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In 1904 John Turner was the first immigrant to be deported under the United States’ Alien Immigration Act.\textsuperscript{1} More commonly known as the Anti-Anarchist Act of 1903, the policy excluded and deported immigrants who espoused or embraced anarchist doctrine and activities. Turner, a British national found to be spreading anarchist rhetoric, appealed his deportation with the United States Supreme Court; however, it was summarily decided that the immigration policy targeting anarchists did “not violate the Federal Constitution” and nor were “its provisions as to the exclusion of aliens who are anarchists, unconstitutional.”\textsuperscript{2} Thus, Turner was deported. However, questions still remain to be asked; what prompted the United States to employ such restrictive measure against anarchists? Additionally, how did the government define and qualify anarchist ideology in this period? To address these questions, the following research evaluates one of the nation’s first experiences with anarchist behavior: The Chicago Haymarket Affair of 1886, in which a pipe bomb thrown in midst of a labor riot ultimately led to the arrest and highly publicized prosecution of eight anarchists. After the Haymarket Affair, both the United States government and the public defined anarchism as being the domain of alien barbarity and incendiary rhetoric, rather than as an authentic and unique political philosophy. This definition allowed for the eventual inclusion of anti-anarchist policy into the later Immigration Act of 1903.

An exploration of the Chicago Haymarket Affair, and its role in establishing anti-anarchist policy, first necessitates an overview of what the term “anarchism” means in terms of a political ideology, and more specifically what it designated at the turn of the century. At its most


basic level anarchy can be understood as rule by none; freedom from domination by any and all authority. However, this simplistic definition does little to encompass the complex philosophy and diversity of culture and belief behind anarchy and anarchist efforts. Russian immigrant Emma Goldman, is perhaps one of the best known authors and purveyors of anarchist theory in the United States. Her own explanation begins to reveal these more complex ideological facets; she defines anarchism as “the philosophy of a new social order based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence, and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary.” Anarchy is, therefore, not inherently chaotic. Rather, it espouses an genuine inherently good human nature. The corrupting influences of religion, property, and above all government, are believed to have created a tyrannical, capitalistic, and violent society; one in which a person cannot be an authentic individual. Only once authority is removed, can the individual pursue their interests in a peaceful society.\footnote{Emma Goldmann, “Anarchism: What if Really Stands For (1907),” American Political Thought, ed. Michael S. Cummings. London: Sage Publications, 2015. 421} Richard D. Sonn’s survey of anarchism reveals the ideology as “a faith, and a way of life, that exercised a powerful hold over the imagination. People did not simply understand anarchist ideas; they lived them.”\footnote{Ibid.,421} Anarchism therefore, constitutes a very active and evolving political philosophy. How to actualize this resistance to authority and “live” these ideals has been interpreted differently by anarchist leaders from the movement’s birth.

Though anarchism was largely produced during the nineteenth-century, the ideology can trace its roots back to the earlier Enlightenment period in Europe. European philosophes such as Rousseau, Diderot, and Marquis de Condorcet were paramount in basing anarchist thought in the inherent rationality and goodness of man. For many enlightenment thinkers an anarchic utopia,\footnote{Richard D. Sonn. Anarchism. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992. xiii.}
which necessitates no system of authority, would represent the ultimate stage of human
progress. Early European anarchists continued to draw from Enlightenment critiques of
traditional institutions as they developed and spread their anarchist prescriptions for action. One
such anarchist was Frenchman Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, whose ideas on property, money, and
economy were popularized throughout Europe and the United States by anarchist press.
Proudhon is illustrative of individualist, philosophical anarchist strains; that is, he rejected
revolutionary violence as means by which to achieve freedom from capitalist authority. Social
morality would instead evolve out of the voluntary cooperation of workers who would each
pursue their own interests, thus exploitation of the workforce would eventually be rendered
impossible. Followers of Proudhon advocated for a mutualistic, peaceful, and gradual change in
societal structure that largely avoided class warfare. However, in the United States, more radical
strains of anarchism, which would go on to influence the Haymarket bombers and largely define
the ideology, were also gaining in popularity by the middle of the nineteenth century.

