second anarchist “outrage” occurred in Chicago. According to Chicago police, a Russian immigrant of about 20 years of age named Lazarus Averbuch came to the house of Police Chief Shippy armed with a gun and a knife, and with the intent to murder Shippy. In the ensuing struggle, the police reported, Averbuch was shot to death after inflicting a superficial stab wound on Shippy, shooting the chief’s son, Harry, through the left lung, and shooting the chief’s driver, James Foley, through the hand.

A new wave of hysteria swept Chicago and the nation in the wake of what became known as the “Averbuch affair.” When it was revealed that Averbuch was a Russian Jew whom police undercover agents claimed had been active in anarchist circles, a wave of anti-semitism swept Chicago.²⁵ The police began making wholesale raids in Chicago’s Russian Jewish colony, breaking into headquarters of supposedly anarchist groups, and seizing leaflets, pictures of anarchist leaders and entire libraries of books, including works of Shakespeare, Spencer, Ibsen and Goethe. About 15 people were arrested for their alleged anarchistic leanings or for their supposed acquaintance with Averbuch, without any legal process and often on the flimsiest evidence. For example, the

The Averbuch Affair—Fact or Fantasy?

The truth about the Averbuch affair remains clouded in mystery. Chief Shippy stated that Averbuch had handed him an envelope upon being admitted to the house, but that he (Shippy) decided that Averbuch was up to no good, so he let the envelope fall to the floor, grabbed Averbuch by the wrists and called for his wife to come search Averbuch for a gun. Thereupon, Shippy said, a general struggle broke out, during which Averbuch pulled out a knife and gun, and Harry Shippy and Foley ran in to help out. According to varying versions given out by Chief Shippy, he decided to grab Averbuch instead of taking the envelope because he noticed a bulge under Averbuch's overcoat that looked like a gun, because "he looked to me like an anarchist" or because "as the man handed me that letter there was overspread his face the most vindictive look that I ever saw upon a human countenance in the 32 years that I have served the city." Shippy's account of the sequence of events also tended to differ from telling to telling; for example, in some accounts he indicated that the real struggle began when he drew a gun and Averbuch drew a knife almost simultaneously, while in others he said he drew his gun only after Averbuch had already stabbed him and shot his son.

Chicago police quickly proclaimed that Averbuch was an anarchist involved in a conspiracy to kill Shippy and other Chicago officials because of their actions in breaking up the January unemployment demonstration and in refusing to allow Emma Goldman to speak. However, after the initial hysteria wore away, a coalition of radicals, anarchists and some liberals suggested that: 1) Averbuch had been unarmed and was murdered by Shippy and then had weapons planted on him; or, 2) he may have been armed but he did not intend to do harm to Shippy. The contention that Averbuch was unarmed, which is proclaimed flatly by two biographers of Jane Addams, is clearly untenable, since it assumes that Shippy, his son and Foley shot and stabbed each other. It also contradicts evidence presented at a coroner's inquest showing that Averbuch had bought the gun and knife two days before the incident, shortly after he had been paid.

However, it is not nearly so certain that Averbuch went to Shippy's house with intent to commit murder. According to his sister, Olga, Averbuch had been talking about returning to Europe; thus, she suggested, he had merely sought from Shippy a letter certifying his good conduct while in Chicago, as was customary at the time in Europe when leaving a city where one has worked. This would also provide an alternative explanation for the police claim that Averbuch's envelope contained only a blank sheet of paper, which the police interpreted to prove that the envelope was only a "decoy." There are a number of other items which make the "good conduct" theory a plausible explanation. According to Foley, who was standing outside the house when Averbuch approached, Averbuch had exhibited a "nonchalant demeanor," while Shippy stated that Averbuch's first action, before handing him the envelope, was to raise his hat. Further, police and press reports indicated that Averbuch had just shaved, cut his hair and bathed, and that he was wearing a suit of clothes and a new hat.

While the police interpreted all this as merely meaning Averbuch had prepared himself for death, it is obvious that all of these are possible indications that Averbuch, for some reason, wished to make a good impression on Shippy. Certainly it is unusual behavior for a man bent on assassination to tip his hat and hand over an envelope before drawing a gun. Further, even Shippy admitted that Averbuch took no hostile action before Shippy grabbed Averbuch and had his wife search Averbuch for a gun. The fact that Averbuch almost certainly was armed does support the police version; however, given the amount of random crime and violence occurring in the country in 1908, it would not necessarily be a sign of planning an assassination to buy a gun and knife, especially if one were planning to travel from Chicago to Europe. In sum, it is certainly possible—and in view of Averbuch's good record one may almost say probable—that Averbuch had come to the chief's house seeking a letter of recommendation but panicked when Shippy grabbed him and when Shippy's wife searched him.

[Sources: *Chicago Record-Herald*, March 3, 4, 5, 25, 1908; *Chicago Tribune*, March 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 25, 29, 1908; *New York Times*, March 3, 1908; *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, March 3, 1908; Jane Addams, "Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest," *Charities and the Commons*, May 2, 1908, 155-66; *The Public*, March 7, 14, 1908; Cornelia Meigs, *Jane Addams* (Boston, 1970), 106; James Weber Linn, *Jane Addams* (New York, 1936), 219.]

bartender and owner of a saloon which Averbuch was reputed to have frequented were arrested, and one man was arrested on the basis of an anonymous tip that he was an anarchist. All of those arrested were eventually released without penalty—often after having been “sweated” by the police for a few days—except for one man who was fined \$5 for stating that Shippy and “a lot more like him” should be killed, and another man who was fined \$85 for handing out leaflets which criticized Shippy.

