



ANARCHY IN CARTOON.

theory of Anarchism. It maintains, however, that Anarchism can be achieved only by a forcible uprising of the people, and it condones acts of assassination when directed against such men as the Premier of Spain, the King of Italy, and others who it claims have shown themselves to be "oppressors and tyrants."

The problem that the American newspapers are trying to solve is how to deal adequately with a sect "which embraces at once the most submissive non-resistants and the fiercest and most treacherous assassins." In the heat and indignation following the assault upon the President, many extreme suggestions were made. The New York *Herald* would have some "cruel and unusual punishment" inflicted on the Anarchist assassin. The Tacoma *Ledger* would make the avowed Anarchist "guilty of capital offense." "Admitted belief in Anarchy should mean loss of freedom to every person in this free country," says the Milwaukee *Sentinel*. "This is one of the occasions," declares the *National Tribune* (Washington, D.C.), "when the aroused public vengeance should have full sway, unfettered by legal impediments, and any proclaimed Anarchist have no further grace than the time to take him to the nearest tree." The Topeka *Capital*, in more moderate vein, says:

"Congress should declare the attempt, whether successful or not, to take the life of the President or Vice-President to be high treason, punishable by death. The law should declare all writers and public speakers who advocate anarchy and assassination, accessory to such attempts; and all such literature, as well as public assemblies where such treasonable sentiments are encouraged, should be suppressed. Attendance on such meetings, and the printing and circulating of Anarchistic literature, should be punished by fine and imprisonment. Societies of Anarchy should be declared to be seditious and should be hunted down and stamped out.

"Such legislation, sustained if necessary by constitutional amendment, followed up by State laws and city ordinances, backed by universal public sentiment and rigidly enforced, will go far to extirpate Anarchy."

A suggestion that wins wide approval is one demanding stricter immigration laws. "Anarchist emigrants," says the Nashville *Banner*, "should be excluded from our shores, and those who have already found lodgment here should be deported." "It may not be possible under present laws to stop the Anarchists from entrance," adds the Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, "but they should not be admitted until after the most searching investigation, and means should be taken that they can readily be arrested if, after admission, they should at any time attempt to preach or practise their doctrine of murder and destruction." The Philadelphia *North American* addressed an inquiry to the members of both branches of Congress, asking whether they favored laws "forbidding the entrance into the United States of Anarchists,"

and an amendment to naturalization laws "making Anarchist principles a disqualification for citizenship." The answers received were practically all in the affirmative. Commissioner of Immigration Powderly thinks our immigration laws should be amended so as to require a certificate from the authorities of the town whence every immigrant comes, that he was not a member of any Anarchist society and was of general good character. The fatal objection, however, to all these plans is that they have only an indirect connection with the case under consideration, for, as the New York *Irish World* points out, Czolgosz was born and brought up in this country, and "no foreign-born man has ever attempted the life of a President of the United States."

Many papers lay stress on the fact that the President's life is subjected to undue risk, on account of the democratic nature of our Government. There must be "no more public handshaking," says the New York *Tribune*. The Denver *News* adds:

"When the spirit of the Anarchist is considered, it may be held certain that mere repressive legislation will not stay his hand. The most important regulations are those that will prevent American Presidents from exposing themselves as recklessly as they have to the knife or the bullet of the assassin. In the state of society, with hundreds of thousands of disappointed office-seekers, hundreds of whom believe that they had a God-given right to the positions they sought and that the man who refused them is their own and the enemy of God, with the teachings of Anarchy spreading, for a President to daily move as most American Presidents have even been boastful of doing, practically unguarded and unprotected, through crowds of thousands and tens of thousands, is foolhardy and a constant temptation to the bloody-minded desperado and the fate-guided believer in anarchy to slay him."

Several papers express the view that existing laws are sufficient to punish the Anarchist criminal. "Our laws reach all crimes; there is no need of borrowing from the barbarous code of Russia to amplify them," says the New York *Press*. The Brooklyn *Eagle* adds that "a sound and sane public opinion is a surer preventive of these crimes than any statutes." The New York *Evening Post* says:

"The truth is, the trouble lies beyond the reach of law. We may pile up enactments until our statute books can not be counted, we may burn Anarchists at the stake, or boil them in oil; but while men have murder in their hearts, they will shoot and stab. We may put a triple guard about our President, but they whose feet are swift to shed innocent blood will dodge all sentinels. The risk of assassination may be somewhat reduced by restricting the traditional freedom of approach to the Chief Magistrate, but it can not thus be eliminated. Our chief reliance in the future, as in the past, must be to allow wide freedom of speech, to beware of intensifying passion by unwise repression of mere talk, to oppose steadily every outbreak of the mob in North or South, to

strengthen our common schools, to maintain a strong and just Government, and to teach every man that his rights and privileges are absolutely dependent on its preservation."

The charge is freely made that "yellow journalism" is one of the chief contributing causes to such tragedies as the recent assassination. The New York *Sun* declares that just such acts are precipitated by "the sort of feeling which a whole school of journalism, spawned of recent years, is ostentatiously working to kindle into passionate violence." The Hearst papers are in particular the object of attack. Says the Chicago *Journal*:

"What man now in office has not been assailed in terms too vile for repetition by the New York *Journal*, the Chicago *American*, and the San Francisco *Examiner*?"

"These papers have vilified President McKinley in language so outrageous that billingsgate is respectful when compared with it.

"Day after day they have printed cartoons in which he is portrayed in the most despicable character and made food for the laughter of fools.

"Is it strange, then, that in the public they have thus sought to educate and to sway, men are to be found who are capable of assassination—men who would consider it their duty to kill such a man as Hearst has taught them to believe McKinley is?"