Revolutionary anarchism and its chaotic image was perhaps most embodied by Russian
anarchist and revolutionary Mikhail Bakunin. Compared to the philosophical and rational
Proudhon, the bearded “Russian Bear” was better known as an anarchical activist who embraced
the ideology’s destructive undertones. As stated in an 1842 German journal, he believed “the
passion to destroy is a creative passion.” Bakunin believed he could capitalize on the
frustrations and energies of the common man and incite these destructive passions, thus
producing a more expedient overthrow of authority networks. His restless revolutionary efforts

___________________________
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9 Sonn, 28.
10 Sonn, 28.
across Russia and Europe led to his prosecution, imprisonment, and eventual flight to the United States in 1861. Though he stayed in America for only a month, the increased publication of his works throughout the 1870s and 1880s heavily influenced emerging anarchist movements in the US.\(^\text{11}\)

Revolutionary rhetoric such as Bakunin’s grew increasingly popular in the United States with the rise of the anarchist press. A milestone was reached in 1881 with the emergence of Benjamin Turner’s journal *Liberty*; whose translations of prominent anarchist works and other rebellious subject matter allowed the spread of its rhetoric to English speakers throughout the United States.\(^\text{12}\) Yet many inflammatory journals continued to be published in other languages, thereby appealing to the growing immigrant US working class; a group anarchists believed were directly repressed by the tyrannical capitalist structure. One such publication, referenced heavily during the Haymarket trial, was the German *Arbeiter-Zeitung*.\(^\text{13}\) Calls to action can also be seen in *The Alarm*, a popular anarchist newspaper also based in Chicago. An 1885 article listing the values of any good social revolutionist advises “The whole work of his existence, not only in words, but also in deeds, is at war with the existing order of society, and with the whole so-called civilized world, with its laws, morals and customs, he is an uncompromising opponent. He lives in the world for the purpose to more surely destroy it.”\(^\text{14}\)

These “deeds” *The Alarm* refers to are nothing short of terrorist tactics. The term “propaganda by the deed” was used to describe the “mass insurrectionary violence” some radical

\(^{11}\) Avrich, 27.  
\(^{12}\) Ibid., 144.  
anarchists deemed necessary to inspiring the overthrow of authority.\textsuperscript{15} The use of explosives in the Haymarket Affair is hardly surprising, given that anarchists heavily advertised bombs as their weapon of choice before the attack. In March of 1885 \textit{The Alarm} itself published “a series of Articles concerning revolutionary warfare, viz: “The Manufacture of Dynamite Made Easy”, “Manufacturing Bombs”; “How to Use Dynamite Properly”, “Exercises in the Use of Dynamite by the Military Department of the United States and Other Countries”.\textsuperscript{16} For anarchists of the 1880s, explosives represented a newly progressive, exciting, and scientific means by which wage war with repressive institutional bodies.

Recognition of these incendiary advertisements as threats to national security, and as associated with immigration, seem briefly to catch the federal government’s eye before the Haymarket Riot; in the 1884 Annual Report of the War Department, Lieutenant Philip Henry Sheridan warns "This nation is growing so rapidly, however, that there are signs of other troubles which I hope will not occur…Still, it should be remembered destructive explosives are easily made, and that banks, United States Sub-treasuries, public buildings and large mercantile houses can be readily demolished, and the commerce of entire cities destroyed by an infuriated people with means carried with perfect safety to themselves in the pockets of their clothing."\textsuperscript{17} Sheridan’s statement hints at growing national concern over immigrant violence and anarchist ties. Whether or not these fears were entirely justified, he certainly was not wrong in his assessment of the United States as an expanding nation; especially in terms of anarchism’s spread.

