

The Image of Immigrants as Anarchists in the American Press, 1886-1888

Krzysztof Wasilewski

HJEAS

The Haymarket Square Riots in Chicago in May 1886 caused by the subversive activity of foreign-born, left-wing sympathizers induced an “anarchist scare” throughout the United States. Even though their numbers were low and their actions limited, the US press made them convenient scapegoats for the country’s economic, cultural, and political upheavals in the closing decades of the nineteenth century. Robin Archer comments on the effects of anarchism: “Anarchism conjured up fears of the most violent and irrational imaginable challenge to the entire established social order. It simultaneously defined a threat to both the democratic and legal institutions of the state . . . , and the American cultural identity of the nation” (137). Additionally, what made anarchists (and other left-wing activists) such easy targets for the US press was not only their radical ideology but also their foreign nationality. Based on the “dangerous foreigner” stereotype then prevalent in American society, US newspapers ran a campaign in which even the slightest criticism of the country’s economic or social system was deemed unpatriotic, treasonous, and foreign (Dobkin 122).

Media as a Pillar of the Sociopolitical System

Four Theories of the Press, by Fred S. Siebert, Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm, was first published in 1956; nevertheless, its findings still serve as the starting point for research into the relations between the media and the state. The authors distinguish four theories of media systems: authoritarian, libertarian, social responsibility, and Soviet communist. They argue that the chief goal of each liberal democracy is the “happiness and well-being of the individual,” based on the assumption that “man as a thinking organism is capable of organizing the world around him and of making decisions which will advance his interests” (Siebert et al. 40). Thus, their libertarian theory of the press places at its center the freedom of the press, constitutionally protected from any governmental control (Siebert et al. 50). The most important functions of the media in such a system are to inform, entertain, and to advertise. The authors maintain that this system optimally serves society’s interest yet, they admit, the commercial character of the media may promote deterioration of published content as “some information reaching the public would be false and some opinions unsound” (Siebert et al. 51).

The libertarian theory of the press focuses on the positive role of the media in liberal democracy, while downplaying any possible side-effects (Christians et al. 23). Despite constitutionally guaranteed freedoms, as well as the media's commercial character, various relations between the media and the ruling classes still exist, and may decide what information is made public and how it is presented. This observation spurred Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky to construct their "propaganda model," which illuminates the role of the media in the contemporary United States. Even though both scholars agree with the authors of *Four Theories* that the main function of the mass media in liberal democracy is, first and foremost, to "amuse, entertain, and inform," they add yet another function: "To inculcate individuals with the values, beliefs, and codes of behavior that will integrate them into the institutional structures of the larger society" (Herman and Chomsky 1). Their model rests on five principles or filters, as they call them: size and concentrated ownership, advertising as the primary income source of the mass media, the media's reliance on information provided by government, business and "experts," "flak" (disapproval) as a means of disciplining the media and, last but not least, "anticommunism" as a national religion and control mechanism (2). The last filter derives from the fact that Herman and Chomsky devised their model during the Cold War. What they call "anticommunism," however, can be replaced with opposition to any political idea that questions the neoliberal version of capitalism. Herman and Chomsky believe that the aforementioned principles filter media content, "purifying" it of anything that could be potentially dangerous to liberal democracy.

It follows that the media play an important role in the process of the stabilization of a sociopolitical system. As Lance Bennett highlights: "It is generally reasonable for journalists to grant government officials a privileged voice in the news, unless the range of official debate on a given topic excludes or 'marginalizes' stable majority opinion in society, and unless official actions raise doubts about political propriety" (104). Bennett adds that "the responsible press" tends to frame certain issues according to the position of state authorities (116). The right media framing of such issues as military decisions, foreign affairs, and trade is essential to the stability of the system, which results in the media avoidance of controversial coverage (DiMaggio 185-86). Michael Schudson also supports this idea, noting that: "the news media should provide coherent frameworks to help citizens comprehend the complex political universe. They should analyze and interpret politics in ways that enable citizens to understand and to act" (30).