While the Chicago police maintained for several days after the shooting that Averbuch had been involved in a conspiracy with other anarchists to assassinate Shippy and other Chicago officials, they eventually abandoned this hypothesis. At the coroner’s inquest which absolved Shippy of all guilt in the shooting on March 24, the sole evidence about Averbuch’s political affiliations and beliefs that was introduced was the testimony of a former co-worker that Averbuch had expressed dissatisfaction that Shippy would not allow Emma Goldman to speak.

Although the only hypothesis offered by police for Averbuch’s action was that he was disgruntled over past police repression of radicals in Chicago, the shooting quickly became a justification for increased repression. Chicago officials announced a major crackdown on anarchists, including the banning of anarchist parades and meetings, the confiscation and destruction of incendiary literature (despite the lack of any statutory authority, on the grounds that the police had the inherent authority to suppress “those things that may lead to or incite disorder or result in injury to life or property”), and the establishment of a city “immigration bureau” to keep track of all foreigners and gather evidence for possible deportation proceedings under the 1903 law. Shippy announced that “Chicago is going to witness a weeding out of undesirable citizens,” while Chicago papers reported that anarchism was to be “exterminated root and branch” in the “most determined warfare against anarchy since the time of the Haymarket riot.”

The first victims of police repression were Emma Goldman and the hundreds of people who wanted to hear her speak. Miss Goldman was repeatedly forced to cancel speaking engagements after her arrival in Chicago on March 5, as a result of police threats to revoke the licenses of hall owners. When she showed up to greet some friends at a meeting of an anthropological society on March 15, an “army of uniformed policemen” invaded the meeting hall, only to discover a woman anthropologist reading an unending paper attacking vaccination. When Miss Goldman actually got inside a lecture hall and attempted to speak on March 16, she was physically dragged off the podium and ejected from the hall by Chicago police. Before leaving the city, she suffered a nervous breakdown.

The federal government, meanwhile, added to the hysteria which emanated from Chicago. On March 3, the day after the shooting, Secre-

tary of Commerce and Labor Straus made public orders which had been sent to all commissioners of immigration and immigration inspectors across the country, instructing them to cooperate with local police officials "in an effort to rid the country of alien anarchists and criminals" falling within the deportation laws. Straus subsequently announced the plan was to "wipe out anarchy." President Roosevelt publicly praised Shippy, while press reports indicated that federal officials, from the president down, were thoroughly aroused by the anarchist menace. The *New York Times* reported that as a result of the anarchist outbreaks, "the hordes of aliens that come yearly to these shores" would subsequently be examined so strictly upon entry that it would "partake of the nature of an inquisition." It added that federal officials were convinced the time was rapidly coming "when it will be necessary to put a check on the liberty of speech."²⁶

Given the nature of the federal reaction and the sensationalized and often incorrect newspaper reporting which followed the Averbuch incident, it is not surprising that the anarchist scare began to spread across the country. Newspapers from coast to coast printed a wire service story on March 3, which stated that the attack on Shippy "is believed to have been the result of a conspiracy to harm Chicago officials" and "the ramifications of the plot are said to have extended to other cities and to have been closely connected" with the Heinrichs murder. While none of this was true, it served to heighten fears considerably. Officials in New York, Pittsburgh, Rochester, Cleveland, Detroit, Buffalo and other cities promised to cooperate closely with the federal government to seek out deportable anarchists and/or to crack down on local anarchists. Press reports from New York indicated that "a systematic campaign against those suspected of anarchistic sympathies has been quietly waged in this city for months" and that "a warm reception awaits the avowed anarchist from other parts, who in an ill advised moment, may turn his steps New Yorkward." In Pittsburgh, the police chief expressed relief that Shippy had killed Averbuch, since a trial would have led to "riots, bloodshed and possibly many deaths."

Reports were published of priests and churches being threatened in New York City, Wilkes-Barre, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Wilmington, and New Britain, Connecticut. The police chiefs of Cincinnati, Detroit, St. Louis and Birmingham reported receiving threats. The town of Wawaka, Indiana, was reported to be in a "state of terror" after receiving an anarchist threat to blow up the town.

In New York, fourteen suspected anarchists were arrested on the grounds that they were congregating for no good purpose, but were released when no evidence could be produced pointing to a specific offense. What New York police thought was a bomb turned out to be a dry battery. In St. Louis reports spread that an anarchist had tried to kill a rich businessman after a policeman fired a shot at a fleeing suspect. On

March 8, under the headline, "Anarchy Crushed by the Police," the San Francisco *Chronicle* reported the arrest of three persons for disturbing the peace at a socialist street gathering. Without any supporting evidence, the Associated Press reported that a man who had threatened to blow up an Omaha bank was an "anarchist." On March 12, Alia was sentenced to death for his murder of Heinrichs. Philadelphia police broke up a number of socialist and other gatherings on March 15. On March 16, as Chicago police were dragging Emma Goldman off a lecture stage, police in Worcester, Massachusetts, refused to allow Alexander Berkman to speak.²⁷

In the aftermath of the Averbuch affair, newspaper editorial writers renewed with increased vigor the anti-anarchist campaign they had begun after the Heinrichs murder. In many cases appeals for crushing anarchy were linked with general attacks upon socialism and especially upon aliens. The Chicago *Tribune* argued on March 4 that "any person who has listened to discussions of socialistic doctrines will have read or heard enough violent language to conclude that there are among the socialists a fair proportion who believe that there are alternatives to the tongue and the pen which may be needed to bring about a communistic state." The *Tribune* called for legislation which would put an end to "foolish toleration of violent language and unsound doctrine."