\textsuperscript{15} Sonn, 50.
The nineteenth century boom in European immigration and the growth of anarchism in the United States occurred almost simultaneously; as stated by the Paul Avrich “It is a well-established fact that foreign immigrants and visitors played a major role in the emergence of American anarchism. European-born artisans and peasants…constituted the mass base of the movement, while its intellectual leadership included well-known speakers and writers from diverse countries, who came either as permanent settlers or on extended lectures.”\(^\text{18}\) Overall, nineteenth century immigration in United States had been rising exponentially; the 1830s through the 1850s alone saw an increase by 433 percent.\(^\text{19}\) The 1870s through the turn of the century saw an increase in Southern and Eastern European Migration, the same period in which anarchist ideology began to bloom across America. However despite the movement’s emergence and rhetoric of instigation, it would seem anarchists were not on the radar of immigration policy makers before the Haymarket Affair.

In 1882, three months after the premier of the Chinese Exclusion Act, the first general immigration law was passed; although it placed restrictions on foreign convicts, persons charged with committing political crimes were exempted.\(^\text{20}\) While absent in federal policy, it does seem as though anxieties over anarchist immigrants were already brewing at lower community levels. As mentioned in an October 1884 edition of The Alarm, a Daily News columnist from Chicago directly called for the deportation of anarchist J. P. Dusey; the columnist prescribed that “He should be nipped in the bud of his mischief-making. If he doesn’t like the way this country is run the authorities ought to furnish him free transportation to some land where such creatures are

\(^{18}\) Avrich, 79.
\(^{20}\) Ibid., 28.
given their deserts at the end of a rope.”

This reference to anarchists as “creatures” reveals budding perceptions and anxieties of alien anarchists as wild and barbaric just a couple years before the trial, while the solution to these fears is already being pushed toward deportation. This same negative characterization can be found within a *Daily Inter-Ocean* article, which likened international anarchist views to “rabies…a sort of verbal foaming at the mouth.”

By 1886, therefore, the American public had been primed to understand anarchism as an uncivilized, alien threat.

These national apprehensions regarding the foreign and sinister nature of anarchists were largely tied to the broader economic concerns facing the nation during the Gilded Age. A boom in United States industrialization coupled with rapid urban population growth in the late nineteenth century saw the emergence of what came to be known as the “labor question.” The growth of a largely destitute class “trapped permanently in the degrading dependency of industrial wage work” caused many to question whether or not a true people’s democracy, working for the needs of its citizenry, could exist in an industrial America.

The socio-economic gap between employers and employees continued to widen, and workers become largely regarded as easily replaceable commodities; as stated by one frank manufacturer “I regard my employees as I do a machine, to be used to my advantage, and when they are old and of no further use I cast them in the street.”

An additional constant stream of cheap European labor made it even easier to keep wages low, and the job market saturated with unskilled workers. It

---


was out of this new industrial order, characterized by a disenfranchised and increasingly immigrant labor work force, that social revolutionary movements began to develop across American urban centers, Chicago being no exception.

The anarchist movement in Chicago, and ultimately the Haymarket Affair, were largely cultivated by the city’s own socio-economic conditions. Although much of Chicago’s commercial district was destroyed in the Great Conflagration of 1871, the city was able to quickly reemerge as one of the country’s greatest boomtowns. By 1880 Chicago’s economy had transitioned from one largely dominated by commercial transportation to one of the nation’s leading industrial producers of consumer and capital goods. This rapid industrial development was substantially dependent upon the city’s massive population growth, as nineteenth century Chicago saw several rapid waves of European immigration. The limited amount of white-collar occupations available were largely dominated by Native-born Americans, while immigrants made up of the majority of the city’s blue-collar workforce. Thus in Chicago, the social movements that were to evolve out of its subjugated proletarian class would be heavily influenced by the revolutionary rhetoric that followed them across the Atlantic. For many working class immigrants, ideologically familiar labor and political groups provided a sense of community and shared culture for those facing subjugation from native-born Americans, employers and other ethnic groups.