To which the New York *Journal* replies:

"The actual truth of the matter is that before this disaster the criticisms by the press of both parties had been of the usual severity—but during this period of excitement it is the Democratic press that has been conservative and the Republican press that has been incendiary.

"It has been left to a truly conservative paper, removed from immediate competition, to answer the incendiary Republican press. The New York *Staats-Zeitung* of September 10, 1901, says:

"If the question must be discussed what causes and elements are working into the hands of anarchism, we do not hesitate a moment to denounce the New York *Sun* and its followers as the most dangerous of these elements. Their nauseating cynicism, their derision of all nobler sentiments, their support of all most corrupted elements, now on this side and now on the other, their continuous performance in vilifying workingmen on the one hand and their unlimited advocacy of capitalism, based on the principle of 'might is right,' on the other—these are methods of warfare which, allied to calumny, distortion of the truth, aye, even barefaced untruthfulness, breed hatred among the classes, act as irritants, and conjure up blind fury against their own pompous insolence. We are convinced that a single one of these contemptible articles on the problems of labor, as they are to be found frequently in the *Sun*, does more mischief than all the stuff, thus sharply criticised by the *Sun*, that other papers are emitting for the benefit of anarchism."

RADICAL COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ASSASSINATION.

NOT the the least striking feature in connection with Czolgosz's deed is the indignant repudiation of his act by the Anarchists themselves. Prince Kropotkin, the intellectual leader of the Anarchists, in a London interview, characterizes Czolgosz as "a common murderer," and says he should be treated as such, while Enrico Malatesta, the best known of the Italian Anarchists, declares "there is no reason for such an act in a country like America." Mrs. Lucy Parsons, of Chicago, the widow of Albert R. Parsons, pronounces Czolgosz's action "the deed only of a lunatic," while even John Most says that "no Anarchists in this country want to kill McKinley. He is not a despot, and it is only against the despotic rulers of the Old World that men who are working for better social conditions have any enmity." It should be added, however, that Most has been arrested for printing in the issue of his paper preceding the attack upon the President a lurid and violent article lauding the killing of "despots." In the issue of *Freiheit* which appeared after Most's imprisonment, but before the President died, he says:

"The people far and wide have shown themselves, so far as we can convince ourselves, wholly indifferent. Only the press, church, and political priests have given vent to idiotic howls of

anger. Whenever these prostitutes are seen their faces show cynical grins and doggish depravity. *O tempora, O mores!* These shootings occur all the time among cowboys—5,000 or 6,000 times a day, and the county sheriffs and local papers hardly take any notice of the matter, and since it has been said year after year that all citizens of this country are equal, there is no difference between a President and a street-cleaner, and no excuse for all this noise and nonsensical uproar.

"It was said that there was a plot to assassinate the President. Notwithstanding all the excitement no one has yet discovered a plot, and it will be necessary to release all those who have been arrested, which will make the politicians, Government, and press ridiculous. Assassinations are not especially Anarchistic. We rejoice that Mr. Czolgosz is not a foreigner but a native."

Emma Goldman, when arrested in Chicago and asked her opinion of Czolgosz's crime, is reported to have said: "Oh, the fool!" and to have expressed her opinion of the utter futility of his act. In a recent interview with a New York *Sun* reporter she said:

"I have never propagated violence. I don't know of a single truly great Anarchist leader who ever did advocate violence. Where violence comes with Anarchy it is a result of the conditions, not of Anarchy. There is ignorance, cruelty, starvation, poverty, suffering, and some victim grows tired of waiting. He believes a decisive blow will call public attention to the wrongs of his country and may hasten the remedy. He and perhaps one or two intimate friends or relatives make a plan. They do not have orders. They do not consult other Anarchists. If a man came to me and told me he was planning an assassination I would think him an utter fool and refuse to pay any attention to him. The man who has such a plan, if he is earnest and honest, knows no secret is safe when told. He does the deed himself; runs the risk himself; pays the penalty himself. I honor him for the spirit that prompts him. It is no small thing for a man to be willing to lay down his life for the cause of humanity. The act is noble, but it is mistaken.

"No, I have never advocated violence, but neither do I condemn the Anarchist who resorts to it. I look behind him for the conditions that made him possible, and my horror is swallowed up in pity. Perhaps under the same conditions I would have done the same."

Lucifer, an Anarchist paper published in Chicago, says:

"We need not say that the shooting of President McKinley is wholly condemned by this office, as the suicidal act of a madman.

"We believe that all acts of violence recoil on the party which institutes them. If a society of Anarchists had caused the assassination of Mr. McKinley, that act would do more harm to their cause than to the cause of governmentalism. On the other hand, the methods adopted by police and newspapers in manufacturing 'evidence' and promulgating lies about their victims will in the end be an injury to their own cause."

The opinion is freely expressed in the newspapers, however, that these Anarchist comments are not sincere, and that they are simply given utterance at this time because of the imminent danger in which the Anarchists find themselves.

In the popular mind, Socialism is often confounded with Anarchism, and these principles are held to be closely related. But, as a writer in the Brooklyn *Eagle* points out, the doctrines of Socialism and Anarchism are diametrically opposed, and warfare has existed between the Socialists and the Anarchists for thirty years. The struggle may be said to have begun, the writer continues, in the contest for supremacy between Marx and Bakunin, and it culminated in the action of the London Socialist Congress of 1896, which summarily ejected the Anarchists and decreed that they could have no representation in future conventions. The hostile spirit existing between Socialism and Anarchism is a very marked feature in Socialist comment on the President's assassination. "Socialism," says J. A. Wayland, editor of the *Appeal to Reason* (Girard, Kans.), the most widely circulated of the Socialist papers, "demands an extension of the functions of law, while Anarchy denies all law. They are the opposite poles of thought. Every Socialist deplors