The “Scapegoat” and the Media

As an indispensable part of any social, economic, and political system, mainstream media are interested in maintaining the status quo. Denis McQuail observes that at the onset of the twentieth century in the United States, “instead of being a vehicle for advancing freedom and democracy, the press was becoming . . . more and more a means of making money and propaganda for the new and powerful capitalist classes, and especially the ‘press barons’” (169). Thus, it can be hardly surprising that most US local and metropolitan newspapers regarded capitalism as the foundation of the republic. As disparities between the rich and the poor were growing larger towards the end of the nineteenth century, there appeared a risk of social unrest that could ultimately result in undermining the country’s stability. In order to distract people’s attention from the economic infirmities of the system, the ruling class had to invent what Girard calls “the scapegoat.” According to the French scholar, such a figure is constructed wherever there is fear that a group would disintegrate: “scapegoats multiply whenever human groups seek to lock themselves into a given identity—communal, local, national, ideological, racial, religious, and so on” (*I See Satan* 160). Girard claims that when a crisis (economic, cultural, or political) breaks out, the majority seeks solution in discriminating against the minority, hoping that it will reverse negative trends (*Scapegoat* 49-50). This mechanism is further explained by Erik Camayd-Freixas. In his opinion, a group needs to expel those who pose real or imaginative danger, or are perceived as “others,” in order to maintain its integrity: “A designated ‘transgressor’ must be expelled or identified outside the group, and if unavailable, replaced with a surrogate, by means of the ‘scapegoat mechanism.’ The sacrifice temporarily appeases the masses, suppresses dissent, restores harmony, and reinforces the social fabric, while the cycle of discontent begins anew” (Camayd-Freixas 45).

It is assumed that the majority of a group chooses “the scapegoat” driven by various, usually emotional motives. What really matters is that “the scapegoat” must be an alien, someone who does not belong to the majority that constitutes a group, for instance, a nation. The alien can stand for a foreigner, as well as a member of the group who openly rejects common values. Such a scapegoat possesses several characteristics which Nathan Kensey describes:

The scapegoat may be an individual or a minority, and is “chosen” on the basis that the individual or minority is “other” or capable of being differentiated from the whole. The scapegoat must be incapable of causing

further violence to the society in the face of the scapegoating. If not, the attempt to scapegoat will constitute an act of vengeance that will perpetuate the cycle of violence. (67)

Because of their radical political views, as well as their foreign origin, in the late 1880s, anarchists appeared to be appropriately labeled as the scapegoat of Americans. An endeavor to distract public opinion from the rise of nationalism, economic problems, and wide-spread distrust of foreigners made anarchists one of the most dominant themes present in the US press in that period. Not only were they regarded radicals who strove to set fire to the Republic, but were also associated with foreigners. As some scholars indicate, anarchists and foreigners served as a leitmotif of many press campaigns, not only in the United States, but also in other countries troubled with social upheavals. For example, historian Teresa A. Meade notes that in Brazil “the Republican elite had succeeded in attributing any conflict in Brazilian society, from backlands peasant uprisings to urban labor disputes and peaceful marches to foreigners [and] anarchists” (114). Similar tendencies could be observed in late nineteenth-century Argentina and Chile (see, for example, Solberg).

The following case study shows the reactions of the American press to the activity of anarchists in 1886-1888. Relying on Peter Swanborn’s definition that a case study is “the study of a phenomenon or a process as it develops within one case” (9), I have employed a qualitative and exploratory approach to my research, which studies selected representative texts from hundreds of newspaper articles covering the topic and the discourse of anarchism and anarchists. By discourse I mean not only “language in use” but, first and foremost—after Michel Foucault—“ways of talking about the world which are tightly connected to ways of seeing and comprehending it” (qtd. in O’Halloran 446). The selected corpora of texts were analyzed with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Since this paper focuses on the political, historical, and social background of the discourse rather than on its linguistic characteristics, the analysis intends to present the general press reaction, putting aside semantic nuances of particular sentences or paragraphs.