One of the immigrant groups most influential to the development and proliferation of Chicago’s radical political theory were the Germans. By the 1880s the German-born population of the city dwarfed all other ethnic groups, and the German language was the most commonly

26 Ibid., 17.
spoken language on the streets. In Chicago’s *Kluendenstien* districts, where German traditional customs and connections with Europe were maintained, anarchist and socialist groups were highly in tune with political movements across the Atlantic. In fact, it was more common to find European news in German-American labor press than the current happening of the United States. As succinctly put by Timothy Messer-Kruse “No, wonder then, that many socialist immigrants, though they become active in American politics, union organizations, and publishing, looked first to trends and events in Europe.”\(^\text{27}\) Readers may note that Messer-Kruse uses the term “socialist” here instead of “anarchist.” Although perhaps seemingly paradoxical from a contemporary perspective, socialist and anarchist philosophy during the late nineteenth century were closely intertwined and fluid with one another; however in the decade leading up to the violence of the Haymarket Affair, Chicago’s socialists had been growing increasingly revolutionary and anarchistic. This trend was largely stimulated by the arrival of radical German rhetoric.

In his “Social Democracy Redbook,” era socialist Fredrick Faries Heath provides a history of socialism in the United States that illuminates both the complex relationship between the two ideological camps and Germanic influences. Speaking of the late eighteen-seventies he states “It was about this time that the Anarchists began to show strength. The line between Anarchism and Socialism was not at this time sharply drawn in socialist organizations, in spite of the fact of their being opposites. Both being denouncers of the present system, however, they were able to work together.”\(^\text{29}\) Chicago’s Socialist Labor Party (SLP) had proved itself unable to

---

28 Ibid., 44.
overcome the slew of corruption tactics that were “regular features of every Chicago election in the Gilded Age,” and disenchanted laborers began turning to the of leadership German revolutionaries for direction.30

Substantial numbers of German refugees, exiled from Europe for their incendiary ideology, started arriving on the American shores in the early eighteen-eighties.31 Many traveled to Chicago and began making names for themselves inside the city’s socialist groups. Men such as August Spies, Carl Kling, Justus Schawb and Paul Grotkau quickly took control of the socialist press and became the editors of prominent publications such as the Verboten and the Arbeiter-Zeitung. The editors of these workers’ newspapers enjoyed positions of influence not only in their printed work; they were generally the most popular public speakers and party leaders in the city.32 The editor Grauttkau especially promoted a militaristic approach more in line with the more radical aims of the SLP’s anarchist spin off, the International Working Peoples Association (IWPA). This labor organization promoted “The destruction of the ruling class by all means, i.e., by relentless, revolutionary, and international action.”33

This message directly contrasted with the SLP’s platform which had encouraged its members to contest the working class condition through “earnest protest with the ballot, aid us with your moral and financial support to secure a more just and equitable distribution of the wealth we create, in a lawful and proper manner, at the ballot-box.”34 However for radical leaning German socialists and IWPA members, the ballot-box was not enough. Propaganda by

---

30 Messer-Kruse, 51.
31 Ibid., 58.
32 Ibid., 45.
the deed had become necessary in the face of the corrupt political industrial order of the Gilded Age and was highly broadcast throughout the socialist press. Thus by the time the Haymarket bombing occurred, Chicago had sufficiently been radicalized. As stated by anarchist leader August Spies of remedying the industrial system, “I should like it better if it could be done without violence, but you, gentlemen, and the class you represent, take care that it cannot be accomplished otherwise.”35