The Washington *Evening Star* lamented that the country had opened the door to "foreigners of all nationalities and races, of all grades of ignorance and viciousness"; as a result American cities were being "overrun with the hot-tempered, evilly trained, badly developed sons of southern Europe." The Washington *Post* (March 4, 1908) repeated its earlier call for the execution of anarchists, whom it termed "the scum of foreign countries," and called for the passage of laws so that there would "not be a nook or corner of this republic where three anarchists could gather together habitually."

The Chicago *Israelite*, perhaps determined to show that Jews were just as anti-anarchy as anyone else, declared that the "most drastic measures" were justified to deal with the situation and cautioned that while freedom of speech, press and worship "are a sacred trinity, they must not mean treason or a subversion of the government." The Boston *Evening Transcript* demanded that the deportation law be amended so that the U.S. could "deport within a reasonable time, or perhaps any time, all those found manifesting those impulses or harboring those purposes that would have debarred them from asylum here had they been known or strongly suspected at the time of landing."²⁸ Perhaps the most novel editorial came from the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* of March 5 which complained that strong anti-anarchist measures in the north were driving anarchists to New Orleans; it protested against having the "refuse of human society" dumped on it.

A handful of papers maintained a sense of perspective during the

scare, however, and opposed the use of repressive measures. Probably the most important was the Chicago *Evening Post*, a conservative Republican newspaper. The *Post* said:

Our course must not be dictated by a bitter and reckless desire for revenge. To murderous lawlessness we must oppose the law and only the law. The hysteria of the Haymarket times must not come over us again. Indiscriminate "raids" and confiscations can do little good; unfounded "theories" of secret plots and blood thirsty conspiracies will do positive harm. . . . Anarchy can not be conquered by anarchy. . . . The necessity now confronts the community, and especially the officers of justice, to guard themselves from wild conjectures, nightmares of conspiracy, imaginary plots and anarchial subversions of law and order. The police have a weakness for fixing upon theories in advance of the facts.

Other publications that bucked the main trend of press opinion included *The Public*, the Chicago *Daily Socialist* and the Milwaukee *Daily News*.

The anarchist scare was showing signs of abating towards the end of March, when President Roosevelt revived it once more. On March 23, the White House announced that in response to a request for aid from the mayor of Paterson, Roosevelt had ordered barred from the mails the Paterson anarchist newspaper, *La Question Sociale*, on the grounds that the paper had published an article advocating murder and arson. Roosevelt further requested in a letter to the Department of Justice that the possibility of criminal prosecution be investigated regarding the editors of the publication, whom he termed "the enemies of mankind." Without citing any law to justify his action—since there was none—Roosevelt announced that "those who write, publish and circulate these articles stand on a level with those who use the mails for distributing poison for the purpose of murder; and convictions have been obtained for the distribution of poisons." He concluded that no law should require the government to "become an accessory to murder by circulating literature of this kind." Roosevelt's action was greeted with general acclaim in the press. Even the Socialist Labor Party's *Daily People* said the president had "done good," adding that workers could not keep their "skirts too clear of the propoganda of physical force only."²⁹

For about five days after the barring of *La Question Sociale*, it again appeared that the anarchist scare might fade out. The only major development occurred on March 25 when San Francisco police arrested and held for possible deportation Paul Bignami, the reputed leader of the local anarchist colony. Bignami was accused of urging destruction of the government, annihilation of the naval fleet, assassination of the president and elimination of the local police department. San Francisco police promised to make further arrests of anarchists for vagrancy.

On March 28, a flurry of excitement was generated when a man

holding a satchel rushed at Mrs. Roosevelt while she was on a trip to Mississippi. He was arrested but released when it was discovered that he was carrying no explosives. On the same day, an attempt was made to murder by dynamite bomb Bulkeley Wells, former adjutant general of Colorado, who had been instrumental in fighting the W.F.M. during the Colorado mining war of 1903-04.

The impact of these two events paled in comparison to the effects of an abortive attempt the same day to throw a bomb into police ranks at Union Square in New York City, where police had just dispersed thousands of persons who were attempting to hold an unemployment demonstration.

The police action had come after city officials refused to grant a permit for the demonstration to the socialist-led Conference of the Unemployed. When a crowd estimated at ten to twenty-five thousand persons showed up, nevertheless, police dispersed them from Union Square and the surrounding area by charging them on horseback and swinging billyclubs, leaving, according to press accounts, "many broken heads." When demonstrators sought to escape mounted police by entering the lobby of the Academy of Music, police on horseback followed the demonstrators into the building and drove them out. At one point, a member of the Conference executive committee showed a copy of the constitution to the police commander in the area and demanded the right of freedom of assembly; the police officer flourished his baton and declared, "This is bigger than the constitution right now."



WHEN THE socialist-led Conference of the Unemployed tried to meet at Union Square, New York City, March 28, 1908, to protest economic conditions resulting from the 1907 economic collapse, police on horseback drove them out of the Square and off the sidewalks surrounding the Square. Shortly afterwards, an attempt was made to throw a bomb into police ranks. (Source: **Collier's**, April 11, 1908.)

Robert Hunter, the wealthy socialist writer and social worker, who the press termed a "parlor socialist," was scheduled to be one of the main speakers at the meeting. He said later that day, "I have seen many meetings broken up by the police in Russia and other European countries, but I never saw such extraordinary roughness as was used this afternoon."