Historical and Economic Background, 1870s-1880s

The last two decades of the nineteenth century witnessed the dynamic economic development of the United States. After years of the so-called Long Depression (1873-1879), the American economy began to grow again. With further technological improvements and discoveries, American industry—

already among the most advanced in the world—was steadily heading towards the position of the global leader. The rise in American exports was unprecedented. This strong position of the United States in the world, however, did not reflect the domestic situation. While large companies had regained vitality after years of recession, the growing income of owners and shareholders was not accompanied by equivalent increases in workers' wages. Embroiled in corruption scandals and consumed by internal disputes, trade unions failed and turned out to be unable to effectively protect workers' rights. In fact, they never regained the position they had held in the second half of the 1870s, when, in California, they became the first political power, capable of imposing their own program. Such an unstable domestic situation caused uproar among the poorest classes. Strikes erupted all over the country as workmen began to call for higher wages and shorter working hours.

For many workers, the chief obstacle to their demands remained immigrants, who would work for lower wages and serve as strikebreakers. The gradual reduction of the influx of Chinese workers until its complete suspension in 1882 made immigration a national issue. As a result of the adoption of the *Chinese Exclusion Act* and its renewal in 1892, immigration on the West Coast dwindled, yet, the topic was still on the agenda. The growing American economy, despite its vulnerability to temporary crises, kept the number of European immigrants high. What had changed was the ethnic structure of this immigration as people from Western and Northern Europe began to give place to Italians, Greeks, Slavs, and Jews.

In consequence, Southern and Eastern Europeans became identified as convenient scapegoats responsible for all the complications troubling the country, and soon they became widely associated with anarchists. The anti-anarchist press campaign began shortly after the Haymarket affair, when the workers of Chicago took to the streets on May 1, 1886, demanding, among others, eight-hour working days. Local authorities refused to negotiate with the protesters; instead, the police were called to restore order. As a result of the clashes, six protesters were killed on May 3, 1886, while the next day, during another mass demonstration, a bomb exploded, killing twelve people, including one policeman.

The investigation did not produce convincing evidence to indicate who stood behind the bombing. Despite the lack of confirmation, several union leaders and journalists were arrested and tried, seven of whom were sentenced to death. Finally, four were executed, while the rest had their sentences commuted to life imprisonment. Editor-in-chief of *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, August Spies, was among the first group. Published in German, the magazine

was founded by veterans of the 1877 workers' strikes, and sympathized with the ideology of anarchism. Michael Kazin proposes that Spies and his collaborators "shared . . . hatred of the current system and belief that a proletarian rebellion would overthrow it" (87). Although their program did not reject violence, the group probably had nothing to do with the May 4 bombing. For the majority of politicians and the press, however, they became a convenient target both for their political beliefs and their foreign origin (Martin 287).

During the trial of Spies and the others, the press coined the phrase "the process of anarchists," indicating that the national origin of the accused was the main evidence of their guilt. Local newspapers wrote about alleged secret ties that the editors of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* had maintained with anarchists and socialists from Eastern Europe. There were also rumors—carefully recorded by a number of newspapers—about secret relationships of the accused with the German government, suspected to have given them the task of "the destruction of the American trade union movement" ("Herr Most Convicted" 2). Thus, anarchists were portrayed not only as a threat to businessmen, but to ordinary workers, as well. Some journalists argued that workers' legitimate demands had been perverted by an alien ideology. "The accumulated wealth is redistributed by the natural laws of the market, this natural process needs no socialist or anarchist," assured the *Farmers' Review* (1). Thus, any attempt to modify the political system was perceived as contrary to nature. According to the *Prairie Farmer*, the idea of freedom, upon which the United States had been built, could not mean consent to anarchy, as some "ignorant and vicious classes from all over the world" might imagine ("A most important verdict" 1). Other commentators pointed out that the trial itself, as well as the execution of the convicted, proved the superiority of American institutions. After all, the republic did not merely spend money on a fair trial, but also allowed for a "dignified" burial of Spies and others.