The violence on May 4th grew out of tensions stemming from a nationwide labor strike started on May 1st, advocating for an eight hour workday. In Chicago tensions were raised when a riot at the McCormick Reaper Works on May 3rd, one of the city’s largest industrial plants, turned violent as police attempting to break up the movement allegedly killed six men.36 In response to this police brutality August Spies, who was a speaker at the McCormick riot, hurriedly had approximately 2,500 broadsides printed with headings exclaiming “Revenge!”, “Rache!” and “Workingmen, To Arms!!!”.37 Speaking to laborers of Chicago, the circular demanded in both English and German “If you are men, if you are the sons of your grand sires, who have shed their blood to free you, then you will rise in your might, Hercules, and destroy the hideous monster that seeks to destroy you. To arms we call you, to arms!”38 The next day, as Police Captain William Ward asked another crowd protesting the McCormick incident to disperse, a dynamite bomb was thrown into the approaching police force; five

36 Messer-Kruse, 1.
38 Ibid.
policemen were killed by the explosion, along with two more policemen and at least three civilians in the answering gunfire that followed.\(^{39}\)

In response to the violence, Chicago’s mayor Carter H. Harrison immediately issued a proclamation condemning the actions of “a body of lawless men” and further warned “that gatherings of people in crowds or processions in the streets and public places in the city are dangerous and cannot be permitted…all persons so disobeying will be treated as law-breakers, and will surely incur the penalty of their disobedience.”\(^{40}\) Over the next few weeks, a number of anarchist leaders were pursued and arrested. Finally on June 21, 1886, eight of the city’s anarchists were brought to trial for the bombing. They were charged with murder and inciting a riot; four of them, Albert Parsons, August Spies, George Engel, and Adolph Fisher would hang for their involvement in the bombing.\(^{41}\) The Haymarket Affair and its subsequent trial would become a defining events, not only for the nation’s labor movement, but also in the ways the public and the government approached the threat of Anarchism.

The Haymarket Affair’s legacy would go on to influence immigration policy in several ways; however, the foremost and perhaps most obvious manner in which it played a role was by cementing the public’s perception of anarchism and anarchy as alien barbarism; as noted by Haymarket historian Henry David, “The common conception of the anarchist as a ragged, unwashed, long-hared, wild-eyed fiend, armed with a smoking revolver and bomb—to say nothing of the dagger he sometimes carried in his teeth” evolved out of the Haymarket era.\(^{42}\) In the days after the bombing, press across the nation exploded with headlines on the “Rioting and

\(^{39}\) Messer-Kruse, 1.
\(^{41}\) Messer-Kruse, 2-4.
\(^{42}\) David, 436.
Bloodshed in the streets of Chicago” courtesy of “Anarchy’s Red Hand.”43 National newspapers like St. Paul, Minnesota’s Daily Globe carried similarly provocative headlines concerning the “Diabolical Designs of Ruffians Now in the Toils to Overthrow the Government.”44 The New York Sun further chronicled Chicago’s police efforts to “stamp out this nest of Anarchists,” raid “the dens of the Anarchists,” and search for Albert Parsons “the most rabid of all the followers of the red flag.”45 The Fort Worth Daily Gazette of Texas especially made efforts to associate the bombing with Chicago’s impoverished immigrant populations, describing the scene of the riot as a “district densely populated with Germans and Poles. Surrounding the square on every hand are 10-cent lodging-houses, cheap saloons, and many of the lowest dives in the city.”46 These hostile descriptions of anarchism and anarchists only worsened with the start of the Haymarket Trial; perhaps most accurately stated by the Salt Lake City Herald, “The Trial of the Demons” had begun in Chicago, and their “Hellish Plots” were to be revealed.47

Only two of the eight men on trial were American-born; Neebe and Parsons. Yet Oscar Neebe and his family had moved back to Germany after his birth, only returning shortly before the Haymarket affair. Thus in the eyes of the public, Albert Parsons of Texas was the only true

American convicted. This left Oscar Neebe, Michael Schwab, Adolf Fischer, George Engel, Louis Lingg, and August Spies from Germany, along with Samuel Fielden from England, to be largely characterized as “foreign dogs” that “had to be taught a lesson”. Press coverage of the trail was heavily saturated with descriptions of “anarchists and their like as ‘vipers,’ ‘ungrateful hyenas,’ and ‘serpents.’” The public’s perception of anarchists as the barbaric and animalistic “off-scourings” of Europe only intensified with the widespread publication of sardonic cartoons such as the one featured below, published in New York’s Harpers Weekly on June 5, 1886.