After most demonstrators had been driven out of the area, a young man was seen in the square holding what looked like a grapefruit in his hand. After sputtering with flame for a second, the "grapefruit" suddenly exploded in the man's hand. It turned out to be a bomb, composed of gunpowder and nails inside some brass tubing. The explosion instantly killed a nearby bystander and maimed the bombholder, blowing off both his eyes and his right hand. Two policemen and another bystander suffered minor injuries. The impact of the explosion was so great that buildings all around the square shook and people a block away were thrown to their knees.

The bomber, who was able to talk despite his injuries, said his intention had been to throw the bomb into a nearby platoon of police. Identifying himself as Selig Silverstein, a Russian immigrant who had been in the U.S. for most of his nineteen years, the man said he had been clubbed by the police a week earlier and he had brought the bomb to the park to gain his revenge. "The police are no good," he said. "They drove us out of the park. I hate them. I am sorry that I did not make good. As for my life, that is nothing. It was the police that I wanted."³⁰

Police officials quickly identified Silverstein as an anarchist. They reported finding in his room a membership card in the "Anarchist Federation of America," signed by Alexander Berkman, along with two letters signed by Berkman. As in the Heinrichs and Averbuch incidents, the police were soon suggesting that Silverstein's action was part of a major anarchist conspiracy. They hinted darkly that Berkman's letters contained highly sensational revelations, and had Berkman arrested on the basis of the membership card and the letters. However, Berkman was freed by the courts when it turned out that the letters were mimeographed pleas for funds.³¹

As in the Averbuch case, while police repression had apparently been the immediate cause of the "outrage" (assuming that Averbuch had tried to kill Shippy), the police reacted by announcing a policy of increased repression. A police spokesman announced that no permits would be allowed in the future for protest demonstrations and that police dispersals of past protest meetings had been done "with entirely too much gentleness." The police also began a massive campaign of surveillance and investigation into the New York radical community, but were not able to come up with anything. One indicator of the extent of police surveillance and radical fears of repression was the attendance at a meeting held by radicals on March 29 in honor of the recently deceased Rus-

sian revolutionary leader, Gregory Gerschunin; whereas a week earlier, 500 had turned out to honor Gerschunin now only 300 attended, and of those, 100 were policemen.

In the days immediately following the Union Square incident, New York police broke up several radical meetings. The galleries of four New York stock and produce exchanges were closed to visitors for fear of additional outrages. When New York socialists held an indoor meeting on April 4, over 100 uniformed police attended, including many who could speak foreign languages in case any seditious utterances were made in alien tongues. The police brought along with them stenographers to record speeches for possible future prosecutions, while the socialists had their own expert stenographers so they could challenge the police records if necessary. Police inspected each person coming to the socialist meeting "as if he were an immigrant coming into a new country" and arrested three persons who displeased them.

The New York incident was viewed by the assistant police chief of Chicago as "enough to justify us for putting a stop to public demonstrations of this sort." Even Chicago's hoboes joined the anti-anarchist crusade, reading the hobo "king" Ben Reitman out of their ranks for "conducting himself in a manner unbecoming any member of the hobo party in allying himself with the anarchist movement" and for "hitting the road openly with Emma Goldman, the anarchist queen."

The mayor of Paterson announced his determination to drive anarchists from that city, apparently because Paterson's reputation as a "hotbed of anarchy" was proving bad for business. He announced all anarchist meetings would be suppressed, and soon proved true to his word. When staff members of *La Question Sociale* sought to rent a hall to protest the paper's exclusion from the mails, city officials pressured a hall owner into refusing to rent to them; the group then tried to hold a meeting inside their own offices, but club-swinging police broke it up. The paper's editor protested, "This is worse than Russia or Italy. There the officers attend the anarchist meetings and if the speaker uses language they think is improper they speak to him and make him change his tone, but they don't prevent peaceful assemblies. And yet you call this a free country."³²

Federal officials reacted to the latest "outrage" with new expressions of concern and threats of repression. Newspaper reports indicated federal officials were "really alarmed" at the development of what was viewed as an increasingly strong and organized anarchist movement. On March 29, the federal government suppressed *Nihil*, an anarchist newspaper, after it had published one issue. Secret service agents began searching for the paper's staff. Press reports indicated federal officials were having translations made of several foreign language papers for the purpose of barring them from the mails if they proved to be disseminating material "antagonistic to organized government."

The Commerce and Labor Department was reported to be keeping a sharp watch on Emma Goldman and her followers. Other press accounts indicated that one of the "shrewdest" secret service agents was working on rounding up anarchists, and that government officials were going over lists of anarchists to see who could be deported. Secretary Straus boasted that deportations had increased 50% during the last year, and added, "I feel able to promise that the next annual report of the commissioner of immigration will show a remarkable percentage of increase." He stated, "Each added crime and outbreak on the part of foreign born criminals and revolutionary malcontents forces the necessity for a strong, clean and withal sanely considered movement to stamp out this ferment of crime and violence fastening itself on our social structure." Straus promised that "no stone will be left unturned" to exclude and deport "the morally depraved, the criminal and those who are unable to value and appreciate the benefits of a free country."

The first government "loyalty" program since the civil war was instituted when the Civil Service Commission directed that special studies be done on the background of all persons of alien parentage applying for government jobs in order to weed out potential anarchist infiltrators.

A regiment of soldiers scheduled to be sent to the Philippines reportedly was ordered to remain in the U.S. due to the fears of Roosevelt and Secretary of War Taft that serious labor and anarchist rioting might break out. Taft publicly called for increased military appropriations in case "the forces of anarchy, socialism and revolt against the organized government should manifest themselves." Cabinet officials began to receive increased secret service protection as a result of alleged anarchist threats against their lives.