Discussion

The Spies trial started a press campaign against anarchists, soon evolving into a campaign against new immigrants. Newspapers depicted anarchists as outsiders due to both their ideology and national origin. Journalists tried to convince readers that only foreigners could challenge American institutions and the American sociopolitical system. Nonetheless, newspapermen continued to comment on the difficult situation of the working class, and most local papers considered themselves allies of the poor. Most journalists, however, would argue that honest and loyal workers should

fight for their rights only through patriotic labor unions, like the Knights of Labor,¹ and under no condition could the cooperation with foreigners under the banner of anarchism be justified. A journalist of *The Chicago Daily Tribune* insisted: “We must not forget that women and men—all those anarchists do not speak the language of our country. . . . Germans, Moravians, and Slavs, who form the majority of anarchists from Chicago are ignorant to the laws, institutions, and the state of civilization. Many of them would be good citizens, if they knew what America really is” (“The Anarchist Funeral” 4).

Anarchists became a convenient collective enemy around whom the foundations of American nationalism were formed (Lieven 31). It was a type of nationalism the main pillars of which were capitalism and liberal democracy. Moreover, being supported at first mainly by the “middle class, educated bourgeoisie and students,” it evolved into the prevailing ideology among the entire American public (Harzig et al. 184). The press played a major role in this process. Newspapers were primarily responsible for building an unfavorable image of the stereotypical uneducated immigrant from Southern or Eastern Europe, who could not adapt to the American way of life, and neither could work properly. The *Rock Island Daily Argus* from Illinois maintains that “immigration—although it has brought a lot of good—if it is not subjected to selection, will increase the existing evil” (“No Longer an Asylum” 2). The author asserts that the idea of the United States as an asylum for all now belonged to the past, as foreign countries had abused it and began to treat America as a place where they could “dump their human waste” (“No Longer an Asylum” 2).

After May 1886, the press associated the influx of foreigners with the rising risk of an anarchist revolution in the United States. The foreign names of the convicts and Spies, as well as their proclaimed ideology that openly questioned the American economic and political system, gave journalists an opportunity to stimulate nationalist sentiment among their readers. It is impossible not to link this fact with an attempt to divert criticism from the business elite, for whom every effort to modify working conditions amounted to the activities of foreign anarchists (Jones 312-13). Shortly after the Chicago bombing, a local newspaper from Illinois began to campaign against “the immigration of paupers and beggars.” In the first article, published on May 22, 1886, the *True Republican* argued that responsibility for the recent events fell to immigrants coming “from the barbaric, ignorant, and stupid class” (1). For the author of that text, the United States had remained open to all who wanted to come for too long: “We have believed that our great institutions

would take care of everything, that our country was big enough to accommodate everyone” (1).

Soon, articles on anarchists as a threat to the American way of life began to appear in newspapers across the entire country. More and more papers alarmed about the number and nature of foreigners who had arrived in the United States with no other goal but to destroy the republic from within. *The Dallas Daily Herald*, for example, notified its readers that the only principle that kept anarchists together was “hatred and jealousy of the richer than themselves” (“Law and Anarchy” 2). A weekly from Fort Worth, Texas, on the other hand, highlighted the foreign origins of the radicals:

Anarchists and socialists, whose actions threaten the social order, especially in the western cities, are mainly people born outside the country. These German socialists have planned and carried out the bombing in Chicago, and nearly all of the participants speaking in Milwaukee were Polish anarchists.

(“Extent and Danger of Foreign Immigration to the United States” 7)

In the same article, the author linked the emergence of “anarchism and communism” to the growth of illiteracy in the United States. This trend was widely attributed to the increasing immigration of poorly or completely uneducated people from Italy and Eastern Europe. Unsurprisingly, more and more maintained that the only way to change such “destruction of the American civilization” was the comprehensive regulation of immigration (*Encyclopedia of U.S. Political History* 188).

Similar remarks appeared in the California press, which was traditionally oversensitive to all manners of foreign threats. Representing the voice of local business, the *Daily Alta California* argued that “the German anarchists and Russian nihilists using methods of the French Commune were the greatest threat to American workers. People who incite the masses are enemies of the society and as such should be treated” (“Stamp Them Out” 4). On the other hand, the *Sacramento Daily Union* linked the growing popularity of anarchism in the US with the growing number of immigrants from Ireland (“Prevention and Cure” 2). Misunderstanding of the immigration issue sparked the press to use various negative stereotypes. An article in the *Los Angeles Daily Herald* described “the image of a typical meeting of anarchists” as: “One held a knife to his chest. The other was armed with an axe. At his feet lay the Stars and Stripes, and over his head flew the red flag” (“An Anarchist Entertainment” 4).