50 David, 180.
The anarchist depicted above is clearly a wild, unshaven, European ruffian; he stands brandishing a pistol while waving a banner of “Anarchist War,” with a bomb at his feet. The viewer immediately understands his anarchist principles to be threat to American liberties, given he stands boldly atop a bleak American flag. The caption below him reads “LIBERTY (to go if you do not like the institutions of our Republic)” OR (commit murder and you will be punished with) DEATH. Uncle Sam, a national symbol for American authority and justice, stands threateningly by the gallows to the right, while a statuesque figure points him alternatively to what can be interpreted as a steamship back to Europe. It should be noted that the sign behind this menacing anarchist specifically advertises steamers to the German cities of Hamburg and Bremen, thus further illustrating the public’s conception of anarchists as largely German in origin. The message of this piece also seems to indicate what Americans believed to be one of their only solutions to the anarchist threat; that is, the removal of revolutionary immigrants back to their homelands. The Haymarket bombing and the press’s campaign to dehumanize its perpetrators and their movement would successfully mold public perception in the years leading up to the Immigration Act of 1903. However, the Haymarket Affair’s legal outcome would also prove itself influential to future immigration law.

What is perhaps most important to note of the Haymarket trial’s conclusion, is that the bomb thrower was never formally identified. Yet, the jury still found each defendant “guilty of murder in manner and form.”52 This verdict set the precedent for convicting anarchists as mere accomplices to crime; that is, anarchists could be considered guilty simply because of the incendiary nature of their political ideology. In his speech to the court, condemned anarchist

Adolph Fisher correctly surmised “this verdict, which was rendered by the jury in this room, is not directed against murder, but against Anarchy. I feel that I am sentenced, or that I will be sentenced, to death because I am an Anarchist, and not because I am a murderer.” The prosecution’s efforts during the trial were centered on proving the Haymarket defendants were part of a “general conspiracy” to destroy the existing social order, and the bombing on May 4th had simply been a development of this anarchist plot. Certainly the court made every effort to tie the defendants to Haymarket violence and convince the jury of an imminent anarchist threat; they paraded no less than 136 exhibits in front of the jury, including pictures of the lead globe bombs used in the attack, along with numerous excerpts from the socialist press preaching that “the revolution must come.” In their closing argument the prosecution implored the jury to recognize that the stakes “stand now, for the first time in this country, between anarchy and law, between the absolute overthrow of the present system of society and government, by force and dynamite, and constitutional law.”

The jury’s decision to heed the prosecution’s warning seemed further validated by the damning statements made by many of the defendants in their final speeches, all of which almost overwhelmingly applauded the Haymarket violence and advocated for further anarchist action; as stated by the aggressive Louis Lingg, “let me assure you that I die happy at the gallows, so confident am I that the hundreds and thousands to whom I have spoken will remember my words; and when you shall have hanged us, then, mark my words they will do the bomb-

54 David, 246.
56 Close of Mr. Walker’s argument as printed in “The History of the Haymarket Affair.” David, 252.
throwing!"\(^{57}\) The jury could only have become more secure in their ultimate verdict; anarchy and its provocative rhetoric obviously seemed a viable threat to United States institutions, and its agents required the ultimate capital punishment.