Roosevelt was reported as "grimly in earnest" in his determination that "men must be suppressed who act as anarchist propagandists and induce the weakminded to commit crime." On April 9, he sent a special message to Congress dealing with the "anarchist problem." Declaring that "compared with the suppression of anarchy, every other question sinks into insignificance" Roosevelt appealed for Congressional action to ban the circulation of all material which propagated "anarchistic opinions." He termed the anarchist the "enemy of all mankind" whose "criminality" was of a "deeper degree . . . than any other."³³

The Union Square incident led to another orgy of recrimination in the press. Many newspapers interlarded calls for stern repression of anarchy with attacks upon socialism and liberals, and with demands for more restrictive immigration legislation. The *New York Times* said Robert Hunter and "his kind" bore an "even greater" moral responsibility for the bombing than did the "misguided wretch who attempts to throw the bomb" because "their endowment" was so much greater that they "ought to know and foresee the mischief they do." The *Times* complained that there had been so much activity by "teachers and

preachers, all and sundry, of anarchism, socialism and communism . . . sowing the seeds of discontent and planting ideas subversive of law, of justice and of order” that “a great number of men . . . have had their minds addled and their quality as good citizens destroyed.” In a similar vein, the New York *Herald* attacked “some of the native-born Americans whose mistaken ‘work’ in ‘settlements’ and elsewhere incites discontent,” and blasted “the fake philanthropists who emerge from luxurious homes to find amusement for a few hours and a fillip to their vanity in addressing the toilers.”³⁴

The Chicago *Tribune* said the Union Square meeting “could have served no useful purpose” and maintained that “these socialists who grasp at the opportunity to make windy speeches at open-air meetings know that the anarchists will be there to make trouble . . . yet they insist on playing with fire.” The New Haven *Register* referred to crimes “committed under the protection and guise of socialism” while the Pittsburgh *Gazette* asserted that socialism “means trouble for all who come under the spell of its pernicious teaching.” The Washington *Star* proclaimed that it was “idle for the radical socialist and the anarchist to disclaim responsibility for such occurrences” since they had been teaching “obstruction to the law and violent methods of opposition until they have filled the heads of weak men and women with fanatic, murderous concepts of government and authority.” The Portland *Oregonian* pleaded, “With unrest verging upon outbreak in the already congested ranks of labor, it would be well for all concerned if not another shipload of immigrants was landed in our ports for five years.”³⁵

What is particularly noticeable about the press reaction to the Union Square incident, however, is the many organs of opinion who attacked the New York authorities for their actions in preventing the meeting. Even such conservative papers as the Washington *Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and the Chicago *Evening Post* expressed displeasure with the New York police. The Chicago *Evening Post* said that despite American claims to have a tradition of free speech, “only in Spain and in Russia will we find more limitations thrown about those who protest against the ‘established order.’” *The Public* termed the “most ominous crime” challenging the “law-abiding sentiment of this country today . . . not anarchistic bomb throwing” but “police contempt for the law.” *The Public* compared the New York police to the Russian cossacks. *The Nation* of April 2 warned:

Men who are out of work, who have a grudge against the existing order, are easily provoked to violence; but there is no surer provocative than to deny them free speech. An incendiary orator may set them off; forcible repression by the clubs of the police is almost sure to do so. . . . If we cannot marshall arguments to destroy the fallacies and the half-truths upon which the structure of socialistic and anarchistic theory rests, our case is indeed hopeless. . . .

Certainly the clubs of the police will never put sound ideas into people's heads.

On April 4, *Charities and the Commons* protested that "under the apprehension of anarchy, we have come to entrust to our police departments a degree of arbitrary power in the matter of breaking up assemblages of citizens which is greater than is found necessary in other civilized countries and we are strangely indifferent to the manner in which they are exercising it." It added, "An unnecessary blow from a policeman in uniform will do more to disturb the mental equilibrium of an 'addlepated' embryonic anarchist than any address by Mr. Hunter or his associates." Isaac Hull Platt, writing in *The Conservator* of May, 1908, asked, "Where else in the world except in Russia and possibly Spain would a collection of perfectly peaceable people be ridden down by mounted police? . . . If you who are in power desire to provoke a revolution of fire and blood you are adopting about the best means to that end." On April 18, *Collier's* warned, "It is a mistake to charge whole groups and nationalities with the crimes of individuals" and maintained the police should not block free speech because they "imagine that what is to be said will not accord with their ideas. . . . Nothing will be gained by beating masses of the struggling poor every time some unhappy individual throws a bomb."

Such libertarian sentiments were not confined to the major dailies and magazines. Similar expressions came from papers such as the Marion, Iowa, *Sentinel*, the Nashville *Tennessean* and the Portland, Oregon, *Journal*.

Perhaps because there were no more "outrages," after the President's message to Congress of April 9, the great anarchist scare dribbled away. Most news items relevant to the scare after this date were more or less afterthoughts to the great crisis. Thus, on April 15, New Jersey's governor signed a bill designed to muzzle the already-muzzled Paterson anarchists; it outlawed advocating the destruction of property, assault on the police or armed forces, or assault or threats of assault against individuals. On April 24, the W.F.M. announced that it was dispensing with the services of William Haywood, apparently because his radical utterances were regarded as not very politic given the general state of public opinion. After a month of agony, Silverstein died in a New York hospital on April 28. On May 26, Roosevelt signed into law a measure which barred from the mail "matter of a character tending to incite arson, murder or assassination," the first time that political criteria were established to exclude matter from the mails. Subsequently, the post office notified local postmasters to exclude such material, to hold up any material about which they were "in doubt" until the post office could rule on it, and to hold up any material printed in a foreign language which they had "reason to believe" fell within the guidelines until a

certified translation was filed. Guiseppe Alia was hanged for the murder of Father Heinrichs on July 16, 1908.