Anarchism became a key topic for some of the most influential newspapers in the country, including those from New York. In the late 1870s and early 1880s, *The New York World* sold 370,000 copies every day, whereas *The New York Journal*, owned by William R. Hearst, sold as many as 385,000. In comparison, *The New York Times*, with a daily circulation of barely more than nine thousand copies, appeared to be a minor player, although it remained influential among the national political elite (Roscho 16). Shortly after the May 4 bombing in Chicago, readers of *The New York Times* could find commentaries expressing that “for the first time in history, the Republic’s law enforcement officers were killed or wounded in the attack on the property rights” (Editorial 4). In another article, *The New York Times* blamed anarchists, who had “long conspired against the United States” (“Anarchists Called to Arms” 1). According to the daily, the interests of workers could not be reconciled with the ideology preached by anarchists. They came mainly from Russia, Poland, Germany, and France, and sought to abolish all property. Meanwhile, anyone who arrived in the United States should understand that only hard work could bring wealth and position. The clashes in Chicago spurred New York papers to print a series of articles discrediting anarchism and its followers. They underlined a connection between the popularity of this ideology and the influx of poor immigrants. Taking advantage of the atmosphere of threat, they called for federal authorities to deal once and for all with radicals. *The New York Tribune*, for example, explicitly stated that “the anarchist is the enemy of all honest citizens, especially of workers” (“Bomb Throwers” 2).

Other mainstream newspapers, such as *The Washington Post*, expressed similar views about anarchism and anarchists. Initially associated with the Democratic Party, after merging with *The National Republican* in 1888, the daily gained independence, while still retaining its influence on the metropolitan elite. The paper’s position on immigration remained unchanged. *The Washington Post* was one of the most ardent supporters of expelling Asian immigrants from the country, and the bombing in Chicago served the paper as an excuse to run a campaign against other groups of foreigners. Reasoning why anarchism could not survive in the United States, a columnist wrote: “The native American is without a doubt the most perfect existing form of humanity.² All the circumstances connected with his birth and training form a human in the best school of the nineteenth century” (“The Future of Anarchy in America” 4). Like many other newspapers, the daily linked anarchism primarily with foreigners. Also, following the example of *The New York Times* and *The Sun*, *The Washington Post* supported the idea of increasing

the special tax on immigrants—as high as \$300—in order to “get rid of the anarchist element” (“A Tax on Immigration” 4). In the same article, the daily demanded federal inspection of American unions, noting that anarchism had gained sympathizers even among the members of the main labor union of the time, the Knights of Labor, with close ties to the business elite.

Carlotta R. Anderson associates the increase of anarchist ideology with the influx of immigrants from Germany, who were the participants of the People’s Spring of 1848. She claims that German settlers after 1848 changed the earlier ethnic structure of the population in Detroit (Anderson 48). She adds, though, that “socialist sympathies were strong in the city” even before their arrival, and the organizations founded by foreigners quickly became “Americanized” (49). To reach all prospective supporters, speeches were given in English, and so were printed papers and pamphlets. Moreover, anarchism—in contrast with socialism—enjoyed only insignificant popularity, also among newcomers. Anarchist newspapers were issued in low circulation and—like the infamous *Arbeiter-Zeitung*—reached mainly the most active supporters. Almost all the major representatives of anarchism were born in the United States or held American citizenship. Although the exact number of anarchists in the US in the 1880s remains unknown, it is highly unlikely that they posed any real national threat.

Nevertheless, US papers would spread fear among their readers by associating anarchism with various unrelated groups and ideas. Matthew Schneirov points out that the American press discourse of the 1880s included a range of definitions of anarchism and socialism (251). In many cases, socialism was associated simply with the idea of increasing workers’ rights while preserving the capitalist system. Commercial journalism of the time rejected the nuances of such definitions by simply declaring that any attempt to undermine the prevailing rules in the US meant anarchism, which involved the subversive activities of foreigners. As Howard W. Morgan contends: “anarchism was a strange and obscure word for most Americans, but its message was clear. In previous decades, many European princes and rulers were killed by anarchists” (400-01). At the same time, the threat of anarchism, built and supported by the American press, coincided with world-wide marginalization of this ideology (Martinek 115-16).