Although the defense attempted to appeal the verdict, the courts were insistent on convicting anarchy on the principle of its theory. The judge himself had advised “that it holds that whoever advises murder is he himself guilty of the murder that is committed in pursuance of his advice, and that if men ban together for a forcible resistance to the execution of the law, and advise murder, as a means to make such resistance effectual…all who are so banded together, are guilty of any murder that may be committed in pursuance of such advice."\(^{58}\) The case was ultimately taken to the Illinois Supreme Court on a writ of error, however, although they initially granted a stay of execution for the defendants, the state court upheld the previous precedent. While it was conceded “that no one of the convicted defendants threw the bomb with his own hands” nevertheless “if the defendants, advised, encouraged, aided or abetted the killing of Deagan (a Chicago Police Officer killed in the Riot), they are as guilty as though they took his life with their own hands."\(^{59}\) Finally on November 11, 1887, the executions of Spies, Parsons, Fielden, and Engel were carried out despite the efforts of the defense.\(^{60}\)

http://www.chicagohistory.org/hadc/books/b01/B01S005.htm.


had effectually placed Anarchy itself on trial, and the ideology and its subscribers found themselves guilty by association, in the eyes of the both the public and the federal system.

In the aftermath of the Haymarket Affair, proposals abounded for the deportation and restriction of anarchist immigrants, especially in the state of Illinois; in 1888, Chicago Congressman Adams presented a bill that would “provide for the removal of dangerous aliens from the territory of the United States.” The following year a proposition was made in the House to prevent former residents from returning to the United States if they had declared themselves anarchists, and similar attempts were made to include anti-anarchist policy into 1891 immigration policy. Although these efforts never came to fruition before 1903, it had become readily apparent that the fears produced by the Haymarket Affair had inspired a popular opinion quite favorable to a restrictive policy on anarchist immigration.

In the years leading up to the Anti-Anarchist Act of 1903, the anxieties anarchists had stimulated in the United States public were far from forgotten. Amid great public outcry, on June 26, 1893, Governor of Illinois John P. Altgeld pardoned the three Haymarket anarchists still imprisoned. The following cartoon entitled “The Friend of Mad Dogs” openly ridicules Altgeld for his actions, while showcasing the terror society still held of anarchist ideology even seven years after the Haymarket incident.

---

61 David, 436.
62 David, 437.
The image depicts Judge Altgeld freeing three beasts labeled “Anarchy,” “Socialism,” and “Murder” upon a defenseless woman and children. On the knife used to free the animals from prison the word “pardon” is clearly written. It is then not a jump for viewers to connect the three “Mad Dogs” to the three Haymarket defendants; therefore, anarchists are once again imagined as the equivalent of rabid creatures, straining at their chains to attack the innocent. The presence of the Haymarket Memorial in the background, which commemorated the police who perished in the incident, further solidifies the image’s condemnation of Altgeld’s sympathies toward anarchists. His pardon could be seen as a disgrace to the victims of the bombing. The illustration clearly eludes to fears still prevalent in the minds of citizens about the possibility of an anarchist threat. Given the continual reverberation of Haymarket fears across that nation years after the trial’s end, it should be no wonder that policy makers were eventually forced to act.
On September 6, 1901 the final push needed for creation of anti-anarchist immigration policy unfolded: President William McKinley was shot and killed by Leon F. Czolgosz at the Temple of Music in Buffalo, New York.65 The president’s assassin fit perfectly with the image of the alien, barbarian anarchist popularized by the Haymarket Affair; granted, Czolgosz was not an immigrant himself, however, his parents were Polish and German immigrants and his name had a distinctly “foreign” sounding ring. Czolgosz had also been raised in areas with a predominant Polish culture. 66 Additionally, when he was refused the opportunity to bathe and shave after his arrest, the Buffalo Commercial used the opportunity to further proliferate his barbarian image by describing how “the combination of the thick, stubby, beard and the general untidy appearance of the prisoner makes him look a great deal more like the typical anarchist than on the day of his arrest.”67 This same article went on to stress that “There is a good deal of the animal in his make-up.”68 The dehumanization of radicals, such as Czolgosz and the Haymarket defendants, would ultimately make it easier for the US public to support the deportation and penalties placed on these anarchist figures. The motivation behind Czolgosz’s actions seemed even further to justify the public’s perception of Anarchism as an incendiary and dangerous ideology.