Perhaps the strangest epitaph to the great anarchist scare of 1908 was the case of William Buwalda, an army private stationed at San Francisco. He had the poor judgment to shake hands with Emma Goldman while in uniform. Buwalda had gone to hear Goldman speak in San Francisco in the spring of 1908, and was highly impressed with her. When army officials heard about his dastardly deed, he was court martialed for "offenses against the flag and army" and sentenced to five years in prison, which was later thoughtfully trimmed to three years since his commanding officer was impressed with his clean 15-year record in the army. Buwalda later anticipated the Vietnam Veterans Against the War by returning to the government the medal he had received for service in the Philippines, terming the medal a reminder of "war-legalized murder . . . upon a weak and defenseless people." Buwalda was given a dishonorable discharge and pardoned by President Roosevelt after spending ten months in jail; he subsequently joined the anarchist ranks, and was even arrested, for no particular reason, along with Emma Goldman in San Francisco in January, 1909.³⁶

Another legacy of the anarchist scare was Miss Goldman's continual difficulties in attempting to give public addresses. She was barred from speaking in Indianapolis in October, 1908, in San Francisco in January, 1909, and in eleven different places in May, 1909. Sometimes police resorted to placing pressure on hall owners not to rent to her, sometimes police blocked hall entrances, sometimes they simply banned her from speaking outright, sometimes police attacked and dispersed her audiences, and on one occasion, in New Haven, she was allowed to enter the lecture hall, but no one else was. The climate for anarchists had improved sufficiently by 1910, however, that she succeeded in speaking 120 times in 37 cities, and was even allowed to speak in Chicago.³⁷ By 1910, the authorities had concluded that the I.W.W. was much more likely to be a real threat than the anarchists, so it was the I.W.W. that had to fight for free speech by then.³⁸

The great deportation campaign proved to be a bust; according to government statistics, not a single alien was deported from 1908 until 1917 for anarchistic beliefs or associations. This is not difficult to understand since a survey of every major immigration station conducted by the Department of Commerce and Labor in 1908 disclosed that in 23 areas there were no anarchists to be found, while in four districts the handful of anarchists who could be identified turned out to have lived in the U.S. longer than three years.³⁹

The real legacy of the 1908 anarchist scare was more intangible than a certain number of bodies clubbed, of speaking engagements cancelled and meetings banned, of hoboes and miners ostracizing their leaders, of men going to jail for shaking hands with the wrong people, or of sup-

pressed papers. The real legacy was one of increased distrust, suspicion and bitterness between the varied elements of American society—between radicals and conservatives, between immigrants and native sons, between Jews and non-Jews, between clericals and anti-clericals. Although Robert Wiebe never mentions the anarchist scare of 1908 in his analytical survey of American society from 1877 to 1920, he notes an increasing tension and irritation entered American life in that year, which may, in fact, be traced to a large extent to the scare:

Straws in the wind appeared everywhere around 1908. Critics who had only grumbled about national reform now cried "socialism" and "communism." Organized labor received particularly heavy abuse, with each hint of violence reported as the first gun of civil war. Bankers who had once tolerated the muckracking journals suddenly found them poor risks, and financial stringency played its part in their disappearance. As always, a rising curve of antiradicalism immediately affected attitudes toward the immigrant.⁴⁰

After 1908, the Progressive Era was marked by a steadily darkening mood among businessmen and members of the middle class as radical agitation seemed to increase yearly. After 1911, major conflicts between labor and capital, which may be summarized by the names Lawrence, Mucklow, Calumet, Paterson, Wheatland, Ludlow, Joe Hill, Tom Mooney and Everett, marked literally every year.⁴¹ Finally, in 1917-20, the ruling elements in American society embarked on a savage—and successful—campaign to repress radicals, through mass arrests, political trials and political deportations.⁴² The anarchist scare of 1908 both provided a preview and helped to pave the way for what was to come. But the events of 1908 merely brought to the surface the fears and tensions that were *always* present during the Progressive Era.

San Diego State University

footnotes

In the course of researching this article, Professor Goldstein consulted the files of the Chicago Daily News, Record-Herald and Tribune; the New Orleans Times-Picayune; the New York Herald and Times; the Saint Louis Globe-Democrat; the San Francisco Chronicle; and the Washington Post, for winter and spring of 1908. In order to save space, the editors have deleted most footnotes to these newspapers, and have included other citations in the body of the text. Professor Goldstein has a copy of his original footnotes and will be happy to supply interested readers with a photocopy.—WAD

1. *New York Times*, *Chicago Record-Herald*, *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, February 24, 1908.
2. *Strangers in the Land* (New York, 1970), 108, 175.
3. *Politics, Reform and Expansion* (New York, 1963), 279.
4. *The Era of Theodore Roosevelt* (New York, 1962), 2.
5. For similar comments, see Maldwyn A. Jones, *American Immigration* (Chicago, 1960), 261; and Oscar Handlin, *The American People in the Twentieth Century* (Boston, 1963), 4-5.
6. Sidney Fine, "Anarchism and the Assassination of McKinley," *American Historical Review*, LX (1955), 777-799; George C. Suggs, Jr., *Colorado's War on Militant Unionism: James H. Peabody and the Western Federation of Miners* (Detroit, 1972).