Anarchists in the US sought to change the existing sociopolitical order. In their critique of American institutions and the American sociopolitical system, they used a language evoking that of the Founding Fathers. Unsurprisingly, they considered themselves the true heirs of Jefferson and Franklin, whose message of individual liberty the contemporary

political elite seemed to have lost. Anarchist Benjamin R. Tucker maintained that the modern state had created favorable conditions only for “the formation of masses of thieves and murderers” (53). In his opinion, it was therefore necessary to overthrow the government and all institutions, including the church, as a source of misery, just like slavery had been overthrown. As Tucker explained, various political attempts to regulate immigration testified to the corruption of the state. Interestingly, contrary to mainstream journalists, Tucker supported his arguments not only with ideological assumptions but many times referred to available statistical data, according to which “the percentage of Americans who steal, destroy, burn, attack, kidnap, rape, and kill is more or less the same as in the case of foreigners” (Tucker 54). This led him to the simple conclusion that “immigration does not increase the dishonesty and violence in our minds, but increases the love of liberty” (Tucker 55). The anarchist or, speaking more broadly, leftist press, however, devoted little space to the issue of immigration. In papers like *The Liberty* or the *Alarm*, it was the “economic enslavement of the working class” in general that was mainly discussed (Andrews 2). Assuming that class divisions were superior to national divisions, American anarchists did not regard immigration a separate phenomenon.

As a result of the media pressure, anarchism became an important political issue. In the 1887 congressional election, the Republican Party branches from New York and Ohio not only demanded the introduction of a ban on immigration of “anarchists, communists, polygamists, beggars, fugitives, mentally ill, and criminals,” but also called for the expulsion of such people who were already in the United States (“New York Republicans” 1). One of the most ardent supporters of restricting immigration was the future president, William McKinley, at the time congressman from Ohio. During one of the rallies in 1887, McKinley stated that although authorities should keep the door open for “well-oriented and entrepreneurial immigrants, who put their energy and intellect to the development of free government,” they should also be aware of the influx of “immigration from foreign lands that is dangerous to the peace and order of the country and the integrity and character of its citizens” (qtd. in Vought 20).

The stereotypical image of the anarchist in the American newspapers of the 1880s and 1890s equated to an immigrant from Germany, Italy, or Eastern Europe. In the collective imagination of American society, a poor, uneducated Pole, Italian, or Jew, who spoke a strange language, and possessed all the qualities associated with anarchy. Although there is no doubt that there

were former citizens of these nations among members of the American anarchist movement, their number was far much lower than assumed by the American press (Zimmer 102-04). Moreover, in comparison with the total number of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, anarchists comprised a small minority. Nevertheless, for most journalists, the association between increasing criticism of the existing US sociopolitical system and the new immigration was obvious. This notion was further strengthened by reports from European correspondents, who willingly provided their readers with information about the activities of anarchists in Europe. Surprisingly, in this case, the American press seemed to be on the side of European absolute monarchs, who otherwise were criticized for being reactionary. The fear of anarchism overruled the critique of the authoritarian rule in Europe. A number of newspapers, including the most prestigious ones, would often publish allegations about the relationships between anarchists on both sides of the Atlantic. For example, *The Salt Lake Herald* informed about “the universal fear of anarchists in Europe and the United States” (“The Anarchist Scare in Europe” 3).

Conclusions

The press coverage discussed in the paper testifies that anarchism became widely regarded as a foreign ideology; an ideology that only immigrants could accept and believe in. It is symptomatic that from among all newspaper articles covering this topic not even one referred to the existence of American anarchists. Instead, they abound in references to the foreign roots of anarchism. Linking anarchism to immigration allowed American newspapers to maintain their role as one of the pillars of the social, political, and economic system in the United States. All those who demanded changes not acceptable by the mainstream elite became anarchists and, in consequence, were considered disloyal and unpatriotic citizens.