Czolgosz professed himself to have been a “disciple of Emma Goldmann,” a rising Russian anarchist who had immigrated to the United States in 1885.69 Czolgosz had heard the popular orator speak in Cleveland on May 5, 1901, and was so impressed with her message that

66 Ibid., np.
68 Ibid., nnp.
he had followed her to Chicago in July of the same year.\textsuperscript{70} Public suspicion instantly focused on Goldman, along with her anarchist colleagues, and their role in instigating the President’s death. Because of the Haymarket trial, the public had been conditioned “to hold anarchism itself responsible for the death of the President and to view Czolgosz as but the instrument of an alien and noxious doctrine.\ldots,” thus “resident anarchists” such as Goldman were seen as accomplices to the crime.\textsuperscript{71} Further incriminating was Goldman’s admission that she claimed to have been inspired to preach anarchism by the martyrdom of those executed for the Haymarket bombing.\textsuperscript{72} News headlines confirmed that doctors had officially established the assassin himself as “a product of anarchy;” and when specifically questioned about his mental state at the time of the assassination, physicians reported “that Czolgosz was sane and responsible under the law and punishable for the offense, though everything in his history…pointed to the existence in him of the social disease, anarchy, of which he was a victim.\textsuperscript{73} Even though Czolgosz admitted before his execution on October 9, 1901 that “I was alone in what I did, and honestly, there was no conspiracy,”\textsuperscript{74} the certainty that anarchist ideology could incite such horrific deeds had already been promoted for over a decade; now given new fuel by McKinley’s assassination, the immigrant anarchist threat, first defined by Haymarket, would finally be addressed in 1903 government policy.

After the assassination of McKinley, the newly installed President Theodore Roosevelt announced in his first Proclamation to the United States that McKinley’s murder had “been a

\textsuperscript{71} Fine, 781.
\textsuperscript{72} American Political Thought, 420.
crime not only against the Chief Magistrate, but against every law abiding and liberty loving citizen.”

He along with other legislators began drafting a series of bills aimed toward anarchists, and it was Roosevelt who first suggested to the fifty-seventh Congress that anarchists should be excluded and deported from US shores. Although the measures addressing the prosecution of anarchists at home were widely disputed between the House and the Senate, it was a broadly acknowledged necessity that the nation should limit the amount of immigrant anarchists arriving in the United States. Thanks to the Haymarket Affair, anarchists were now nationally recognized as a sub-human, alien threat, which, as suggested by the presidential assassination, could no longer be ignored. Haymarket’s legal precedent of guilt by complicity also found its way into the language of the newly proposed immigration law; on May 27, 1902 all “anarchists or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of all governments, or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials” were added to the list of excluded immigrant groups. The law was further expanded in Section 38 from only those anarchists who condoned violence to penalize anyone who was opposed to all forms of government or who were affiliated with organizations who expressed those views. Thus, the mere adherence to anarchist ideology itself once again warranted conviction. On March 3, 1903, the President officially signed the Anti-Anarchist Act into effect.

The Immigration Act of 1903 would not be the last United States policy to address anarchists; in fact, the law would later see expansion to include communist enemies of the state.

---

76 Fine, 790.
77 Ibid., 792.
78 May 27, 1902 United States Congressional Session. As found in Fine’s “Anarchy and the Assassination of McKinley”, 793.
79 Fine, 793.
80 Fine, 793.
in 1918. Further exploration of the Haymarket Affair and its influence on later immigration policy offers a rich area for future research. As the Haymarket Affair had such a profound impact on shaping the public’s definition and negative perception of anarchist ideology up to the 1903 policy, consideration could also be given to its further influence on conflating socialism and communism in the public and government eye in later immigration measures. The ability to properly identify and understand evolving ideologies has become increasingly embedded in today’s modern immigration and border debate. An evaluation of past government policy and public reaction to terrorist activities could perhaps provide valuable insight into how the nation could thoughtfully move forward with future policy measures.
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