7. George L. Cherry, "American Metropolitan Press Reaction to the Paris Commune," *Mid-America*, XXXII (1950), 3-12; Samuel Reznick, "Distress, Relief and Discontent in the U.S. During the Depression of 1873-78," *Journal of Political Economy*, LVIII (1950), 494-512; Herbert Gutman, "The Failure of the Movement by the Unemployed for Public Works in 1873," *Political Science Quarterly*, LXXX (1965), 254-275; Wayne Broehl, *The Molly Maguires* (New York, 1964); Robert Bruce, *1877: Year of Violence* (Indianapolis, 1959); Higham, 30-31.
8. Henry David, *History of the Haymarket Affair* (New York, 1963), 436; Norman J. Ware, *The Labor Movement in the U.S.* (New York, 1929).
9. Daniel Bell, *Marxian Socialism in the U.S.* (Princeton, 1967), 26.
10. James Joll, *The Anarchists* (New York, 1966), 129-145; Leon Wolff, *Lockout* (New York, 1965), 175-187; Fine, "Anarchism and the Assassination of McKinley."
11. Fine, 788-793; William Preston, *Aliens and Dissenters* (New York, 1966), 32. Four states passed laws in 1902 and 1903 which outlawed the advocacy of anarchy and which later became the models for the criminal syndicalism laws of 1917-20, which were used to harass the Industrial Workers of the World and the fledgling Communist Party. In addition to laws passed in New York, New Jersey and Wisconsin, which Fine notes, the state of Washington also passed an anti-anarchist bill during this period. Charles LeWarne, "The Anarchist Colony at Home, Washington, 1901-1902," *Arizona and the West*, XIV (1972), 167.
12. Theodore Schroeder, "The Lawless Suppression of Free Speech in New York," *Arena*, XXXIX (1908), 696-8; Leon Whipple, *The Story of Civil Liberty in the U.S.* (New York, 1929), 308.
13. Elias Tobenkin, "Anarchists and Immigrants in America," *World Today*, May, 1908, 484.
14. Richard H. Frost, *The Mooney Case* (Palo Alto, Cal., 1968), 47; *Chicago Tribune*, March 5, 1908; *New York Herald*, March 29, 1908.
15. David Shannon, *The Socialist Party of America* (Chicago, 1967), 3-5.
16. Melvyn Dubofsky, *We Shall Be All* (Chicago, 1969), 96-105; Vernon Jensen, *Heritage of Conflict* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1950), 197-218.
17. Mowry, *Era of Theodore Roosevelt*, 216-22; Harold U. Faulkner, *The Decline of Laissez-Faire* (New York, 1968), 30, 420; *The Public*, March 28, 1908.
18. Russell R. Elliott, "Labor Troubles in the Mining Camp at Goldfield, Nevada, 1906-1908," *Pacific Historical Review*, XIX (1950), 369-383.
19. Marc Karson, *American Labor Unions and Politics, 1900-18* (Boston, 1965), 50-53; Irving Bernstein, *The Lean Years* (Baltimore, 1966), 198.
20. Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order* (New York, 1967), 201.
21. Philip S. Foner, *History of the Labor Movement in the U.S.* (New York, 1973), IV:101-2; *The Public*, January 11, 18, 1908, February 1, 8, 1908.
22. *Chicago Record-Herald*, February 25-6, 1908; *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 25, 1908. Still later, Alia claimed: 1) that he had only shot at the communion wafer in the priest's hand because the wafer had burned his tongue; or, alternatively, 2) that he did not shoot at all, but had spat out the wafer and run from the church because it was against the rules of the church to take the host without first giving confession (*Chicago Record-Herald*, February 28, 1908; *Chicago Tribune*, February 29, 1908).
23. *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, February 29, 1908, March 1, 1908; *Chicago Tribune*, February 26, 1908. Perhaps because it was so unusual for a woman to play a political role, Emma Goldman became the most publicized anarchist during the first decade of the century. As Richard Drinnon notes, she "had not been getting a good press"; in fact, along with William Haywood, Goldman was a prime public enemy in the eyes of the media. She was repeatedly and falsely accused in the press of somehow inspiring the assassination of McKinley, and eventually the mere mention of her name "became enough to frighten little children." *Rebel in Paradise* (Boston, 1970), 87-9.
24. *Chicago Record-Herald*, February 28, 29, 1908. The U.S. district attorney in Chicago stated, "These people must know that liberty does not mean license and that if they have come to this country as anarchists to destroy authority and to strike at government and law they will find the place too warm for them and the ships very fast to carry them back." *Chicago Daily News*, February 26, 1908.
25. *The Public*, April 17, 1908; Jane Addams, "Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest," *Charities and the Commons*, May 2, 1908, 157; Edgar Bernhard et al., *Pursuit of Freedom* (Chicago, 1942), 142. In the following weeks, Jewish spokesmen repeatedly expressed the Jews' hatred for anarchy. Thus, Rabbi Tobias Scharnfarber stated that Judaism and anarchy were "antipodal," said Averbuch had received his "just retribution," and demanded that anarchists be given "no quarter." When Averbuch was buried in Chicago's Potter's Field, no Jewish rabbi or undertaker would agree to participate. *Chicago Record-Herald*, March 6, 1908; *Chicago Tribune*, March 8, 1908.
26. *New York Times*, March 4, 5, 1908; *Chicago Tribune*, March 5, 1908. Newspapers also reported, correctly, that the federal government had begun an investigation to see if Goldman could be deported. It turned out that she had gotten her citizenship by marrying a naturalized American. Since the only way to deport her was to take away her (former) hus-

band's citizenship on the grounds of fraud, this was done. However, since she had been in the U.S. for more than three years, she could only be gotten rid of if she then left the country and tried to re-enter as an (anarchist) alien. After the immigration laws were changed, she was deported in 1919. Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 112-120, 206-223.