The press campaign launched against anarchists and socialists, and all those who criticized the foundations of the American sociopolitical system in the 1880s, did not lead to an immediate restriction of immigration laws. Improvement in the labor market (with the exception of the years 1892-1893), as well as the involvement of the United States in military conflicts in the Western Hemisphere (the Spanish-American War of 1898), removed anarchists from the front pages of American newspapers. The issue itself, however, remained in the political debate,

which manifested in the reform of the immigration law in 1903, aiming at dealing with “the uncertain element,” which included anarchists. The stereotypical image of the anarchist as a newcomer from Eastern and Southern Europe solidified in the collective memory of American society.

Zbigniew Herbert Library

Notes

The article was completed thanks to the research grants I received from the Roosevelt Institute for American Studies in Middelburg, Holland (2015), and the John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies in Berlin, Germany (2016). I would like to thank both institutions for this opportunity.

¹ Knights of Labor (Noble and Holy Order of the Knights of Labor) was the largest and one of the most influential labor unions in the 1880s. It rejected socialism and anarchism, and fought for the eight-hour work day through negotiations with employers. Their failure to achieve their goals led to a sharp decrease in its membership: from 800000 members in 1886 it dropped to fewer than 100000 four years later (*Encyclopedia of Strikes in American History*).

² By “native Americans” the US press of the time meant US citizens of Anglo-Saxon descent.

Works Cited

- “Anarchists Called to Arms.” *The New York Times* 27 Nov. 1888: 4. *ProQuest*. Web. 10 Oct. 2016.
- “An Anarchist Entertainment.” *The Los Angeles Daily Herald* 27 Nov. 1888: 4. *Chronicling America*. Web. 2 Oct. 2016.
- “The Anarchist Funeral.” *The Chicago Daily Tribune* 15 Nov. 1887: 4. *ProQuest*. Web. 10 Sept. 2016.
- “The Anarchist Scare in Europe.” *The Salt Lake Herald* 2 Jan. 1894: 3. *Chronicling America*. Web. 9 Oct. 2016.
- Anderson, Carlotta R. *All-American Anarchist: Joseph A. Labadie and the Labor Movement*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1998. Print.
- Andrews, Stephen Pearl. “The True Constitution of Government.” *The Liberty* 27 Feb. 1887: 2. Print.
- Archer, Robin. *Why Is There No Labor Party in the United States?*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2007. Print.
- Bennett, Lance. “Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations in the United States.” *Journal of Communication* 40.2 (1990): 103-25. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Aug. 2016.
- “Bomb Throwers.” *The New York Tribune* 22 Aug. 1886: 2. *Chronicling America*. Web. 13 Sept. 2016.

- Camayd-Freixas, Erik. *U.S. Immigration Reform and Its Global Impact*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Print.
- Christians, Clifford G., et al. *Normative Theories of the Media: Journalism in Democratic Societies*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2009. Print.
- DiMaggio, Anthony R. *Mass Media, Mass Propaganda: Examining American News in the "War on Terror."* Plymouth: Lexington, 2009. Print.
- Dobkin, Bethami A. "The Television Terrorist." *Terrorism, Media, Liberation*. Ed. J. David Slocum. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2005. 121-36. Print.
- Editorial. *The New York Times* 6 May 1886: 4. *ProQuest*. Web. 25 Sept. 2016.
- Encyclopedia of Strikes in American History*. Eds. Aaron Brenner, Benjamin Day, and Immanuel Ness. London: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Encyclopedia of U.S. Political History*. Ed. R.M. Valelly. vol. 7. Washington, DC: CQ, 2010. Print.
- "Extent and Danger of Foreign Immigration to the United States." *Fort Worth Weekly Gazette* 6 May. 1887: 7. *Chronicling America*. Web. 16 Sept. 2016.
- Farmers' Review* 10 Nov. 1886: 1. *Chronicling America*. Web. 10 Sept. 2016.
- "The Future of Anarchy in America." *The Washington Post*. 9 May 1886: 4. *ProQuest*. Web. 13 Sept. 2016.
- Girard, René. *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2001. Print.
- . *The Scapegoat*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989. Print.
- Harzig, Christiane, et al. *The Press of Labor Migrants in Europe and North America, 1880s to 1930s*. Bremen: Universitat Bremen, 1985. Print.
- Herman, Edward S., and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. London: Viking, 1994. Print.
- "Herr Most Convicted." *True Republican* 5 June 1886: 2. *Chronicling America*. Web. 9 Sept. 2016.
- Jones, Maldwyn A. *The Limits of Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.
- Kazin, Michael. *American Dreamers: How the Left Changed a Nation*. New York: Knopf, 2011. Print.
- Kensey, Nathan. "Scapegoating the Guilty: Girard and International Criminal Law." *Violence, Desire, and the Sacred*. vol. 2. Eds. Scott Cowdell, Chris Fleming, and Joel Hodge. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. 67-80. Print.
- "Law and Anarchy." *The Dallas Daily Herald* 21 Nov. 1887: 2. *Chronicling America*. Web. 12 Sept. 2016.
- Lieven, Anatol. *America Right or Wrong: An Anatomy of American Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. Print.

- Martin, James J. *Men against the State: The Expositors of Individualist Anarchism in America, 1827-1908*. Colorado Springs: Ralph Myles, 1970. Print.
- Martinek, Jason D. *Socialism and Print Culture in America, 1897-1920*. New York: Routledge, 2012. Print.
- McQuail, Denis. *Mass Communication Theory*. 6th ed. Washington DC: Sage, 2010. Print.
- Meade, Teresa A. *"Civilizing" Rio: Reform and Resistance in a Brazilian City, 1889-1930*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1999. Print.
- Morgan, Howard Wayne. *William McKinley and His America*. London: Kent State UP, 2003. Print.
- "A most important verdict." *Prairie Farmer* 28 Aug. 1886: 1. *Chronicling America*. Web. 10 Sept. 2016.
- "New York Republicans." *Lewiston Evening Journal* 15 Sept. 1887: 1. *Chronicling America*. Web. 12 Sept. 2016.
- "No longer an asylum." *Rock Island Daily Argus* 25 Jan. 1888: 2. *Chronicling America*. Web. 11 Sept. 2016.
- O'Halloran, Kieran. "Critical Discourse Analysis." *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Ed. James Simpson. New York: Routledge, 2011. 445-59. Print.
- "Prevention and Cure." *Sacramento Daily Union* 10 May 1886: 2. *California Digital Newspaper Collection*. Web. 13 Sept. 2016.
- Roscho, Bernard. "The Evolution of News Content in the American Press." *Media Power in Politics*. Ed. Doris A. Graber. Washington, DC: CQ, 1984. 7-22. Print.
- Schneirov, Matthew. *The Dream of a New Social Order: Popular Magazines in America*. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. Print.
- Schudson, Michael. "Creating Public Knowledge." *Media & Democracy*. Eds. Everette E. Dennis and Robert W. Snyder. London: Transaction, 1998. 29-34. Print.
- Siebert, Fred S., et al. *Four Theories of the Press*. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1963. Print.
- Solberg, Carl. *Immigration and Nationalism: Argentina and Chile, 1890-1914*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1970. Print.
- "Stamp Them Out." *The Daily Alta California* 14 May 1886: 4. *California Digital Newspaper Collection*. Web. 10 Sept. 2016.
- Swanborn, Peter G. *Case Study Research. What, Why and How?*. Washington DC: Sage, 2010. Print.
- "A Tax on Immigration." *The Washington Post* 12 May 1886: 4. *ProQuest*. Web. 14 Oct. 2016.

True Republican 22 May. 1886: 1. *Chronicling America*. Web. 13 Sept. 2016.
Tucker, Benjamin R. *Individual Liberty*. New York: Vanguard, 1926. Print.
Vought, Hans P. *The Bully Pulpit and the Melting Pot: American Presidents and the Immigrant, 1897-1933*. Macon: Mercer UP, 2004. Print.
Zimmer, Kenyon. *Immigrants against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America*. Springfield: U of Illinois P, 2015. Print.

Uncorrected proof