27. Chicago *Tribune*, March 17, 1908; Eliot White, "Denial of Free Speech in Massachusetts," *Arena*, XXXIX (1905), 698-701.

28. Quoted in *Literary Digest*, March 14, 1908.

29. Quoted in *Literary Digest*, April 4, 1908.

30. New York *Times*, March 29. After the explosion, the *Times* reported, police went on another rampage of clubbing, "hitting every head in sight." They arrested about 10 people in the area who were viewed as acting suspiciously. Most were quickly freed with a reprimand from a judge who told them, "Times are getting better every day. You will have to wait for work. Meanwhile, conduct yourself like ordinary folks with common sense, cutting out this monkey business."

31. New York *Herald*, March 29, 31, 1908; New York *Times*, March 31, April 4, 1908; Chicago *Tribune*, March 29, 1908; St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, March 29, 1908. After arresting Berkman, the police brought him to Silverstein's hospital room in hopes the two anarchists would betray an acquaintance with each other. However, since Silverstein was blind and could not see Berkman, and since Silverstein's face was entirely swathed with bandages except for his chin, it is not surprising that this approach yielded little fruit for the police. Silverstein himself made contradictory statements on the question of conspiracy, at one point saying he had been told to throw the bomb and had been given the bomb by someone else, at another point saying he had acted alone and built the bomb himself from instructions he had read in an encyclopedia. New York *Times*, March 29, 31, 1908; New York *Herald*, March 31, 1908.

32. New York *Herald*, April 3-4, 1908; New York *Times*, Chicago *Record-Herald*, April 4, 1908. The newspaper's staff subsequently purged its editor, who was viewed as the cause of all the trouble, voted to go underground and dismantled the press. New York *Herald*, April 8, 1908; Washington *Post*, April 12, 1908.

33. New York *Times*, April 10, 1908. The full message is printed in *Transmission Through the Mails of Anarchistic Publications*, Senate Document 426, 60th Cong., 1st sess. (1908). Along with his own request for action, Roosevelt submitted a legal opinion from Attorney General Charles Bonaparte which must rank as one of the strangest documents in American legal history. Bonaparte in essence stated that publications such as *La Question Sociale* which urge "arson, murder, riot and treason" constitute clear cases of "seditious libel at common law," then conceded that the Supreme Court had ruled there is no such thing as a federal common law, but concluded in any case the government could suppress such material since the government should not be required to serve as "accessories to grave crimes" and as an agency "destructive of the ends of all government." *La Question Sociale* was formally excluded by the Post Office on March 26, 1908, on the technical ground that it was not a newspaper or other periodical within the meaning of the law, apparently because there were no other legal grounds for acting against it. Fortunately for Roosevelt and Bonaparte, Congress soon passed a law authorizing such suppression, thus avoiding the need for further legal gymnastics on this question. See *The Public*, April 3 and June 26, 1908.

34. Quoted in *Literary Digest*, April 11, 1908. The attack on the settlement houses was a theme running throughout the anarchist scare. After the Averbuch affair, Chicago Police Chief Shippy said a settlement house worker had recently denounced the police and it was this type of statement "that causes these poor deluded men to go out with their knives and revolvers to kill." He concluded, "The social settlements are first cousin to the anarchists." Chicago *Tribune*, March 3, 1908. The official Roman Catholic organ in Chicago, *New World* (quoted in Chicago *Tribune*, March 8, 1908), called for action against "the gentlemen anarchists, who, from the dignified shelter of so-called social settlements, or so-called educational clubs, which in a gentlemanly way propagate vice, irreligion and social disorder, pour poison into minds too weak and hearts too sin-blackened to spurn it, and then arm their victims and send them abroad to kill or be killed." One Chicago newspaper headline reported an investigation of "Hull House Settlement Institution where Meetings of Revolutionaries are Held and Seditious Theories are Taught to be Examined." See Addams, "Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest"; James Weber Linn, *Jane Addams* (New York, 1936), 220-221; Daniel Levine, *Jane Addams and the Liberal Tradition* (Madison, 1971), 148-149.

35. The New Haven *Register*, Pittsburgh *Gazette*, Washington *Star* and Portland *Oregonian* are quoted in the New York *Herald*, April 3, 11, 1908.

36. *The Public*, June 5, 1908; June 4, 1909; January 8, 1909; Drinnon, *Rebel in Paradise*, 138; San Francisco *Chronicle*, January 15, 1909.

37. *The Public*, November 6, 1908; San Francisco *Chronicle*, January 15, 1909; Drinnon, 121-142.

38. Dubofsky, *We Shall Be All*, 173-197.

39. Preston, *Aliens and Dissenters*, 33; *Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service* (Washington, 1957), 52.

40. *The Search for Order*, 209.

41. See Dubofsky, 227-291; Jensen, *Heritage of Conflict*, 272-288; Gibbs M. Smith, *Labor Martyr: Joe Hill* (New York, 1969); Frost, *The Mooney Case*; Woodrow C. Whitten, "The Wheatland Episode," *Pacific Historical Review*, XVII (1948), 37-42; Samuel Yellin, *American Labor Struggles* (New York, 1974), 171-250; Norman H. Clark, *Mill Town: A Social History of Everett, Washington* (Seattle, 1970); Philip Taft and Philip Ross, "American Labor Violence," in Hugh D. Graham and Ted R. Gurr, eds., *Violence in America* (New York, 1969), 320-332.

42. Robert K. Murray, *Red Scare* (New York, 1964); H. C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite, *Opponents of War, 1917-18* (Seattle, 1968).